The Collected Writings of J. N. Darby, Volume 31 (Doctrinal 9)

John Nelson Darby

Public domain. As published on plymouthbrethren.org.

Also online at https://plymouthbrethren.org/series/10990

KEE Ministry Library · Faithful Men
kee-ministry-library.netlify.app

Familiar Conversations On Romanism

Eighth Conversation Transubstantiation

N*. Good-evening all.

James. Pray sit down, gentlemen.

N*. Well, we are here again to pursue our inquiry into the subject we had arrived at, and examine whether the doctrine of the Romish creed can be held to be the truth. I suppose we may at once enter on the point which it was understood we should speak of—transubstantiation. Perhaps the best way, if our friends agree to it, would be to state from unquestionable Roman Catholic authorities, what the doctrine maintained by them is.

Mr. R. We could not pursue a better method. We can then follow out the proofs and testimony on which it is based, though the plain words of Scripture are the strongest, and it seems to me, conclusive.

N*. Well, we cannot take better authority than the Council of Trent to begin with. “But since Christ our Redeemer said that that which He offered under the form of bread, was truly His body, it has therefore been ever the persuasion of the church, and this holy Synod now anew declares, that, by the consecration of [the] bread and wine, conversion of the whole substance into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord takes place, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. Which conversion is conveniently and properly called, by the holy Catholic church, transubstantiation.” (Sess. XII, c. 4.)

That we may complete this account I may add the Canons I and II of the same Session XII.

Canon I

“If any one shall have denied that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently, a whole Christ; but shall have said that they only are in it as in a sign, or figure, or virtue, let him be anathema.”

Canon II

“If any shall have said that in the very sacred sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall have denied that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of wine into blood, the forms of bread and wine only remaining; which conversion indeed the Catholic church most aptly calls transubstantiation, let him be anathema.”

Canon III

“If any shall have denied that in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist under each form, and under every part of each form, when separation is made, a whole Christ is contained, let him be anathema.”

Canon VI declares it is to be adored with divine worship.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent, which explains and enlarges on it, is even more precise. (Part ii, c. 4, Sec. 33.) Not only the true body of Christ, and whatever belongs to the true body, as bones and nerves, but also a whole Christ is contained in the sacrament. It is then

added, that, by the words of consecration, the bread becomes the body, and the wine the blood; but that, by concomitance the blood, soul and divinity will be with the body in the bread and so conversely of the wine (see 34). What I have now cited gives the doctrines to us on the highest authority, clearly enough. Any reasons of Bellarmine or others we can take up when needed.

R. This is quite sufficient for us as a statement of it.

N*. Well, I affirm all this to be a delusion and a fallacy.

R. That is strong language, Mr. N.; when so many Fathers and holy men have received and taught it, and when it is the common faith of the church in all ages. What you have to meet is the plain statement of Scripture, “This is my body” —words so definite that your own Luther could not get over them.

N*. We will take the statements of Scripture up first then. That it was always the persuasion of the church I wholly deny. That superstition and very high-flown statements are found in the Fathers as to what we receive, I freely admit. But not only was it not the uniform persuasion of the church, but the best known and most esteemed Fathers taught expressly the contrary, and it was not authoritatively established as a dogma in the West, for centuries; and, though gradually dropped into as a general persuasion after John Damascene, never in the Greek church as a body. This we will examine; but before we turn to the Fathers, we will turn to the Scriptures themselves, “This is my body,” and chapter 6 of John’s Gospel.

Allow me however to say that every Christian acknowledges the great and blessed privilege granted to us in the institution of the Lord’s supper—that feeding

on Him, though not there only, is the very way of life to the soul. Nor is there anything more touching, than that He, the blessed Saviour, should care that we should remember Him, and should even desire with desire to eat the last Paschal supper with His disciples before He suffered. This is not the question; but whether the bread and wine are physically changed into the body and blood of Christ, so that there is no bread and wine there at all; but that Christ, a whole Christ, and that expressed in a profane way, His bones and nerves, alone is there. They admit that it is called bread after consecration, and seek to account for it, saying it is so called, because it has the appearance of it; as when Abraham saw the three men who really were angels. And that it still retains the quality natural to bread, that of supporting and nourishing the body.

R. But where do you find that admitted?

N*. In Part II, Section 40 of the catechism of the Council of Trent. The difficulty really is of answering what has no solid ground at all. They admit that “the exposition of this mystery is most difficult.” At any rate, it is such that “the whole substance of the bread is changed by the power of God into the whole substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of the blood of Christ, without any change in our Lord” (41). Before we examine the positive statement of Scripture, which really presents no difficulty whatever, there are some difficulties on the Roman Catholic view of it, I should like to present to you. The pouring out the wine into the cup, is, you say, a kind of figure of Christ’s shedding His blood. In Sec. 76 on the Eucharist too, the catechism of the Council of Trent declares that it is the same sacrifice with that of

the cross. At any rate the essence of the doctrine we are treating is that the blood of Christ is really there, the wine being changed into it in the cup, and by concomitance the body, which is under the form of bread, also. First, it is inconsistent (and grossly so) to say it is in His body, and shed out of His body too; I have already remarked that if it is in the body, not shed, there is no redemption. Satan has mocked you with a sacrifice of non-redemption. But I go further: Did not Christ shed his blood on the cross for us?

R. Surely, it was a bloody sacrifice.

N*. And now He is entered into glory, though, thank God, and wondrous truth it is, still a man, and there according to the efficacy and power of His precious blood. But He is not there in His body and unshed blood in the state in which He lived on earth.

R. No; He has a spiritual and glorious body and dieth no more. His blood has been shed, and if we speak of His entering in, not without blood, it is as shed upon the cross.

N*. But then, how can we have the body, blood, soul and divinity all in one true present person? By the cup it celebrates His blood being shed. It is the very basis of our hopes. There is then no such whole living Christ, as the One into whom you profess to change the bread, and indeed the wine by concomitance too. As to the cup, it is a contradiction, for it is there professedly as shed, to shew it is, and yet it is in the body all the time. But there is no such Christ now, as a Christ living in flesh and unshed blood: He is glorified in heaven. The Eucharist or Mass is the same sacrifice as that of the cross: that of course (sacramentally if you please) includes shedding

of blood of a Christ who first offers Himself alive to God down here: and such you make the bread by consecration. But there is no such Christ; I do not mean merely that you do not put Christ to death now, but there is no Christ now who is such as could die, and shed His blood. He is actually, livingly, in a state in which He cannot be offered in sacrifice. The Christ which is now, though the same blessed Person, as to His state cannot be a Christ on the cross, nor the same sacrifice offered, nor a Christ living in flesh and blood on the earth, capable of being sacramentally or otherwise, so offered. A glorified Christ cannot be a Christ living on earth capable of dying, nor a Christ offered as a victim of propitiation by blood-shedding. You cannot in truth, life, or reality bring Him back into this condition in any sense. He is not now a Christ who can be sacrificed. If you transubstantiate the bread into the Christ that is now, He cannot be a sacrifice, nor one shedding blood, nor flesh and blood as He was: hence not the same sacrifice. You cannot either make Him again what He was on the cross. No such Christ can or ever will, exist.

Is He in the Mass an existing Christ, glorified?

R. No; we hold it is sacramentally His body broken, and blood shed, the sacrifice of the Mass.

N*. Then it is no true Christ. There is none such now. Can He be now truly, really, and substantially the dying Christ on the cross?

R. Well, Christ is now in glory, He cannot die, or be as He was on the cross.

N*. Then you have no Christ in the Eucharist; not a glorified one, for it is His death and blood-shedding which is there set before us, as we all know. Not a dying

one on the cross, or the blood yet unshed in the body, for there is no such Christ now. Transubstantiation is a wicked fable, as Mr. D. once owned it. It is neither a glorified, nor a dying Christ, truly really and substantially. It is no Christ at all.

Bill M. Well, Mr. R., which do you think it is? for I do not think it can be Christ as He is now in glory, if we think of the cross, because He is not there now; nor such as He was then, and surely it is not a Christ glorified that we have set before us in the Mass, but the sacrifice of Christ. But that cannot be now. I do understand doing it in remembrance, but I cannot see how it can be a glorified Christ, if it be a sacrifice, nor how a Christ as He was on the cross can be really and truly there, for there is none such now. I begin to see into it more clearly than I did.

N*. You have lost a glorified Christ, for He cannot be in any sense a sacrifice again, and a crucified one you cannot have, for there is none such now; and in fact you have lost both.

D. But what then is taught and given to us there?

N*. I have all Christ's institution, and a most blessed one too. That which we do, as He told us to do in remembrance of Him, and find grace and refreshment, comfort and sanctifying power from Himself in doing it, to say nothing of the deep thanksgiving and deeper affections it awakens in us. I hold it to be as to institutions, the highest privilege. That is not the question, but this conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, His soul and divinity being there, and as I quoted, and the catechism of the Council of Trent says, His bones and nerves.

D. But all the holy Fathers teach it.

N*. I am not concerned in what they teach, but they do nothing of the kind. I do not justify what they say, for the grossest superstition and immorality and heresy is found in them, but they do not teach that. The very doctrine of substance and accidents is scholastic Aristotelism. The system of seven sacraments is from Lombard. In the tenth century it was largely discussed, the greatest doctors denying it, and was never settled as a church dogma till 1215, by the same Pope and council that established the Inquisition, at the time the papacy was in its highest pitch of power, in fact governed the world, and all was in a state of infamous corruption, as we have seen. There is another thing which curiously points out how, when the Canon of the Mass was framed, I suppose substantially in the seventh century, there was no such thought. In consecrating the cup, following, I apprehend, the Vulgate, it reads in reciting Christ's words at the institution, "which shall be poured out." That is, it makes Christ not institute a sacrifice or offer Himself at the institution of the Eucharist, but declare that He was going to be sacrificed and His blood shed on the cross. Strange to say, the Canon of the Mass is a positive denial of the pretended sacrifice in the Eucharist. Christ speaks of it as a thing to take place afterwards, not as anything then accomplished in any sense. It is 'effundetur,' not 'effunditur.'

D. But in the Greek it is not so, it is to ekchunomenon.

N*. That merely gives it its character, for it certainly in fact was not poured out yet, and confirms really the general idea. It is the poured out blood which is represented there, and as we have said no such Christ

(that is Christ in such state as dead upon the cross, his blood poured out), exists now, while the true spiritual commemoration of it is most precious. But it is not the question, what is in the Greek. First, the Vulgate is the authentic Bible of the Roman Catholics, not the Greek: and secondly, I am not yet inquiring what the truth of the institution is in itself, but shewing that the very Canon of the Mass treats it as no actual offering, but representing what was yet to be accomplished, saying not, “my blood poured out” but “my blood which shall be poured out.”

R. It is curious it should be so put, and the fact is unquestionable. The fact too that the living glorified Christ cannot be sacrificed, and that if it be now a real living true Christ, it must be a glorified One, perplexes me, but I fear reasoning about it. The blessings and benefits of it are more pressed upon us than its nature.

N*. I understand that. The pastor is directed in the catechism of the Council of Trent so to do, except with more mature members of his church. Nor would I deny that in receiving, however false the whole thing is, pious souls may think for themselves of the true sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, though not with intelligence. But if the service itself is false, it is a very serious thing. Your worship is all false, though it may be ignorantly so. If you have a true Christ, body, soul, and divinity there, the only true One is in glory, and cannot be a sacrifice at all: He cannot now in thought or sacramentally be a sacrifice. If it is what was on the cross, there is no such Christ in existence. And remember I am not now reasoning against the sacrifice of the Mass of which we have spoken; but you cannot convert the bread and wine into a true, real living Christ as now in this world and

crucified when none such exists, nor into a dead one, for there is none such now. If into a glorious One, He is not in a condition to be a sacrifice. A commemoration of it, done in remembrance of Him, shewing forth His death till He come, that we can all understand, and wonderful grace too, that the Lord can care for such poor creatures remembering Him.

James. It is so indeed, wonderful grace. It seems all plain to me.

Bill M. I see it cannot be a real living Christ there, and it is hard to think that the priest should make Christ out of a piece of bread; but the passage, “This is my body,” what do you make, sir, of that?

D. I was just going to ask the same question, and there are other passages as “the communion of the body of Christ,” and John 6; the unworthy eaters being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. And why should we cast a doubt on the omnipotency of God?

N*. It is not a question of God’s omnipotency, which, in the true sense of it, no Christian denies. But God has revealed His ways of dealing and acts in grace and truth according to those ways. Thus, working by the Lord Himself or by His followers to confirm the blessed word of His grace, He gave miracles, sensible signs, works of power which all men could see and multitudes did see, so as to accredit those who announced the truth. The miracle was a plain proof of the senses to confirm the testimony. But here the alleged miracle, which is not the revelation of any new truth, is the thing we are called upon to believe; not only with no testimony to it, but with the fullest testimony against it in every possible way, to sight, taste, touch and smell, and even, as is

admitted, nourishing powers, it is and remains bread and wine, can be eaten by an animal, decay, become corrupt, nay, we learn from Corinthians could make people drunk, in a word in every way contradicts the alleged miracle, the very idea of which is founded on a heathen philosophical system of substance and accidents adopted by the schoolmen in the middle ages, never dreamt of in the early church, and a chimaera without any real foundation, a mere philosophical thing without proof. Some hidden essence clothed in various appearances, which essence was the substance of bread, while all we can see, taste, or feel, are accidents; the substance becomes, they say, Christ, and these accidents remain. Nor is Christ brought down from above, for then, they say, there would be a change of place1 (Cat. Council of Trent, Euch. Part ii, 37 and 44), and space would be in question which, though they speak of a true body, bones and nerves, is not they admit, tenable. It is a creation of Christ2 there taking the place of what was bread in this philosophical idea of abstract substance. And if Christ does not change His place and come there it must be a creation of His soul too or changing, if they prefer it, the bread into His soul. And is it then the same soul? If it be His soul as in glory, He does not change His place; if not, is it another? Is it His soul, if He has not changed His place? I am called upon, not to believe a divine truth helped by the confirmation of visible works of power addressed to my senses, but a contradiction and a philosophical fancy in admitted contradiction to the evidence of my senses. This is not what Scripture calls a miracle. What is the truth I learn there? Christ’s sacrifice is a truth already revealed, only with a declaration that it cannot be repeated. There is no revelation of any truth in

transubstantiation, and no proof of it; but every proof which God does use in miracles contradicting it. And the thing itself, a repetition of Christ's sacrifice forbidden to the believer by the word of God. It is the contrary to a miracle, and a mere fable. Your appeal to the omnipotence of God, which no one denies— though what is contrary to truth, to what He has revealed, to Himself, He cannot do—is only throwing dust in peoples' eyes, the wiles of the enemy. The question is what has He done, not what He can do, of which indeed we are no judges, morally speaking. For I repeat He can do nothing inconsistent with Himself or His wisdom. God, it is said, who cannot lie: and of His wisdom we are no competent judges, knowing it only as it is revealed in Christ. Further we know divine truth only as it is revealed. The question is: Has He revealed that in the Lord's supper He has, and that the priests can turn bread into the body, blood, and soul, and divinity of Christ, as our poor Irish friends say, "make God"? It is really a monstrous supposition, without any truth revealed in it, or any testimony to it. But we will examine what Scripture says. All the direct testimony for it is: "This is my body," and "This is my blood" of the New Testament, "which is," or as you say "which shall be shed for you and for many." Now in ordinary language, nobody would dream of such a use of the words as would make it a change of the bread into the body. Supposing there were two pictures, and I were to say, "That is my mother, and that her sister," who would dream that the pictures were transubstantiated into my mother and aunt?

D. Yes, but you have no power to do it, and the Lord had.

N*. I do not pretend to the power, nor raise any question as to what the Lord could do. The question is as to the force of the words He used, not His power. Such words are used every day without a thought of what is called by the name of a thing being the thing itself or changed into it. Nothing is commoner in the use of language. No one would think when the object named was not already actually materially what was named, that it meant anything but a representation of it. Nor would such a thought as transubstantiation enter into anybody's head when such language is used. When the thing named is there, it states the fact, as "That is my mother," when she is present; but it never means "is changed into."

And it is actually certain that in the other part of the Eucharist the Lord does so speak according to usual language, not meaning any change. "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." No person dreams that the cup was changed into the New Testament. That is, the Lord uses the usual language of men in such cases. It is a fact that He does so, and they are, though insisting on the literal words, obliged to change them to make them answer: that is what the cup contains, not what is literally said; but even so the blood is not the New Testament, and another gospel gives it differently: "This is my blood of the New Testament," shewing that there is no thought of a literal application of the words. And note, in the Mass, the words used are, "This is the cup of my blood of the new and eternal covenant"—words, remark, never used by Christ at all; so that insisting on their literal accomplishment, because of His saying it, has no ground at all. Besides literally they cannot be used, as is admitted, if they were spoken by Him, because the cup itself is spoken of, not the wine, so that

it is necessarily figurative, proving that all the Lord said, so far as the words are the Lord's, He spoke figuratively (just as we ever speak in such cases); for to say He spoke figuratively as to the wine, where they are forced to admit it, and not as to the bread, is absurd. But further as to the bread. It must be remembered Christ was sitting there with His disciples and held the bread in His hands, gave thanks and broke it. Were there two Christs, two bodies, in one of which He sat, the other which He Himself broke? I am aware that Augustine says we are to believe in a certain way Christ held Himself in His own hands. If it was literally, truly, and substantially, there were two Christs. God may be said to be everywhere; but were His body and blood and soul, for these are personal and individual, in the loaf as well as in Himself? Besides you now pretend, it is a glorified Christ, for there is no other living Christ now, but Christ was not glorified then. Was it one Christ, unglorified, sitting at table, and another glorified He held in His hand? But you say too it is the same sacrifice as the cross. But Christ was sitting at the table, and there was then no sacrifice on the cross at all, and so your own Mass puts it, "it shall be shed"; really it is "which is shed" (not that it was yet, but that it was the figure of it as so shed, was given to them in that character), but it was not so shed yet, shewing it was a figure. It was given to them as a memorial, and a figure; there was no sacrifice as yet, no blood shed. Christ was there a living Christ, not yet sacrificed, not yet of course risen and glorified. That He should institute it as a memorial before He went, as He says, "Do this in remembrance of Me": we can easily understand, but the elements could not be really and substantially a sacrificed Christ, for He was sitting there not sacrificed, His blood not shed. The

notion of the Mass contradicts all the facts; all Christ said, all He did, and all He was. Is it not, Mr. R., the sacrifice of Christ we have in the Mass, the same as on the cross?

R. Surely, so we are taught.

N*. Was Christ sitting at the table such?

R. No, not yet. He was just on the point of being offered a sacrifice.

N*. Then how could “This is my body “constitute Him a sacrifice?

R. We hold it changed the substance of bread into His body.

N*. Glorified?

R. No, He was not yet glorified.

N*. Sacrificed?

R. No, He was not yet sacrificed on the cross.

N*. But the cup was His blood poured out, was it not?

R. Yes.

N*. Then that part of it was as sacrificed on the cross.

R. Well, it was poured out in a figure.

N*. It certainly was not yet poured out in fact. Nay, your Mass says, “shall be shed.” But we have now touched the truth of the matter. It is a figure and the bread a figure. You must make the two parts answer to one another, the blood shed, the body offered. But the Christ sitting at the table was not that; that is, it was not Himself. St. Augustine may talk of holding Himself in His own hand. If it be a mere figure and manner of speaking

it is all very well, but He could not really hold Himself, and while alive on earth hold Himself as offered on the cross, and His blood poured out. And what He did, He told His disciples to do. If He did what represented Himself crucified, such He commanded them to do. The blood was shed blood, the body an offered body, and that Christ was not really. It was so as taking the place of the passover by a better redemption; Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. And so Israel was to say: “It is the sacrifice of the Lord’s passover,” the memorial of a deliverance which had been wrought long ago; then a real sacrifice, repeated yearly: with us repetition is forbidden as denying the perfectness of Christ’s once for all; but a blessed memorial which Christ Himself instituted of that which was fully accomplished on the cross.

But it is perfectly clear that the living unsacrificed Lord could not hold Himself in His own hand as crucified or glorified. The true living Christ, body, blood, soul, and divinity, could not be truly and substantially in what is the same sacrifice as the cross, for He was there at the table, His body not offered, His blood not shed.

Bill M. But surely, Mr. R., you do not think the Lord held Himself in His own hand, and that with His blood shed out of His body too? I begin to see it is all an invention of men, or of the enemy, and a wicked one, to destroy simple faith in the one true offering of Christ upon the cross once for all.

R. Well, I am not prepared to solve the difficulties Mr. N. has raised: they had never been before my mind. I took it all piously I trust, for granted, and the grosser material part of it did not arrest my mind.

D. And surely it is much better so to take it. It was just the way the Jews were offended when the Lord spoke of eating His flesh, and drinking His blood.

R. I cannot quite see with you in that, Mr. D., because if it is false it is a very grave error, and what is false about the Lord especially cannot sanctify, and by error we always lose some truth which it displaces. I see this far with our friend M., that the abiding and unchanging efficacy of Christ's one sacrifice, which it is said, cannot be offered often, is in question in it, and it is this which makes it grave for me.

D. But I would not deny the efficacy of Christ's one sacrifice. The Mass, as you know, as held, is that same sacrifice, and the church by the Eucharist applies the benefit of it.

R. This does not satisfy me, because Christ upon this system does offer Himself often. It is not the church's applying it merely; that, as far as I see at present, would not trouble me, but we are taught that Christ offers Himself there, and for the living and dead, where there is no sacramental application. It is a truly propitiatory work. Can that be done now when Christ is in glory, and Christ be often offered? I begin to fear I am not in the truth, and I desire to be, and yet I am afraid too to be led away. But we have got back, Mr. N., to the sacrifice of the Mass.

N*. Never mind that, Mr. R.; as you said before, the subjects run into one another so much that it is hard to separate them, for transubstantiation is the very basis of the Mass, as is evident.

R. Perhaps you would take up the Scriptures; we may look into the Fathers afterwards. I cannot call to mind

any answers in our writers to the objections you have raised, but they quote other scriptures. Milner attacks the established church and others for their inconsistency, but otherwise merely refers to the passages we are examining and turns to the Fathers.

N*. Milner takes care not to quote the Canon of the Mass: “This is the chalice of my blood of the new and eternal covenant!” He quotes Matthew and Mark, saying, “This is my blood of the New Testament,” which is not in the Canon, and adds, “Luke is nearly the same.” Otherwise he has no proofs at all, only he avoids the Canon of the Mass which shews the absurdity of taking it literally. Bellarmine really gives little else than a few words on John 6 to which we will refer.

But allow me to state what is the real truth as to this doctrine, before I examine the scriptural statements in order to shew negatively that it is not taught there. The doctrine of transubstantiation is simply the fruit of the scholastic use of Aristotle in the middle ages. It depends, on the face of it, on the difference of substance and accidents. The substance of bread is changed into the substance of the Lord’s body, the accidents of bread remain. Without this theory, the idea could not exist. But this theory of a particular substance and accidents was a mere metaphysical theory, without any real foundation. We have got nowadays to molecules and atoms infinitely minute, which may be called perhaps substance or essential matter; but all this Aristotelian theory of an imaginary substance and accidents in material objects, is a mere groundless fancy. We see different qualities which awaken sensations in us; colour, form, hardness, etc., and the mind recognises there is something there. Of this conviction, which in relation to us creatures I do

not dispute, Aristotle and the schoolmen, who were as a rule wholly under his influence, made a distinct but imaginary substratum in which the various qualities were inherent. There was the substance of bread, etc. But this was a mere philosophical notion, a mere theory of the heathen Aristotelian school, adopted by the schoolmen, and has no other foundation whatever. But the whole doctrine of transubstantiation, and even the word, depends on it, cannot exist without it, is the mere expression of it, only bringing in a miracle on the ground of it, as to the Lord's supper.

D. But do you mean to say that the Holy Catholic church, in its most solemn and essential rite, founds its doctrine on a piece of heathen metaphysics? It is a dreadful and irreverent thought.

N*. Most irreverent is the fact that they have done so, in itself, and it shews the wretched state into which the professing church had fallen. But I affirm it distinctly, and, what is more important, the Roman church affirms it. In the catechism of the Council of Trent, De Eucharistiae Sacramento, I read Section 26:3 "There are these three things most deserving of admiration and veneration, which the Catholic faith unhesitatingly believes, and confesses to be accomplished in this sacrament by the words of consecration; the first, that the real body of Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin, and sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is contained in this sacrament; the second, that, however remote from and alien to the senses it may seem, no substance of the elements remains in the sacrament; the third, an easy consequence of the two preceding, although the words of consecration express it principally, that the accidents, which present themselves

to the eyes or other senses, exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner without a subject (sine ulla re subjecta esse). All the accidents of bread and wine we indeed may see: they inhere however in no substance, but exist by themselves; whereas the substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord, that the substance of bread altogether ceases to exist." Now the Catechism is not content here with stating the real presence according to the Aristotelian and scholastic system, but formally, in the third wonder, bases the whole doctrine and alleged essence of the sacrament on that system. Part of the miracle is that the accidents, that is, all that man's mind can know, are all there without any substance or substratum to inhere in. They could not hold the colour, form, and other apparent qualities to be those of Christ, yet there they are. So they make a miracle of these sensible qualities being there without any existing substratum. They are sensible qualities of nothing, for Christ and no bread is there!4 They have a thousand other subtleties to make it out. It is Christ's body, now at the Father's right hand, the body born of the Virgin Mary, but not as extended in space, nor divided when the bread is broken, but all a whole Christ as they say in each part. Now I agree that all this is most painfully irreverent; but it is the irreverence of Roman doctrine. And the whole of it founded, and avowedly founded, on the mediaeval adoption of Aristotelian doctrine of substance and accidents, on logical predicables, not on divine truth at all.

D. But it is not founded on this. It is founded on "This is my body," and "He that eateth my flesh," and other scriptures.

N*. We will look at these scriptures; but, taking them even as you now do, they only state the fact that it is Christ's body: but transubstantiation is what we speak of, and that is based and avowedly based on the false metaphysical notion of the middle ages. And they felt in a measure where this had brought them, for, in further expounding this third miracle, they tell the pastor in the Catechism to caution the people not to inquire into it too anxiously. But they repeat the wonder of the metaphysical miracle; it defies (see c. 43) our powers of conception, nor have we any example of it in natural changes, nor in the work itself of creation. The change itself is the object of our humble faith, the manner of that change is not to be the object of too curious inquiry. So he is to use the same caution in explaining the mysterious manner in which the body of the Lord is contained, whole and entire, under the least particles of the bread. I quote a part of Canon 44 to shew how completely it is this metaphysical theory which is in question. The pastor is to teach that Christ our Lord is not in this sacrament as in a place; for place regards things themselves inasmuch as they have magnitude; and we do not say that Christ is in the sacrament inasmuch as He is great or small— terms which belong to quantity; but inasmuch as He is a substance, for the substance of the bread is changed into the substance of Christ, not into His magnitude or quantity. Is not all this wretched and depraving irreverence and substitution of false metaphysics for divine teaching enough to drive away any spiritual mind from such doctrine? What is become of Christ for the soul? Irreverence, yes, it is; but where is it found? In what the pastor is told by Rome to teach his parishioners. But this was not all the abominable effect of this: it was laboriously discussed by

the Roman Catholic doctors, if a mouse ate it, what became of Christ! or according to Matthew 15, or if it was burnt, or any other accident happened; and on this plea the wine was taken from adults.

D. But do you not think it very sad that thoughts so unworthy of this deep mystery should be put forth, as the Reformers did, in order more advantageously to pull down a holy doctrine held and taught by the holiest Fathers of the church? It tends to lower and degrade Christ, and it is painful to hear.

N*. Most painful, I admit; but you are altogether wrong in your statement. We will speak of the Fathers by-and-by. It does tend to degrade Christ. All spiritual apprehension is lost in this doctrine, and the Roman doctors, not liking to retain that in their knowledge, as the heathen of old the truth of the Godhead, have been allowed of God to fall into these degrading thoughts, and worship with divine worship that which a mouse can eat: and though the divinity is there with the soul, body and blood, it is all inert, and cannot hinder the mouse's eating it, nor move nor give a sign of life, and what ought to have been a symbol of Christ's dying love, and dealt with, in so using it, as being such. But they have carnalised and degraded everything in their sacramental system. But I was not thinking or speaking of the Reformers. I cannot say how they used it against the Roman Catholics, save as Bellarmine charges them and Berengarius with doing so. I speak of the most celebrated doctors and popes of the Romish church who discussed these questions elaborately: Peter Lombard, whose influence was supreme in theological schools, Innocent III, Alexander of Hales, and Thomas Aquinas who rivalled Lombard in his influence.

Lombard, after insisting at length that the unworthiness of the priest did not invalidate the consecration of the sacrament, adds, “That indeed it may be soundly said that the body of Christ is not taken by brute animals, though it may seem so. What, therefore, does the mouse take, or what does it eat, God knows.” Pope Innocent III is more precise (de sacro altaris mysterio, c. 4, 11), “If it is sought what is eaten by the mouse when the sacrament is devoured, or what is consumed when the sacrament is burned, it is answered that as the substance of bread is miraculously converted when the Lord’s body begins to be under the sacrament, so in a certain miraculous manner it returns, when itself (that is, the body) ceases to be there. Not that substance of bread returns which passed into flesh, but that in its place something is miraculously created, although its accidents may be thus devoured as well as eaten.” Alexander of Hales, it seems, taught otherwise. Bonaventura, a more spiritually-minded man, a mystic, holds that however this opinion may be sustained, it can yet never be so sustained that pious ears should not have a horror in hearing that the body of Christ should be in the belly of a mouse, or in a sewer. No wonder. Yet the famous Thomas Aquinas supported this view, because the other derogates from the truth of the sacrament; and his authority prevailed. Now these are the highest authorities of that age: Lombard was some 400 years before the Reformation; Innocent, 300; Thomas Aquinas 50 or 60 years after Innocent. His statement will be found in Part III of his Summa, quæst. LXXX, Art. 3. His doctrine is that, as long as the species or form of bread and wine remains, the body of Christ is there, whether it be sinner or animal that has taken it. As to the subtleties as to species and accidents and

substance, as to which we may read folio pages, I leave them. They only shew, when faith and spiritual perception are gone, the degradation to which the holiest things are reduced. Thomas Aquinas, and so Bellarmine, excuses what the more pious mystic Bonaventura says, and justly, cannot but give horror to a Christian mind, such as a mouse eating Christ, by comparing it to Christ's voluntary humiliation in going to the cross. Can any one go lower? This was not the Reformation, Mr. D., but the full bloom of Roman orthodoxy and learning.

R. This is all very distressing; it militates against all piety and right feeling.

N*. I entirely sympathise with you. I have referred to it that we may know what transubstantiation means, and Mr. D. may see whether what I have said as to its being based on the scholastic or Aristotelian distinction of substance and accidents be well founded or not. Any one who will take the unedifying trouble of reading Thomas Aquinas' Summa, Part III, quaest. 74 to 80, will soon see whether it be so or not. It may be seen in other writers, but here you have it in its fullest development, and we have seen it laid down in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. I do not enter into the endless arguments of these reasoners, such as Thomas Aquinas and Bellarmine, as to how the change takes place. What is not cannot be changed into what is, neither can, according to their metaphysics, one substance be changed into another. They arrive at its being simply divine power, it being impossible that such a change can take place according to the nature of things. Secondly, they have endless discussions how Christ's body is in heaven and the same body in thousands of places on earth. This is settled

partly by divine power, and partly by this doctrine of substance and accidents, that Christ is there not materially and in extended magnitude, but His substance, and so in every particle a whole Christ if the species of bread and wine remains. They also discuss largely whether Christ is broken when the bread is broken: the more probable opinion is He is not, as He is only substantially (not materially) present, or in bodily extension, or by a change of place. Yet they say His body, blood, soul, and divinity are all there, but in a different way. For if the wine be changed into His blood, how, they inquire, can it be under the species of bread? They say it happens in a different way, that sacramentally the bread is changed into His body, but as His whole Person is there, the blood and divinity are there, not by sacramental transubstantiation, but by necessary concomitancy, and so the body and all else under the species of wine. The common expression in Ireland is that the priest “makes God.” All this is the effect of the loss of true spiritual communion and feeding upon Christ, and turning to bad metaphysics. I have heard a poor peasant there striking his hand upon his stomach, say, “I have God in my belly, sir,” and why not, if it can be in that of a mouse? And in a public argument on the subject, the Roman champion (being confounded by his adversary telling him he did not believe in transubstantiation, or as they say that the priest could make God) insisted he did, and the other confounded him by saying, “Why God cannot do that!” All this, you will say, is irreverent folly. I quite agree, but it is where this wretched heathen philosophy has led the followers of the Roman system. Well, I think we have sufficiently pursued the inquiry as to what transubstantiation means.

R. I feel so too: I had no idea such things were involved in it, but took it as it was taught.

N*. I do not doubt it, dear sir, and therefore it is I have thus far gone into it; for there are pages of subtleties all depending upon scholastic ideas of substance and accidents which we may leave untouched. But these poor Irish were as simple and sincere as you could be, ignorant if you please, but drawing a perfectly just conclusion, though a gross one, from this wretched materialising what is spiritual. But we will turn to Scripture.

R. By all means. After all, it is the only thing which gives us a sure resting-place.

Bill M. But simple souls, sir, do not know of all these shocking profane thoughts as to Christ being eaten by a mouse, and the like. They have only a kind of terror about the body and blood of Christ, but it is mortal sin if they do not receive it at Easter, and then they are absolved in order to do it, and then they are all right until the next time.

N*. They do not, M., I quite admit and thankfully too. But the effect even on them is what you say. Instead of spiritual persons with holy reverence celebrating the memorial of Christ's death, humbled in the sense of the infinite love which brought Him there for us, while they wait for Him who so loved them; but with holy joy and thanksgiving (which is the very name of the ordinance, eucharistia) that He has so loved them and washed them from their sins in His own blood, so that saved by Him they can wait for Him with joy, feeding on Him and living by Him meanwhile, they go on with dread if they have divine life, or, as generally is the case, get clear for a

time as the Jews did with their repeated sacrifice, and then go on as carelessly as before with a conscience at ease but unpurged till the year comes round, and the same ceremony goes on again.

R. This is but too often the case, but some go with piety and love to the Lord.

N*. I do not deny it, but I have lived too much among the Roman Catholics, not to know what is habitually the case. And those who are pious go, as I have said, with dread. It is not the Eucharist, thanksgiving, for those whom the Lord has loved and saved by His precious death, and waiting for Him from heaven.

R. You speak as if a Christian were always confident and assured of his salvation.

N*. Certainly. If he fails in any way he has to humble himself and be heart-broken before God about his failure, and have his heart fully before God about it; but "we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father." We know our relationship as redeemed to God by Christ, by His Spirit dwelling in us. A disobedient child has to mourn over and confess his fault, but it does not raise the question if he is a child.

R. I cannot say I am there.

N*. The system you belong to cannot bring you there nor even allow it. It would destroy all its influence. But it is yours. For I have no right nor wish to doubt that you love the Lord: only you do not know the perfectness of His redemption.

R. But I do not doubt the Lord's having accomplished our redemption.

N*. I do not question it. But He says that those who believe are justified from all things. You say you believe, but do not know whether you are justified. How is that?

R. I am afraid of being presumptuous or thinking too well of myself.

N*. I do not assuredly ask you to think well of ourselves. It was just poor Job's case, and he had to learn to abhor himself; and so have we all. What gives peace is that God is satisfied with Christ's work who died for us, and His raising Him from the dead is the witness of that. And it is no presumption if He has borne your sins, and the terrible debt is paid: to believe it is and to own His love in doing it.

R. But what are we to do about the sins that we are guilty of since?

N*. Since when?

R. Since we were forgiven, since our baptism.

N*. In the outward sense, you had committed none before it, so that as to this it did not do much for you. But allow me to ask you how many of your sins did you commit since Christ bore them?

R. Why, all of them; I was not born, of course.

N*. All of them. That is the point. If Christ bore all my sins and I through grace believe in Him, the whole matter is settled as to their being put away. God works by His word and Spirit in us, so that we are brought to repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; we have a new life, are born of God; and there are various ministrations of grace by the way. But the matter is settled with God for my soul as to forgiveness and salvation. As the Lord said to the poor woman, "Thy

sins are forgiven thee; thy faith hath saved thee"; and He did not deceive her, nor say it for her alone.

R. It is a serious question. Is it indeed so?

N*. Well, I can only leave and commend you to His grace who can make all clear to our souls. Shall we turn to John 6?

R. If you please.

N*. In the first place many Roman Catholic writers admit that it does not apply to the Eucharist. Bellarmine gives quite a list of them, only he says their motives were more right than the Protestants', and that as good Catholics they must hold it does, for the Roman Catechism and other church authorities hold it does. But he evidently feels he is on weak ground here. And it is perfectly certain, taking their own view of the Eucharist, that eating Christ's flesh and drinking His blood in John 6 does not apply to it. No Roman Catholic holds that every one that receives the Eucharist is finally saved: but this is positively affirmed of those who eat Christ as the act is spoken of in this chapter. It is not merely that they have life by it, nor that they live by it, but that He will raise them up on the last day. This is positively declared of every one who eats Christ's flesh and drinks Christ's blood as here spoken of.

R. Where is that?

N*. The Lord declares four times over in the chapter that He will raise up certain persons, to whom He has given eternal life, at the last day: verses 39, 40, 44; and lastly, verse 54, make it dependent on their eating His flesh and drinking His blood, and unfold this truth. They had no life in themselves without it, they dwelt in Him,

and He in them, but he that ate of that bread was to live for ever. Christ was their life, and, as possessed of that life, they would never die. In a word, they who ate Christ as spoken of in that chapter would live for ever, and be raised up in blessing. No one pretends that all who partake of the Eucharist will live for ever. It is not of this rite then that the passage speaks, for those who eat as here spoken of will live for ever. Do you believe that everybody that partakes of the Eucharist is surely and eternally saved?

R. No, surely not.

D. Nor do I for a moment.

N*. Then it is perfectly certain that John 6 does not refer to the Eucharist, for the Lord says, “If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever.” Again: “Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.” Now this leaves no loophole for controversy. He has everlasting life; this, a person may say, he may lose; but the Lord shuts out this evasion of the truth by adding, “I will raise him up at the last day.” That is, He connects final blessing with the present possession of eternal life by those who eat His flesh and drink His blood. And all confirms it: “he that eateth me shall live by me.” Now we all admit, that every one who receives the Eucharist is not necessarily finally saved, but the persons spoken of in John 6 are. It does not therefore apply to partaking of the Eucharist.

D. But this must be taken with the conditions attached to it in the gospel. He has this in eating the grace of eternal life; and if he perseveres, he will be raised up for glory.

N*. I find no “if he perseveres” in the passage. It attaches eternal life, and consequent raising up by Christ, to the eating, shewing that it is a real spiritual possession of Christ by faith through the Holy Ghost. And the whole chapter confirms this thought, that it is Christ personally, not Christ in the Eucharist. He is first spoken of as coming down from heaven, and then as sacrificed, giving His body and shedding His blood, and then as ascending up where He was before. Bellarmine, who has really very little to say on the point, insists on His saying, “I will give”; and that if it referred to spiritual feeding on Christ by faith, they could do it then or at any time, and He need not say, “I will give”; while in the institution He says, “This is my body.” But this has no force whatever. First, in the Mass, we have seen it is “shall be shed,” so that his argument falls to the ground. And when He says, “I will give,” what does He refer to? Clearly to His death, His blood shed out, the sacrifice of Himself, as it is said, “He gave himself for our sins; loved us and gave himself for us.” It is what He was going to do. He was the bread of life come down from heaven. That cannot be said of the Eucharist, nay, the Catechism of the Council of Trent (Euch. P. 2, 37, 44) denies it, even in the change which takes place, for then it would have to do with locality and space. It was the Son of God, come forth from the Father, the Word made flesh; and whoever believed on Him had everlasting life; He was that bread of life then: “I am that bread of life”; but He had yet to give Himself for the life of the world, and people to be saved must believe on Him as the crucified Saviour as well as the incarnate Saviour, but if they really did, He was a Saviour, and they were saved. And the grand testimony that He was such by His death was, that He ascended up whence He was before. Those

taught of God came to Him; but He must die to save them. Nothing really can be simpler. Whoever ate of that bread, according to the sense of that chapter, would live for ever. Bread that came down from heaven (which is professedly denied of the Eucharist) and One giving Himself on the cross for the life of the world, and then ascending up where He was before, which is impossible to apply to the Eucharist: but it is the same Person of Christ spoken of all through. Nor could the Eucharist give itself and its life. When the thing is examined into, it is absurd nonsense to apply it to the Eucharist. This living Christ, body, soul, blood, divinity, has no sense or feeling, is as inert and helpless as the bread it appears to be, and the wine that can be drunk by the lips of men.

Bill M. We have never believed, Mr. R., that he who received the Mass would live for ever in eternal life.

R. No, that is not the doctrine of the church; his final state depends on what he does afterwards.

Bill M. But John 6 says, He who eats that bread will live for ever; so it cannot mean receiving at the Mass, but having Christ really in one's soul some other way. Whatever people get in the Mass, they do not get that.

JR. They may get the grace of eternal life, and then lose it perhaps.

Bill M. But that is not "shall live for ever"; and eternal life and then being raised up as having eternal life.

R. No, it is not, nor do I deny that when you look through the chapter, it seems to refer to the Lord Jesus Christ personally, not to the sacrifice of the Mass.

N*. I really do not see how a person can doubt it. Especially when we see how the Lord speaks of coming

down from heaven, giving His flesh and blood, and ascending up where He was before, which cannot apply to an ordinance, but plainly to Himself in Person. “The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.” “I am that bread of life.” He was it then personally, when no Eucharist could be in question. Then He says, “I will give,” which He was going to do, and so introduces His flesh and blood separated in death, and then, as we have seen, His ascension. The Jews rejected both, would not own He came down from heaven, nor think they could eat His flesh and drink His blood, taking it in a carnal sense. You really give it this sense, though you cover it under the term sacramentally and species of bread and wine; for you say there is no bread there, but truly, really and substantially the body and blood of Christ with His soul and divinity. But we have nothing to do with Jewish unbelief, and the Lord treats the Jews there as hopeless reprobates, and indeed all through John’s Gospel, for we take the words spiritually, as Christ in the chapter itself tells us to do (v. 63). “It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.” As for Dr. Milner, he takes it all for granted, saying, “After which [the miracle] He took occasion to speak of this mystery, saying,” etc. The extreme weakness of both Bellarmine and Milner on this point is most striking.

But it proves more. It proves that, in speaking of eating Him and drinking His blood, such language refers to spiritually feeding on Christ, not on any actual reception of the Lord’s body and blood. A person who eats, as here spoken of, lives by the life of Christ, has eternal life, abides in Him, and is raised up into glory. But it proves

more; it proves that the terms used on this subject by the Lord and recorded in the New Testament are used, not literally, but figuratively. Christ declares His Father gave them the true bread from heaven. Do the teachers of transubstantiation mean to say that Christ was really bread? Surely not. Yet He says, “I am that bread of life.” “He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.” He was not physically nor substantially bread come down from heaven; that is, “is” was figuratively and spiritually used. Again, the bread which He gives is His flesh which He would give for the life of the world. As bread, as a figure, He was come down from heaven, incarnate in the world. The bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. This bread means Him who came forth from the Father, and came into the world, the Word made flesh, the Son of God. He was the living bread come down from heaven. But incarnation was not sufficient alone to save us. He must die, or He would have abode alone, and the bread He gives is His flesh which He had taken, and this He gives for the life of the world. Here we have the cross, the propitiation made for sin. The Eucharist is for believers, His people. This giving His flesh is for the world; and he that eats not this, and drinks not His blood, has no life in him. But the Lord’s supper none can truly eat but those who have life in them already, and even if only formally, it is as Christians they do it, not as the unsaved world, to which He came that men might live and be forgiven through Him; and as we have seen he who does eat has eternal life, and will have part in the resurrection of life—he will live for ever. In a word, no eternal life without the cross, without shedding of blood. Hence the blood too must be drunk. It must be shed and taken into the heart, as shed, to be of any use. Without shedding of blood there is no

remission. It was not a Messiah to the Jews they were to believe in, true as that was, but One come down from heaven incarnate in the world, and giving Himself and shedding His blood for the world. So must He be received, so fed upon, and thus men would have eternal life. Hence, having spoken of incarnation and death, He adds, “What and if ye see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?” You make giving His flesh for the life of the world, after His ascension, contrary to the order of the chapter. Thus, when Christ is said to be bread, it is a mere figure. The bread was Christ in the flesh which He was going to give for the life of the world.

D. But then He speaks of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, which He gives for the fife of the world.

N*. Surely. He gives Himself literally on the cross, His blood being poured out, for it is to be drunk. He actually gave Himself for the life of the world upon the cross, and there His blood was shed, and without shedding of blood there is no remission. And if this drinking of blood were literal, the poor Roman Catholics could not be saved; they never get it at all. They are told that they get it in the body, but that is not poured out; they must drink it to have life. And it refers to Christ as He then was in incarnation and so dying (before His ascension which comes afterwards); and such as do so eat Him, feed in heart on Him as incarnate and dying for us, are eternally saved (v. 54), and men have no spiritual life at all if they do not. That Christ’s blood should be shed now that He is in glory is perfectly impossible, contrary to all truth and Scripture. And the blood-shedding here spoken of is after His incarnation as head come down from heaven, and before His return thither; in a word it is His blood

as shed on the cross as incarnate down here, shed indeed for redemption, but closing all association with man in the flesh, given for the life of the world, none other. And indeed, whereas we know that He shed His blood for man on the cross, there is not a trace of His taking His blood again, though in its spiritual efficacy it is presented to God, but as shed, apart from Him who presents it on high. That His body was raised, every Christian believes—a man is no Christian who does not; but not that He took back His blood and went up to heaven, having it in Himself as if He had not shed it and died. And indeed it cannot be; for we are to be conformed to His image, that He may be the firstborn among many brethren: and it is said of us, flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. But what is essential is that Christ's blood can in no sense be shed now. It must be drunk spiritually in memory that He did shed it, or not at all. Hence Christ puts eating His flesh and drinking His blood, and eating Him together, that is faith in His Person and death so as to live by them. Only the recognition of the shedding of His blood, and the drinking of it as so shed, is essential. We have no life else. Now it cannot be shed, and at the same time be in His body as the bread come down from heaven. If it be in His body, then there is no redemption at all. The words He spake were spirit and life: shed blood is salvation. If it be a glorified body, it is impossible. If it be looked at as His body down here, there is no redemption at all.

R. What you say I cannot resist the force of. But, as you have said, many esteemed Catholic authors do not apply John 6 to the sacrament of the altar. Still there are principles in what you say which go beyond John 6, and

raise the whole question as to what that sacrament is, or what blood there can be for us to drink as spoken of in John 6, save as figuratively. That a glorified Christ cannot shed blood now is clear, and that He gave His flesh for the life of the world on the cross is certain. I confess I am perplexed, and it distresses me. We do, as Bill M. said, attach so much importance to the Mass and sacrament of the altar, and boast, as against Protestants, that we have a sacrifice and they have none.

N*. But, remark, Mr. R., if you believe that the blessed Lord gave His flesh and shed His blood on the cross for us, and in your heart feed on the bread which came down from heaven incarnate and sacrificed for us, you have exactly what Hebrews 9, 10, speak of, a sacrifice once offered of perpetual efficacy and never to be repeated, He being ascended on high and seated there now. You have eternal life, nay, shall live for ever. Whatever the privilege of partaking of the Eucharist, which I hold to be very great, it is by that one sacrifice once offered and blood once shed, as Scripture tells us, really received into the heart by faith, that we are sanctified and perfected in conscience, and have assurance, in John 6, of eternal life.

R. I see clearly what you mean, but it is, for us, if we are to receive it, an immense revolution in the mind.

N*. It is, Mr. R., but a blessed one. Only allow me to remark that the foundation of faith remains, only cleared of much that both obscures and mars it, the Person and work of the blessed Son of God; only so as to give peace to the conscience and joy to the heart, instead of dread and bondage.

But we may turn, I think, to the apostle Paul's statement in 1 Corinthians 11:23-29. One thing is clear, that he calls it bread after the giving of thanks as before, has no idea of its being anything else (vv. 26, 27). For him it was bread and the cup after the Lord had said, "This is my body," as before. The words He uses as to the cup are that the cup is the new covenant, as in Luke. There is not a trace that He counted it anything but what it was, evidently. It is done in remembrance of Christ, which could not be if He was then giving Himself. Was Christ the offerer, doing it in remembrance of Himself? We shew forth the Lord's death, but He cannot die as now glorified: the notion of a sacramental putting to death a glorified Jesus is as horrible as it is contrary to all truth. It is a remembrance of what was His death, and His death is over for ever. All He says supposes it to be constantly bread and wine all through. That is what a man eats or drinks unworthily, when he is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. So that in saying this He has no idea it is not still bread.

R. Let us turn to the words of institution.

N*. We will. Let us, however, carry this with us, that the Lord, speaking in John 6, uses this figurative language. He was the bread come down from heaven. If we remember the occasion on which the rite was instituted, the phraseology is very easy to understand. God, when redeeming Israel out of Egypt, had had the blood of the lamb sprinkled on the doorposts and said, "When I see the blood, I will pass over … "; and they ate the lamb. Of this they were to keep up the memorial, and, if their children inquired, were to say "This is the Lord's passover," when He did not pass over at all; but they celebrated the memorial of it. Christ our passover has

been sacrificed for us, where, note, the apostle has no idea but of the one sacrifice of Christ accomplished long ago; and we are to keep the feast with no renewed one, as indeed we have seen that there was to be no more sacrifice for sins; and our feeding on Him is not physically or materially, but spiritually in our souls, in thankful faith for what He has wrought, our conscience being, through the unchangeable efficacy of His blood, perfected for ever before God.

Now let us consider the supper itself. It was to be observed in remembrance of the true Paschal Lamb, Christ just about to be offered, not a memorial of redemption from Egypt as Jews, but from sin and the flesh and Satan by an “eternal redemption obtained” for us. This Christ clearly sets before them, speaking of His blood shed for many, His blood of the new covenant. It was the true passover sacrifice of the Lamb of God, and that, and not deliverance from Egypt, was to be perpetually remembered. Nothing can be clearer than this, and it gives its character to the whole scene. It was the Jewish passover, and another and better, for the whole world and eternity, was just going to be substituted for it in the sacrifice of the true Paschal Lamb, giving His flesh for the life of the world, shedding that blood which by faith cleanses from all sin, yea, by the shedding of which alone remission is obtained. He takes the elements furnished by the supper as symbols of this. And mark here, not one word, as Roman Catholics have admitted, is said in Scripture of changing anything in any way, no such thought is ever expressed in any way. He says, with the bread in His hands, This is my body.

D. But excuse me, sir, if it was His body, it must have been changed, for He had taken the bread into His hand.

N*. If it means literally His body. But as to this, your saying “it must,” is the admission that there is nowhere any statement that there is a change. Can you refer to any actual statement that such a change takes place?

R. Well, I can call to mind no scripture, but I cannot pretend to know the Scriptures well.

Bill M. I never thought of that, and if there be none, it does make all the difference as to the doctrine. It is only man’s way of explaining if it be really His body.

N*. They are not agreed how to explain it themselves. Many did not hold it to be a change, holding that a substance could not in the nature of things be changed and be not itself; they thought that the bread disappeared miraculously and the body came in its place without changing the appearance of the elements, but as the underlying substance. Into all this we need not enter. It is only important to shew that the whole was from human reasoning. But it is held by many schoolmen, and even by Cajetan, Luther’s opponent, that it cannot be proved by Scripture. Bellarmine (3, 23) admits it may be so, “it is not altogether improbable,” seeing most learned and acute men as Scotus have so held. Quoting Cameracensis, many others5 whom I need not recall, might be cited. But let us turn to the words. Are we to believe that Christ held His body in His own hand and His blood poured out too? I know Augustine says He bore His body in a certain manner in His hand (quodammodo), but this “in a certain manner” just shews that it was not really and substantially in His hand, which would be grossly absurd. But what they call

the real body of Christ He did hold in His hand and gave thanks and brake it. Did He hold His own body? Or did the living Christ hold the dead Christ with the blood shed out in His hand? Indeed, a bone of Him was not to be broken,6 but did He break His own body in any sense? or was it bread?

James. Surely, Mr. R., you do not think He took His own body in His hand, and broke it.

R. I do not wish to say much; we will continue our examination of the passage.

N*. The apostle Paul has at any rate settled it. In speaking of the communion of the body of Christ (that is, as the passage makes evident, our spiritual identification with Christ as the Gentiles were identified with their idols in partaking of the idol sacrifices, and the Jewish priests with the altar of Jehovah by eating of the sacrifices offered there), he declares what we break to be bread. Where this communion, that is, takes place, it is still bread. And so little does he attach the thought of any substantial change to it, that he is content to say, “The cup which we drink.” He saw the broad plain fact which all saw and acted in before him. It was bread He broke, and a cup they drank of. The spiritual sense was communion with the body and blood of Christ, association with it, and if so they could not be associated with demons too. But remark further, it is “Christ crucified” which is in question. He is viewed in the Eucharist not as sitting, true as that may be, thank God at the right hand of God; but as often as we eat that bread and drink that cup, we shew forth the Lord’s death till He come. What we eat is bread, and what we drink is the cup, the plain, Sensible, evident fact; but

what we set forth and declare in it, is Christ's death—His body given for us, His blood shed for us; we do it in remembrance of Him. There is no such Christ to be changed into. There is now no dead Christ, no shed blood substantially to be found. And this is no mere playing with words, it is the essence of the rite, what we shew forth. It is His blood as shed that is set forth, and His death. It is Christ's dying that is the meaning of the rite, and that must be remembrance. He cannot die now. Hence, as so presented in John 6, it comes after His coming down from heaven, and before His ascending up where He was before, as of course His death necessarily did. For in John His death itself, not the memorial of it, is spoken of. But it cannot be in remembrance of a present living Christ in heaven. It is in remembrance of Him once humbled and dying, a state passed and gone for ever. Further He could give no such Christ at the last supper: His blood was not then poured out. The state spoken of, He was not in. He could not say, "This is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many," as a present substantial real thing; there was none such. Giving it to be observed as a memorial of its shedding on the cross, that we can all understand; but He could not hold His own shed blood in His hand, for it was yet in His body. A figure of what would be is plain enough. Hence, as we have seen, your Vulgate says, "which shall be poured out," acknowledging it was not so then. The truth is the word (ekchunomenon) does not say "had been" or "would be," but gives it that character; it was shed blood which was of any avail; that must be drunk, or there was no life, without that shedding there was no remission. When the Lord said, "Take eat," He had not yet consecrated it by the words said to do so by the Roman Catholic doctrine. As has long ago been urged,

when He took and brake it, and said this, it was the bread He had taken in His hand. It was the bread which He took and brake they were to eat as such, as His body, but not a word of being changed into it, and do it in remembrance of Him who was gone, and to eat it in remembrance of that which, though the one foundation of every blessing, was a passing thing in His history; His death and blood-shedding could not be an abiding present thing. And this embarrasses their doctors. They say (Bellar. 4, 22, 17) that the priest's drinking of the cup7 is more for the sacrifice than the sacrament (a distinction unknown of old to Christendom), as the people get the blood in the body all the same, but that the shedding of blood is thus set forth. But then the priest takes it as shed, the people as in the body. And if the priest in eating the bread have taken it as in the body, it is before the shedding of the blood, and there is no sacrifice, no redemption, no remission: and according to Bellarmine, it is the priest's eating it which is his putting Him to death, a sad office to perform, so that he has taken Him to feed on Him before there was any sacrifice, and yet the consecration had taken place which turned it into His body. But such irreverent confusion is the necessary consequence where so holy and blessed a memorial of Christ's death is turned into a profane materialism; and yet after all, taken in sufficient quantity, it nourishes the body, yet there is no substance of bread at all: the accidents do it.

The note of the Rhemish translation of Matthew 26 also distinguishes the sacrifice and the sacrament, that the sacrament by concomitancy is the whole body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Lord, but that for the sacrifice it is the bread changed specifically into the body, and the

wine into the blood—that being the condition of Christ in making the sacrifice, so that His body is apart for the sacrifice and His blood apart, but all together in the sacrament. But Paul knows no such difference: the bread which we break is the communion of His body, and the cup which we bless, the communion of His blood, so that the distinction made in the alleged sacrificial part is yet by Paul declared to be the communion, and on the other hand, as often as we eat that bread and drink that cup, which is the alleged sacramental part, he says, we do shew forth the Lord's death till He come; but in His death it is admitted that the blood was separated from the body, shed for us, so that the attempt to make this difference to meet the evident testimony to death and the shedding of Christ's blood in the sacrament— for it was shed blood they were to drink—only brings in increased confusion. The use of "is "for "represents" is too common to dwell upon. That rock "was" Christ. The seven kine "are" seven years, the seven ears of corn "are" seven years. So we do constantly; I shew a picture and say, "That is my mother," and so on.

D. But we should look at it in faith, and take it, as really what the Lord called it.

N*. But what the Lord took and broke is called bread, and the cup the blood of the new covenant. Paul calls three times over what we eat bread, and I suppose he had faith. He says the bread they broke which is confessedly mere bread, was what was the communion of the body of Christ and the cup the communion of His blood. So that he formally puts the identification with the body and the blood of Christ in that which is confessedly mere bread. Nor, as I have said, is there

anywhere a hint of any change. So that Bellarmine, as we have seen, admits that it is not improbable that it cannot be found in Scripture.

R. I feel that it stands on much less solid ground than I thought, and though I feel that it is an important principle to receive things in simplicity by faith, yet where it is our most solemn religious rite, and remission of sins depends upon it in this world and even in purgatory, one needs a sure foundation for that faith; and here our greatest doctors treat it as not improbable that it cannot be proved by Scripture, and in examining it by Scripture, and the reality of the sacrifice of the blessed Lord, it is difficult to see how they agree. We shew forth Christ's death and yet we are told the blood is in the body, and this is sought to be set straight by distinguishing the sacrifice from the sacrament. But I do not see that this separation has any solid ground at all. But it is difficult to get rid of an impression or conviction which seemed to have been faith, and it is not only a matter of instruction and persuasion, but interwoven with every religious feeling we have. And then to think we have been worshipping what is only a little bread and water really. Still my comfort is that it was done supposing it was Christ, and Him my soul would worship still.

N*. Amen, dear Mr. R.! My spirit goes with everything you have said. I do not doubt a moment your having done it in the purpose of your heart to Christ, and, as your words suggest, that worship remains which turned —forgive me if I seem hard—not a bit of paste into Christ, but Christ into a bit of paste you could put into your mouth. God forbid we should ever lose heart-worship to Christ, alike due to Him, and the best

treasure to us; only it is in spirit and in truth that worship is truly offered, not in outward things. And I can fully sympathise with you on the difficulty of getting rid of long cherished impressions. Only experience of human nature tells us that false ones of a superstitious nature are harder to get rid of than any. They are suited to human nature, and prop up human nature, whereas the truth is spiritually enjoyed and foreign to human nature. “Because I tell you the truth, therefore ye believe me not.” The Jews were circumcised, the Gentiles not: that they could boast in and cherish, when all its value was gone. You have a sacrifice, you think, and we have not, and that does not humble you. To drink of the cup of Christ, where we had no part but our sins, and His infinite life-giving love was made good, always humbles. We have full liberty with the Father through it, not dread, but it bows down the soul in the sense of His goodness; and it is that, and Himself who did it, the Lord’s supper brings to us, while we wait for Him till He comes. Blood taken as in the body is setting aside the whole force and meaning of the ordinance: and shed blood is not to be found, nor a Christ in death in existence then or now. There is no such Christ to be transubstantiated into, nor was there then. Your Mass not only pretends to be a sacrifice when there can be no more, but it sets aside the whole force and meaning of the Eucharistic rite, taken as received by the faithful.

R. But this is putting it in a very strong way, Mr. N.

N*. I do not doubt there may be personal piety in those receiving it, ignorant of what it involves; but I believe, as far as a rite can do it, the Roman Catholic rite involves the foundations of our relationship with God. It denies that one sacrifice once offered suffices for ever,

and that there can be no more offering for sin, and hence, the true and perfect purging of the conscience once for all of those who receive that sacrifice by faith; and it gives a fancied presence of Christ in substance, when there is no such Christ at all, setting aside the spiritual feeding on Him as the bread come down from heaven, with the blessed remembrance of His dying and efficacious blood-shedding. You have the blood in the body, which is no shewing forth His death at all, but a denial of the very point and meaning of the rite so precious to true Christians.

R. I see it is very serious and makes Christianity, as to its present reality, a different thing. But do you not think all things are possible with God?

N*. It is not a question of what is possible, or whether such things as we may imagine are not what God has instituted and revealed. The Mass and transubstantiation are contrary to what He has revealed and the historical facts of Scripture, and its fundamental doctrines too. According to Scripture there can be no more sacrifice for sin. According to you, Christ was holding His own shed blood in His hand when it was at that time unshed in His body.

Bill M. Why, Mr. R., it is as plain as possible: how could Christ give us His blood shed, when it was there in His body not shed? There could not be two, and if it was not shed, there is no redemption, and in heaven in glory He does not shed His blood. I never thought it was so plain, and then if John 6 refers to it, we never drink it at all, and have no life in us.

R. My dear Bill M., you do not take into account the effect of education and habit, and whatever piety you

have being connected with it. You had not been brought up in this way; I was from a child.

Bill M. I hope I did not offend, sir; I only meant to say how clear it all seemed to me. I do not doubt, what you say makes a great difference. And I was brought in by thinking it was the church when I knew nothing about it, and was glad to get forgiveness ready settled for me, for I knew I was a sinner.

R. Oh, I have not a thought of any offence. I am very glad you speak plainly what you feel about it. But it is to me an anxious serious thing, if I have been wrong all my life. I do not say I have, but I cannot answer what I have heard, and I see you are all happy and I am not.

D. But you seem to me to forget altogether the teaching and authority of the church of God.

N*. What church? Yours says that it cannot be proved by holy writ, but is repugnant to the plain word of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, etc. How you ritualists reconcile your maintenance of it to your conscience, honest people do not understand. I know they plead the “words in which it was commonly said,” as not being against the formal doctrines of the Roman Catholics, but only against current notions; but that refers to the offering of Christ (Art. XXXI), and there is nothing of the kind in the one I have quoted. (Art. XXVIII.) So that the authority of the church, what you own to be such, will not help you here. As to the Roman Catholic body it was never decreed till 1215 in the fourth Lateran Council, and was rejected by the ablest doctors. So Scotus whom Bellarmine declares was a most acute and learned doctor, though he does not agree with him; but there were many others, as Rabanus

Maurus, Bertram. As to the Greek church, indeed the whole church for centuries, it wholly rejected it, superstitious as it had become and disposed to magnify the Eucharist. And what all the early church held as alone consecrating the elements has to this day no place in the Roman service. Nothing can be more distinct than the testimony of the early Greek Fathers against transubstantiation, which we will look into just now. After John Damascene, the doctrine and at last the name gradually prevailed. It used to be called transelementalism.

But we have not quite done with Scripture: the Lord, speaking of the cup, says, “This is my blood of the new covenant shed for many,” and again expressed in a different form, shewing that no importance was attached to the letter of the statement, as if it were a literal fact. “This cup is the new covenant in my blood.” That is, He speaks of the import and value of the symbol. No one can say that the cup was a covenant. I might give deeds and say, “There is the house conveyed to you,” and every one would understand it, and no one would think the parchment was a house. Yet if “This is my body” is literal, so is “This cup is the new covenant,” and Paul, who received this directly by revelation from the Lord, gives it in this form: “This cup is the new covenant in my blood”: has no thought of any literal blood. It suffices to him to speak of it as the new covenant in Christ’s blood, and he calls it bread when thus given and broken, and not only when so broken but when eaten by the faithful (1 Cor. 11:26); they “eat this bread,” and drink the cup, and shew forth the Lord’s death. Yet they are associated or spiritually identified with Christ’s body and blood, as the Jews with Jehovah their God, and the Gentiles with

their gods in eating the sacrifices. But what the faithful did was to eat bread and drink of a cup, but both, the symbol of the Lord's death who gave His flesh and shed His blood for the life of the world. And even when doing it in the profane and unworthy manner which made the Corinthians guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, it was still eating of that bread and drinking of that cup. If one should spit on my mother's picture, he is insulting my mother, guilty of doing so to me. And there is a much deeper sense of the value of the blessed Lord's death, and realisation of union and communion with Him when spiritually realised, than when we materially take it into our mouths and stomachs. The truth is, the whole thing is a delusion.

D. But what do you make of the uniform teaching of the Fathers, Mr. N.?

N*. There you are, I dare say, in your element, Mr. D. The traditions and doctrines of men have all weight with those of the school you belong to. But you know it is written, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," and I suspect, like many who rest upon them, you have not searched them. A man's writing a thousand years ago does not make his word to be more the truth in the least. They were not inspired. We are specially taught in view of the turning away from the truth which had already begun in the apostle's days, the mystery of iniquity being already at work, and warned that evil men and seducers would wax worse and worse, so that the last days of the church would be perilous times—we are warned, I say, to hold fast by the Scriptures, to know of whom we have learned anything; that that which was in the beginning should abide in us. Hearing the apostles themselves, is made a

test of truth. In a word, we are carefully warned against trusting anything but what came out first and by inspiration from God, which no one pretends was the case with those you call the Fathers, who after all were only prelates and doctors of bygone ages whose doctrine was very loose and uncertain. The Fathers generally before the Council of Nice were unquestionably unsound as to the divinity of the Lord, and, after it, the church was whatever the Emperor made it. Athanasius was excommunicated, the Luciferians who held by him were condemned as a sect by Jerome. Hosius, who presided at Nice, gave way; two popes were Arians, or consecrated by the Arians, Felix and Liberius, and the universal church displayed a scene of dispute and contention which never ended in the East till sunk under the power of the Turks, and in the West till Bernard (the last of the Fathers) declared Antichrist was sitting at Rome. But none hardly of the early Fathers were sound in the faith. As to this particular doctrine as we have seen, one whom Bellarmine calls a most learned and acute doctor did not believe it. John Scotus declares it was never known to be of faith till the fourth Council of Lateran in 1215. And all Bellarmine has to say is that it was in a Roman Council, in the case of Berengarius; that is in 1060 and 1079.

D. But if these Fathers were not inspired, they were nearer the fountain head; they must have known better than we do. Besides there is the uniformity of the testimony.

N*. There is no such uniformity. Even Bellarmine says it is not surprising if, before the heresy sprang up, the earlier Fathers should use expressions which may be made a bad use of (De Euch. II, 37, 6) “in malam partem

trahi"; a plain confession that they do use what denies transubstantiation. He says this in speaking of Bernard, the last of the Fathers so-called, and so late as the eleventh century, adding that if some did, we must take their other plain statements, for it is certain (constat) they must have all agreed. And this is the consent of the Fathers! But I have no need to get what is nearer the fountain head, that is, the inspired testimony of God, when I have that testimony itself. We have God's own word, and that word written save a very small part for all the faithful, and we are warned to hold fast to it, to that which was from the beginning, and that is practically a warning against the Fathers. They are just those who were not from the beginning, who lived when, as the apostle warns us, after his decease, from within and from without perverse men and wolves would arise. When I sit down to read the Scriptures, I sit down to know what God says to me; I cannot do so with these Fathers. To say the least, they must be judged like other men, human authors.

D. And do you feel yourself competent to judge these holy men?

N*. I do not feel the need to read them at all, any more than other books; but if I do, I am bound to judge their teaching by the word of God. If I have my father's express orders, and some one comes to tell me what he thinks, I must know if this statement accords with what my father has expressly said. Nothing can pretend to compare with the word of God.

D. But you may misinterpret it.

N*. So I may the Fathers. But, mark, I have a promise in reading the one, and none for reading the others.

Besides as to a great many I do not admit that they were holy men. Cyril of Alexandria was a thorough ruffian.

R. That is strong language, Mr. N.

N*. I appeal to history. He was both at Ephesus, and heading riots at Alexandria, nothing less: and a heretic, an Eutychian as it is called, to boot.8 The famous Jerome was one of the most abusive, intemperate, violent men possible. Many were respectable enough, but I cannot venture my soul on such men as these, nor on any men; I can on the word of God. But we will speak of them. Now I admit that many of them speak in the strongest way of Christ's being there after consecration, our partaking of Him whom we do not see there, and the like—speak of tremendous mysteries, and that they early fell into gross superstition; but we shall find abundant passages to shew that transubstantiation was not the faith of the church, and that even the contrary was taught and urged by the Fathers in their arguments against the Eutychians and earlier heretics.

But let us look at them. We must not confound the real presence and transubstantiation as Milner carefully does. I regret to say he is not to be trusted. He quotes a regular succession of popes, carefully concealing that there were sometimes three, at other times two, with Europe divided between them; that one drove out another, and set up himself in his place, and when there were three, all three were deposed by the Council of Constance, and another set up by it. So here he quotes English divines, who hold the real presence as though they meant the same thing as Rome; he quotes Cosins' book, which is an elaborate treatise against transubstantiation. Milner gives as his view what is

wholly false: he says, “Bishop Cosins is not less explicit in favour of the Catholic doctrine: he says, ‘it is a momentous error to deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist we confess.’” There is no such sentence in Cosins at all. And as to Hooker the words he quotes are there, but Hooker does not use this language to make con-substantiation or transubstantiation a matter of indifferent speech, but to prove both unnecessary to the enjoyment of the promise. As to Ignatius, the passage is not found in the longer copy of the Epistle to the Smyrnseans at all, but it is found in the shorter. Theodoret quotes it, but there is little doubt that these epistles are spurious. At any rate Milner has falsified the passage, for it looks like nonsense as it stands. What is read is, “They withdraw from the Eucharist and prayer,” which last word Milner has changed into “oblations.” It can have no authority, and refers to the denial of Christ’s incarnation, in respect of which the Eucharist was greatly used as an argument against the Gnostics who denied that Christ had really come in the flesh, a truth so distinctly recognised in the Eucharist.

The testimony of Justin Martyr is against the doctrine; he says, “Then we all stand up together and make prayers, and, as we have before said, when we have ceased prayer, bread is brought, and wine, and water, and the president offers up prayers and thanksgivings as well as he is able, and the people assent, saying, Amen. And the distribution and reception of that over which thanks have been given takes place to each, and it is sent to those not present by the deacons.” And a little before, more distinctly, “Then bread and a cup of water and wine is brought to him who presides over the brethren. He, having received them, offers up praise and

glory to the Father of all things, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and makes long thanksgiving that we are accounted worthy of these things by Him, and having finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people present exclaim assent, saying, Amen. And the president having given thanks, and all the people exclaimed assent, those who are called deacons amongst us, distribute to each of those present to receive [it] of the bread and wine and water over which thanksgiving has been made, and carry it away to the absent. And this food is called amongst us the Eucharist [thanksgiving], of which it is not lawful for any one to partake, but one who believes what is taught us to be true, and has been washed for the forgiveness of sins and the laver of the new birth, and so living as Christ taught. For we do not receive this as common bread or common drink, but as by the word of God. Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh, had both flesh and blood for our salvation; so also the nourishment over which thanks have been given of the word which is from Him, of which our flesh and blood by conversion are nourished, we have been taught to be the flesh and blood of that Jesus made flesh." Now this statement upsets the Roman Catholic doctrine entirely. First, what the deacons carry is bread and wine and water to each; Justin has no idea of any transubstantiation. They are after the thanksgiving what they were before; bread, wine, and water is what was distributed and received. Next, it is of these elements they partake, God's creatures for which they thank Him. It is not a whole Christ to each, but of the elements offered each gets a portion, and, what is a key to multitudes of statements, what is confessedly bread and wine and water, they esteem the body and blood of Christ. But, further, they nourish our body and

blood. The idea of being changed and substantially Christ is totally foreign to his mind.

Irenæus is formal and positive in his denial of it; he speaks (lib. 4, 17:33, 34) of offering God's creatures to Him, and explicitly as sent, created by Him, practically as Justin, for the sacrifice was always of His creatures to God before the giving of thanks. But that is not all. Recognising that we receive Christ in the partaking of the rite, he says, proving the resurrection of the body, "For as the bread which is from the earth, receiving the invocation, is now not common bread, but the Eucharist consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly: so also our bodies receiving the Eucharist are no longer corruptible, having the hope of resurrection." Now I am not answering for all Irenaeus' doctrine, for he was not sound on very important truths, but his statement is a flat denial of transubstantiation. Remark here further that this epiklesis (Irenaeus as now read has ekklesis) is that to which he attributes its not being ordinary bread, and this is wholly left out by Rome!

But to proceed. Tertullian says in terms against the Marcionites (v. 40): "Having taken bread and distributed it to His disciples, He made that His body, saying, This is my body, that is, the figure of my body. But it could not have been a figure unless the body had been a truth." Now this is as plain as can be, and shews what these ancients mean when they speak of making it His body or its being His body. He is proving against Marcion that Christ had really a body. If it was merely a phantasm and nothing really, there could not be a figure of what was nothing. Tertullian never could have had an idea of such a thing as transubstantiation in speaking thus. Origen (Horn. 7 on Lev.) says if according to the letter you

should follow this very thing which is said, “Unless you shall have eaten my flesh and drunk my blood,” the letter kills… but if you understand it spiritually, it does not kill, but there is in it a life-giving spirit. I cannot find what Dr. Milner quotes in this Horn. 7, but just preceding what I have quoted above, Origen referring to John 6, “If you are sons of the church, if imbued with evangelical mysteries, acknowledge what we say that it is of the Lord, lest perchance he that is ignorant let him be ignorant; acknowledge that they are figures which are written in the divine volumes, and therefore examine them as spiritual, not carnal, for if you receive them as carnal, they hurt and do not nourish you.” This is his whole subject. Jesus therefore because He was altogether pure, all His flesh is food, and all His blood is drink; because all His work is holy, and all His speech true, therefore all His flesh is true food, and His blood true drink, for with the flesh and blood of His word, as with pure food and drink, He gives to drink, and renovates every race of men. Again in Comm. on Matthew, torn. 11, “But if everything (Matt. 15) that enters into the mouth goes into the belly and is cast out into the draught, the very food also consecrated by the word of God and prayer, according to what itself consists of materially, goes into the belly and is cast out into the draught; but, according to the prayer which is added to it, it becomes useful according to the proportion of faith, and makes the mind become clear-sighted, looking on that which profits. Nor is it the matter of the bread, but the word spoken over it which helps him who eats not unworthily of the Lord, and thus far of the typical and symbolical body. But many things may be said concerning the Word which became flesh, and true food which he who eats lives altogether for ever, which no

wicked person can eat; for if he could, he adds, it would never have been written that every one that eats of this bread shall live for ever." Whatever else Origen held, he did not hold transubstantiation. The dialogues against the Marcionites (attributed to him but not his it appears) are equally clear. Taking up the common argument of those days, we read: "But if as they say He was without flesh and blood, of what flesh and what body, or of what blood, giving both the bread and the cup as images, did He command His disciples to remember Him?"

We may next turn to Cyprian, the letter Dr. Milner refers to, "That the cup, which is offered in remembrance of Him, is offered mixed with wine." That is, what is offered is wine; he is reasoning against there being only water. "For when Christ says, I am the true vine, the blood of Christ is not water but wine, for His blood by which we are redeemed and sanctified cannot be seen to be in the cup when wine fails in the cup by which the blood of Christ is shewn forth, which is preached by the sacrament and testimony of all the scriptures." So in the same letter to Cæcilius he calls after the consecration of the fruit (creatura) of the vine; "we find the cup mixed which the Lord offered, and that it was wine which He called His blood. Whence it appears that the blood of Christ is not offered if wine be wanting in the cup; but how shall we drink new wine of the fruit of the vine in the kingdom of the Father, if in the sacrifice of God the Father, we do not offer wine?" Now this, however little spiritual apprehension there may be as to the new wine of the kingdom, is clean against transubstantiation. "I wonder," he adds, "that in some places, wine is offered in the cup of the Lord, which alone cannot express the blood of Christ. So we see that in the water the people

are to be understood, but in the wine the blood of Christ is to be shewn forth: if both are united, a spiritual and heavenly sacrament is celebrated." He held the sacrifice they offered to be the passion of the Lord, quoting I Corinthians 11:26 (Ep. 63, Cæcilio). So Athanasius (Ep. 4, ad Serapionem de S. So.) on John 6:62, "For here also He speaks both of Himself, flesh and spirit, and distinguishes spirit from flesh, that, believing not only what appears but what is invisible of Him, they might learn that what He was saying was not carnal but spiritual. For, for how many men would the body suffice for food, that this should be the nourishment of the whole world? Therefore He reminds them of the ascension of the Son of man into heaven, that He might draw them away from corporeal thought, and for the rest might learn that the flesh of which He spoke was heavenly food from above and spiritual nourishment given from Himself; 'for what I have said to you,' says he, 'is spirit and life,' as much as to say what is manifested and given for salvation of the world is the flesh which I carry, but this and the blood from it of me shall be spiritually given to you as food. So that this (nourishment) may be spiritually reproduced (anadidothai) in each, and be a preservative for all for resurrection to eternal life." So earlier Clemens Alexandrinus (Pædagogus lib. I, 6 and lib. 2, 2). I cite the last as more short and simple. "He used wine, for He is a man also Himself, and He blessed indeed the wine, saying, Take, drink; for this is my blood, the blood of the vine." He did not think it was transubstantiated. He is arguing against the Encratites who would not use it.

Cyril of Jerusalem uses language as strong in appearance as may be, but not that the substance is

changed, but that faith sees the body there, and he really uses language which shews he never thought of such a change. Thus in the very place where he uses the strongest language, he says (Cat. 22, Myst. 4), “Do not regard (proseche) the bread and the wine as merely such (psilois), for they are the body and blood of Christ according to the Lord’s declaration.” They were still bread and wine, but to be received as the body and blood of Christ by faith, and citing Psalm 23 (22), interpreting it as a mystical table, apprehended by the understanding (noeten). I quote this the rather because it shews how the passages which speak of Christ’s flesh and blood do not contemplate any change of the substance; faith receives it; it is noeta, received by the mind. As bread suits the body, so the word the soul. So in 3, “For in the figure (tupo) of bread, His body is given to you, and in the figure of wine, His blood.” They are the tupoi, figures, of the body and blood. So Gregory Nyssen: (oratio octava) in his praise of Gorgon calls them the antitypes (antitupa) of the precious body and blood. There is one passage of Gregory Nazianzen which I must read before I turn to the Latins, shewing how Christendom had sunk into Judaism, but shewing most clearly the vagueness of their thoughts. I am almost ashamed to go through the quantity of passages I collected on the subject, but I do not myself attach the smallest authority to the uncertain and superstitious thoughts of the Fathers; but for you, or at least to clear your mind from the notion that it was a settled doctrine of faith, corrupt and superstitious as Christendom had become, I go through them.

R. Do not, I beg you, let it weary you. I can understand that, at your point of view, it is wearisome; but for me it

is still a question of what is or was the faith of the church. I have ever held it to be unchanging, and the consent of the Fathers has been held ever as the solid ground of it, as embodying the tradition of the church and authoritatively interpreting Scripture. I see strong statements in what you have quoted as to its being, when consecrated, the body of Christ, but generally as to what we receive, not exactly transubstantiation.

N*. Note then these points. They do not speak as yet of transubstantiation, though, as I have fully admitted, they use very strong language as to receiving the body; such as Prostestants, many of them, the Anglican church for instance, still do. Further, supposing some declared it in terms and others stated the contrary, what is become of their authority or the consent of the Fathers? It is a mere private opinion, not the faith of the church.

R. That is true.

N*. The Council of Trent expressly takes, as you say, the ground of the consent of the Fathers, and that we have not certainty on this point. But I will quote then Gregory Nyssen: he is speaking on baptism, in the discourse, eis ten emeran ton photon, etc. “Wherefore despise not the lavatory, nor count it of little value, as if a common thing on account of the use of water, nor esteem it of light moment, for that which is wrought is great, and wonderful effects exist from it. For this holy altar also, at which we assist, is common stone according to its nature nothing different from other stone flags which build our walls,9 and adorn our pavements, but since they have been consecrated to the service of God, and have received the blessing, it is a holy temple, a spotless altar, not now touched by all, but only by the priests, and

these in offices of piety. The bread again is in the first place common, but when the mystery shall have sanctified it, it is called the body of Christ. Thus the mystic oil, thus the wine, being of small worth before the blessing, after the sanctification which is of the Spirit, each of them works excellently. The same power of the word makes a venerable and honoured priest, by the new [force] of the blessing, separated from the profaneness of the many. For yesterday and the day before one of the many and of the people, he is suddenly presented as a leader, a president, a teacher of piety, initiator into hidden mysteries, and these things he does, nothing changed within, in body or in form, but being according to what appears, the same as he was, but changed as to his soul for the better, by a certain invisible power and grace, and thus applying the mind to many things, what appears to the sight is contemptible, but great things are effected." Now the comparisons made here exclude the idea of transubstantiation. But the passage does more and shews that when the writers of this age speak of its becoming the body of Christ, it does not the least mean transubstantiation; and further that when they spoke of what appeared, they had no idea of a form and a totally distinct substance behind. There was nothing changed in body or in form. Chrysostom, if we are allowed to count his letter to Cæsarius as genuine, is quite clear on the point. He says, reasoning against Apollinarius, "For as before the bread is sanctified we call it bread, but divine grace sanctifying it by means of the priest, it is freed from the appellation of bread, but it is held to be worthy of the appellation of the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains in it, and we announce it not as two bodies, but as one." Now if this be not Chrysostom's it is

quoted as such by John Damascene, Anastasius and the Fathers; it is an early writing of nearly the same age (the Jesuit Hardouin holds it is Chrysostom's), and plainly shews that the positive doctrine of the bread's remaining bread caused no scandal then. But Chrysostom himself at any rate, (and where pressing, as he is famous for doing, the importance of this ordinance) speaks of it as distinct from other food. "Do not look at it as bread, nor think of it as wine, for it does not as other food go into the draught. But as wax put to the fire does not lose any part nor leave anything superfluous, so also here reckon the mysteries to be consumed by the substance of the body" (De Poen. Horn. 9, 2, 350). This is transubstantiating into us. How little his mind is occupied with literal transubstantiation is evident from the way he repeats word for word in the second discourse on the betrayal by Judas what he says in the first, save the last words. In the first (11, 3 and 4), after saying the words "This is my body "made it the body of Christ, etc., he compares it to "Be fruitful and multiply," which was efficient through succeeding generations; so these. And in the first discourse, he concludes by "Make it a perfect sacrifice"; in the second, "will ever increase with grace those worthily partaking of it." The. wicked who partake increase their condemnation. But there is no thought of its being Christ Himself at any rate. The Homily on "Nolo vos ignorare" implies equally that it is spiritually Christ's blood, not literally. Now in Chrysostom we have the Eucharist spoken of rhetorically beyond all the Fathers, and receiving Christ's body and blood; but I find no trace of his not considering it as in fact bread and wine. "We are not to consider it such: they who receive worthily receive Christ." On its being His body, he is plain enough, and

saints receiving it; but he does not seem to have thought of transubstantiation in the modern sense. He speaks of the bread and the cup, and indeed when coming to the table to be looking up like an eagle to the sun, to Christ, and there applying “where the carcase is the eagles will be”; but all is such rhetoric that as doctrine it proves little. This is Homily 24 on 1 Corinthians. Were we to take the imperfect work on Matthew as Chrysostom’s, the denial of transubstantiation would be as clear and strong as possible. “In these sanctified vessels, in which the true body of Christ is not contained but the mystery of his body “(Chrys. Opera, ed. B., 6, 63, Appendix).10 D. But you can hardly say it is, or cite it for any doctrine.

N*. Certainly not. But I cite nothing of the Fathers for any doctrine: I should not think of doing so, but the Scriptures alone. I cite them for history; and although I do not think that this work can be considered Chrysostom’s, though cited for centuries as such by popes,11 and in Roman church services, and though only condemned by Pope Paul IV in the copies which were full of errors; yet (all the evidence carefully weighed) from its unsound doctrine, citation of the Vulgate, and other marks, it cannot be reasonably thought to be his, or even of the same age. But it was early, and historically shews that such a doctrine as the elements not being Christ’s body did not hinder popes and the Romish church services using it; and, I repeat I quote the Fathers only as history. I have only one quotation from the true Chrysostom to make; where he treats (in Horn. 82 and 83 on Matthew 26:26-28) on the institution of the Lord’s supper, he explicitly calls (7, p. 783, ed. Ben.) the sacrament symbols—tinos sumbola ta teloumena. Yet this is in a passage where he insists that

Christ drank His own blood to make it more tolerable and easy for the disciples so to do, a point on which the ancients and ancient liturgies disagree. But we learn this, on a point treated before, that being a symbol of Christ's sacrifice according to Chrysostom, and very justly, there could not be a transubstantiation of a now glorified Christ, nor indeed of a then living one; but an actually sacrificed Christ exists only in memory.

But we may now turn to plainer statements than the rhetoric of the golden-mouthed, Theodoret in his Dialogues, Dialogue I (vol. 4, Paris, 1642). He had been saying that the Saviour changes the names (giving the name of the thing to the symbol, and of the symbol to the thing, calling Himself a vine), and attributes the name of blood to the symbol. Eranistes asks why? He answers: "The purport is obvious to those who are initiated into the divine mysteries. He desired that those who participate in the divine mysteries should give heed to the nature of those things which are seen; but, by the change of names, have faith in the change which is made by grace. For He who called His body natural wheat and bread, and again called Himself a vine, honoured the visible symbols with the appellation of body and blood, not changing the nature, but adding grace to nature." So what follows: "Of what thinkest thou that all-holy food to be the symbol and figure? The divinity of Christ the Lord, or of His body and blood?" This leaves no obscurity as to his thoughts; and "symbol" is the word we have seen Chrysostom use, who with Theodore of Mopsuestia were his theological masters.

But we have another, if possible, stronger passage in Dialogue II, the more striking because it is expressly the

point in discussion. His adversary Eranistes denied two natures in Christ. The Word, he said, was made flesh. There was only one nature remaining; and he insists that flesh after the ascension was absorbed into the divine substance. Not only so, but he brings in the Lord's supper to prove it. "As therefore," he says, "the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are one thing before the priest's invocation, but after the invocation are changed and become another thing, so the Lord's body after ascension is changed into the divine substance." Orth.: You are taken in the net you have woven, for neither after the consecration do the mystical symbols leave their own nature, for they remain in their previous substance (ousias), form, and kind, and are visible and tangible as they were before, but they are thought to be what they have become, and are believed and worshipped as being these things which are believed. Noeitai de apas egeneto kai pisteuetai kai proskunetai os ekeina onta apais pisteuetai. These statements of so well-known and esteemed a father puzzled the Roman Catholic critics. Their discussions about it you may find in the fifth or posthumous volume by Garnier, a Jesuit, de fide Theodoreti (Paris, 1684, 478). The passages are in vol. 4 at the beginning. This was written about a.d. 446.

The truth is, one reading the Fathers cannot but see that, however rhetorical they may be about it, the thought of transubstantiation could not have been in their minds. I do not refer now to positive statements already quoted, but to collateral statements. Thus Cyprian writing against those who would have only water, says, If wine were not there, there was no figure of the blood; that the wine was the figure of the blood

and the water of the Christian people. Who would think of transubstantiation here? So Augustine, It is said the rock was Christ; and insists that it is not said the rock signified Christ, but was Christ (Contra Adamantium 12, 5, and in sec. 3). So the Lord did not hesitate to say, in giving the sign of His body to His disciples, This is my body. And again (Er. in Psa. 3:1), when the great and admirable patience of our Lord received [Judas] to the feast in which He commended and delivered to His disciples the figure of His body and blood. But were I to cite all Augustine says on the subject I should not soon close. It is a point he insists on continually, so that Cardinal Du Perron had to write a book (Refutatio, etc., Paris, 1624) to explain away what he says. On Cone. Ad. 12, 3 he says, you must introduce "according to you," that is, the Manicheans, which is really only a confession of the force of the passage. Tertullian, Cyril, Gaudentius, and others constantly declare a figure is not the truth, but the imitation of the truth.

I turn to Gelasius. Baronius and Bellarmine have tried to deny that he was Pope Gelasius, as it was awkward to have a pope denying transubstantiation, and there were two other Gelasiuses. But there is no real ground to question it, nor does it change the fact that a Father of the church, so-called, taught it, if he were not pope. They have ascribed it to Gelasius Cyzicenus, but those versed in such studies have no doubt that the treatise "De Duabus Naturis in Christo" is the work of the pope. Gelasius was pope in 492. Gelasius Cyzicenus was archbishop in 476. There was another of the name a century before, but he is not in question. We must ascribe it to the pope. He says, writing against the Eutychians and using the argument common to the

Fathers, “Certain sacraments which we take of the body and blood of Christ are a divine thing, on account of which and by the same we are made participators [consortes] of the divine nature; and yet it does not cease to be the substance or nature of bread and wine. And certainly the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries. It is therefore shewn to us evidently enough that that is to be felt by us in the Lord Christ Himself which we profess, celebrate, and are,12 that as they pass, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, into this that is divine substance, remaining however in the propriety (that which was proper to them) of their own nature, so that principal mystery itself whose efficacy and virtue they truly represent” (Gel. de D. N. Ch.). Such indeed was the constant argument of the day against the Eutychians. If one only read the Dialogues of Theodoret, which I have quoted, it will be found to run through them, as we have seen in the much earlier Irenaeus arguing against other heretics.

R. This reasoning of Irenaeus and Theodoret and Gelasius seems to me, I confess, to be of great force. There is no mistaking its import; because the comparison of the two natures in Christ and the denial of them by the heretics, and in Theodoret where his Eutychian opponent sought to make good his argument of Christ being made flesh or transubstantiated, and being met by Theodoret by the contradiction of its being so in the Eucharist, as an acknowledged truth too, leaves no question what their faith was, and it is confirmed by the other statements you have quoted. I do not understand how they can say the Fathers taught it.

N*. I am glad you see the force of the statements of these Fathers. Indeed the argument against Eutychianism in Theodoret and Gelasius, and of Irenaeus against the Gnostics or Docetae, leaves no doubt as to the common faith of the church; while they held, some in a very strong way, the participation in a spiritual sense in Christ's body, making it as Irenaeus did effectual for the resurrection; so that Chrysostom also has to guard against its being a physical effect, or the wicked would arise with Christ's glorious body (a strange conclusion); yet that transubstantiation evidently, in the proper sense of the word, was unknown.

Bill M. Sure enough, if it was His body, and was transubstantiated into ours who partake of it outwardly, the wicked would be transubstantiated into His pure and glorious body. I do not believe that.

D. But you see that the holy archbishop and doctor guards against it.

Bill M. How can he guard against it? He sees what I never thought of: what a terrible consequence flows from it! But either it is only received spiritually by true faith, or if it be its own efficacy, it must change one as well as the other, and I cannot help saying, though it is a shocking thought, the mouse's too. They may bring judgment on a wicked man perhaps by it, but at any rate the poor mouse is innocent. I do not know what its worth really is, but none of these notions can be true.

D. I wonder so ignorant a person as you can speak so confidently about so holy a mystery, tremendous or fearful, as those holy men justly called it.

Bill M. I am an ignorant man, sir, and all this I never knew, or I might have been spared going wrong. But can

you, sir, deny what we have been hearing, or can you explain how the wicked, if they really partake of it (and if it is it, they must partake of it, as I thought I did), do not get their bodies raised in glory, or what comes of it when an animal eats it?

D. I do not pretend to explain anything, but receive it by faith as the church holds and gives it; and you had confessed and received absolution before you took it.

Bill M. That is true, but I was not a bit really changed. I tried to behave myself just at the time, and ate nothing till I partook of it, but I never thought of sin or salvation as I do now. It was only just being safe through these things being done for me, and I had my conscience easy for a moment, but I was not a really changed man at all, and if I did not receive at Easter, I was in mortal sin; so they told me. For my part, though I was not exactly a bad liver, I believe I was in mortal sin all the time.

D. I dare say you were, and, not having faith in the holy mystery, got no good of it.

Bill M. Excuse me, sir, I did believe it; I accepted all the priest told me, and joined the Catholics because I did, and did all they bid me. I was in earnest, but I was as to sinfulness just what I was before. I do not pretend to understand much, but that I know for certain; I have nothing to pretend to now, but I know I see the difference.

R. But, Mr. D., we are inquiring whether the views Bill M. and I myself have held are true. You who have very lately adopted them after having long utterly rejected them as blasphemies and dangerous deceits, have appealed to the Fathers, and when we examine them, though some, and especially Chrysostom, use very

strong language as to the sacrifice of the Eucharist, yet, as it would seem, one after another teaches what clearly denies transubstantiation. You appealed to them: we have examined them, and do not find your assertion as to what they held, made good. Our friend, Bill M., on the other hand, declares that he was not a changed man in point of fact when he partook of the Eucharist in the Mass. Now Catholics hold that man is born again in baptism, but few or none maintain baptismal grace, and therefore penance is needed, and, perhaps, renewal of heart is called for. Now we know, alas! that multitudes who partake at Easter are not changed men in the least in their lives, nor those even who frequent the celebration of mass and receive oftener. This is notorious. It may be their own fault, but the fact is so; so that you cannot complain of Bill M., when he says it was his own case. It will not do; if we are to believe that what we all confess to be a little flour and water by consecration becomes God, the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Lord Jesus, we can do so, scorning the convictions of one who has had his eyes, he alleges, opened as to real godliness, and this partaking of Christ producing no effect of the kind. It may be painful to have one's faith shaken, but we must find somewhere divine authority for divine faith.

D. But there is the church, sir.

R. The church teaches that she believes quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, and we are told to interpret Scripture by consent of the Fathers. Now this we cannot say we have as to transubstantiation. For if some did believe in it (which is not yet apparent), certainly a great many did not, and early ones; so that both rules fail. You talk of the Fathers and the church,

but they do not, in primitive times at least, make good your assertion. But I confess I should like to continue our search into these ancient authorities.

N*. We will return to our quotations. I have only given such as I have found in those of these ancient authors which I myself have access to; but these are really sufficient. I will add one quoted from a collection, not having Procopius of Gaza. “For He gave the image of His own body to His disciples no longer admitting [or accepting] the bloody sacrifices of the law,” and then it speaks of the purity of the bread by which we are nourished, as the whiteness mentioned in the prophecy as to Judah, a common reference in the Fathers.13 I go on to Eusebius in his Demonstratio Evangelica from whom Procopius draws it (lib. I, 10, Paris, 1628, p. 37). After speaking of Christ’s sacrifice supplanting all the Jewish figures of it, he says: “We who believe in him are free from the curse of Moses and justly since they daily celebrate the remembrance [upomnesin] of his body, and of his blood”; and (38) “Christ having offered for us all an offering [thuma] and sacrifice as slain [sphagion] and given to us a memorial, for (or instead of) a sacrifice [ami thusias] to offer continually to God.” The sphagion, the actual sacrifice, Christ had offered to His Father (anenegke, a sacrificial term for offering up on the altar); but He delivered there to us also a memorial to be continually presented to God (prospherein the bringing up as such), in place of, to serve instead of, a sacrifice. And again (p. 39), saying how according to Psalm 45 Christ had offered Himself a sacrifice to God in place of the old Jewish sacrifices: “As therefore we have received to celebrate the memorial of this sacrifice on a table by symbols both of His body and His blood,

according to the rites of the new covenant," and then he goes on to cite Psalm 23, as a table spread in the presence of their enemies, etc. Now he speaks of unbloody and intelligent offerings, but they are for men only symbols and memorials. So in book 8 at the very end of the very first part (apo tes geneseos) after the preface (p. 380) he says, commenting partly on the blessing of Judah, which the Fathers are very fond of, and partly on the prophecy of Zechariah: "For by the wine which is the symbol of His blood, those who are baptised to His death and believe in His blood, are purged from their old evils." And after speaking of it as mystic food, and quoting the Lord's words, he adds: "for again He delivered to His own disciples the symbols of the divine dispensation to make it the image of His own body [ten eikona tou idiou somatos]." They were no longer to use bloody sacrifices, nor slain offerings [sphagia] of divers animals as under Moses; but He "taught them to use bread [as] a symbol of His own body" (Eusebius, Dem. Ev.). I have gone a little backwards in date, for Eusebius was in Constantine's time, early in the fourth century; but this does not weaken his testimony, which is plain enough.

I turn now to Ambrose, a pious man doubtless, but as superstitious as the most bigoted heart could wish. Our friend Dr. Milner says he passes by Tertullian, Cyprian, etc., but cannot Ambrose, and quotes, as they all do, a treatise De Mysteriis, and another De Sacramentis. But all these things have to be looked into. It is one of the painful things in these inquiries that you cannot trust such writers as Dr. Milner. In the first place, the first treatise is doubtful, and the second is very generally rejected. They both, however, take exactly the same

ground as to doctrine. Bellarmine holds them to be genuine, being quoted by subsequent doctors: I will therefore take notice of them. One thing is quite certain, that according to the Romish doctrine both are heretical. There is a good deal of nonsense in them and extraordinary applications of Scripture; but this we must expect from the Fathers. The author, whoever he is, says that the angels also doubted, when Christ rose. The powers of the heavens doubted seeing that flesh ascended into heaven. At last they said: “Who is this King of glory?” and when some said, “Lift up your heads,” etc., others doubted, saying, “Who is this King of glory?” “In Isaiah also thou hast the virtues of the heavens doubting, saying, ‘Who is this that cometh from Edom?’”

Bill M. But do you think the angels and heavenly powers doubt that way, sir?

N*. In truth, I do not. I give it only as a specimen of patristic interpretation. We read the angels came and ministered to Christ, and they told the women He was risen; but nothing is too absurd for the Fathers. However we will say no more of them. But in the first treatise, he states that the washing of baptism clears from actual sins, and refers to the Lord’s word to Peter, “Ye are clean,” in John 13; but that then He washed their feet, and that was what cleansed from original sin, because, as the devil had tripped him up, he wanted the soles of his feet cleansed (Cap. 5, or §32, p. 335, 2, Benedictine edition). The same is repeated in De Sacramentis. (Lib. 3, cap. 1, 9, p. 364.) Now the Romish doctrine holds distinctly that original sin is done away by baptism. In this second treatise it is noticed this was

not done in Rome. The editors state that it was in various places in France.

R. But it is alleged these treatises are not genuine, so that Ambrose may not be chargeable with all this.

N*. It is possible: yet the catechism of the Council of Trent founds its doctrine on them (De Ecc. 2:32). Bellarmine and Milner quote it as particularly to their purpose, being (like Cyril's) the teaching of catechumens and thus of those admitted already. As the Lord's supper was kept a secret from others, they liked, like the heathen, to have initiation and mysteries, and used the terms. But let us see how they speak of them. In the "De Mysteriis," he does speak of changing the nature as is alleged, but it is not in a material sense; for in the next paragraph (9, 53, p. 340), though begotten miraculously, he says, The flesh of Christ is true [flesh] which is crucified, which is buried, truly therefore it is the sacrament of His flesh. But a sacrament of a thing is never the thing itself, as is urged by Augustine, Tertullian, etc. In the De Sacramentis, lib. 4, cap. 4, §15, p. 369, "If therefore such great force is in the word of the Lord Jesus, that things began to be which were not, how much more does it operate that they should be what they were, and be changed into another thing?" And the comparison which follows shews that, while they thought people received Christ, they had no thought of a corporal or physical change in insisting on its being the body of Christ after consecration. He says, referring to baptism, "There thou wast thyself, but thou wast an old creature: afterwards when thou wast consecrated, thou begannest to be a new creature: dost thou wish to know how a new creature? Every one that is in Christ is a new creature."

We afterwards find a direct denial (lib. 4, cap. 7, §27, 28, p. 372) of the doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But this belongs to the whole doctrine of the offering of the Mass, and I will not enter farther into it. It is a fundamental question as to what Christian redemption is.

R. But it is this which troubles me in the doctrine, I am free to confess. It seems to militate against the efficacy of Christ's offering offered once for all, and the statement that there is no more offering for sins.

N*. Surely it does. I will quote for you then what I have alluded to. The words run thus. After reciting the prayer of the service of the Mass which blasphemously prays that the offering may be received like that of Abel and Melchizedec and carried by the angels to the altar on high, he says to the catechumens: "Therefore, as often as thou receivest, what doth the apostle say to thee? As often as we receive, we announce the Lord's death. If we announce death, we announce remission of sins. If, as often as the blood is shed it is shed for the remission of sins, I ought always to receive it that my sins may be always forgiven. I who always sin ought always to have the medicine." Now if we read Hebrews 10 this is in open and flagrant opposition to it. No honest mind can read the two and not see it. The whole effect of Hebrews 10 is to shew there can be no repetition of the sacrifice, and that the forgiveness is complete and full.

R. I confess I cannot reconcile them. Hebrews 10 is very strong; I do not say I realise it, but certainly I cannot reconcile it with the doctrine of the Mass.

D. But these are the private opinions of the Fathers.

N*. No doubt; but it is, you say, by the consent of the Fathers, Scripture is to be interpreted. Now, if even some Fathers teach transubstantiation, which in the modern and scholastic sense I deny, certainly many we have cited teach the contrary, and there is no consent. Strange to say, the canon of the Mass itself calls it bread, after the consecration.

R. How is that?

N*. After the consecration, and adoration by the consecrating priest, both of the bread and of the wine, he says in the prayer, commencing, “Unde et memores,” etc.—We offer to thy illustrious majesty of thy gifts (donis et datis) a pure victim, a holy victim, an immaculate victim, the holy bread of eternal life, and the cup of eternal salvation.

D. But this may mean Christ as the bread of life.

N*. I suppose it may be taken so, but then the blasphemy of the following prayer comes out in all its grossness; in which it is asked that God may deign to look upon it with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them as He had deigned to accept the gifts of His righteous servant Abel, etc. There can be little doubt that the prayer is borrowed from the ancient offerings before consecration, but as it stands it is really blasphemy.

R. It is strange and perplexing, but, Mr. N., we are not accustomed to examine these things.

N*. I am aware you are not, but when they are examined, their real and unscriptural, and here really blasphemous, character comes out at once. But Ambrose has made us wander a little from our subject. We may

turn to Augustine— along with Jerome the most influential of the Latin Fathers, as to doctrine more so. But of Jerome first, as he has not much on the subject.

Jerome, as superstitious as any monk could wish, knew of no such doctrine. Referring to the corn and wine and oil of which the Psalm speaks, he says, Of which the bread of the Lord is made, and the type of His blood is filled, and the blessing of sanctification is shewn, etc. (Com. in Jeremiam, 6, 31, 4,1063, ed. Vall.). And again when he introduces Jovinian, denouncing his antimonastic teaching, to combat it he makes him say: In type of His blood, He offered not water, but wine. It is of course said that Jovinian was a heretic, not that there is the least proof he was; but Jerome has no thought of combating this, but only the use of the wine as justifying the rejection of such asceticism. It passes with him as a matter taken for granted, with both as a matter known by all. But there is more than this. In meeting Jovinian's statement so given by him, and speaking of the abstemiousness of Christ, he says it is written, He never was a slave to His throat or to His belly, that is, abstained from drink or gluttony, the mystery excepted (that is, the Lord's supper), where He made it the type of His passion (in typum passionis expressit)—gave it that character and turned it into that.

I may turn to Augustine in his Tractatus 26; he is full of its being spiritually eaten. Many ate the manna, he says, who pleased the Lord, and are not dead. Why? Because they understood visible food spiritually, they hungered spiritually, tasted spiritually, and were satisfied spiritually. For we also at this day receive visible food, but the sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the sacrament another. So again (Ssc. 15): The sacrament of

the unity of the body and blood of Christ is prepared in some places daily; in some at certain intervals on the Lord's table, and is taken from the Lord's table by some to life, by some to ruin; but the thing itself of which it is the sacrament is for every man to life, to doubt to ruin whoever has partaken of it. The many receive of the altar and die, die by receiving. And after speaking of Judas, he says: See therefore, brethren, that ye eat the heavenly bread spiritually; and if forgiven, approach in security, it is bread, not poison. After referring to the unity of the body the church, he says: This therefore is to eat that food, and to drink that drink, to abide in Christ, and have Christ abide in oneself, and through this he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, beyond doubt does not eat His flesh nor drink His blood, but rather eats to his own judgment the sacrament of so great a thing. In the Tractatus 45, he is comparing Israel and Christians. The Red Sea is baptism, etc., "the same faith with different signs," and again, "See then, faith remaining, the signs varied." There the rock is Christ: for us Christ is what is placed upon the altar, and is a great sacrament of the same Christ. They drank of the water that flowed from the rock: "If you attend to the visible form, it is different: if to the intelligible signification, it is the same; they drank the same spiritual drink." This comparison of that rock was Christ with the Lord's supper, because both were a sign of Christ, he very often repeats. We have seen in Tr. 45 on St. John; again in Tr. 26, 27.

I will quote enough to give his thoughts. He says in general (De Civ. D., 10,5) Sacramentum, id est sacrum signum, I cite as a key to many passages. As all things that have a signification seem in a certain way to fill the

role (sustinere personas) of those things which they signify, as is said by the apostle, the rock was Christ, since the rock of which that is said signified indeed Christ. So again, Quaest. in Lev. 3:57, he refers to Pharaoh's dream, the seven ears are seven years, and "That rock was Christ"; for he does not say the rock signifies Christ, but as if He was this, what substantially He was not, but by signification. Again on John, Tract. 63: As therefore Scripture is accustomed to speak, he, calling the things that signify as if they were the things signified, largely insists in the questions on Leviticus already quoted, as to the life being the blood. Referring to this principle, he says (Contra Ad. 12, 3) (besides what I have said above) that it does not belong to me to say what becomes of the soul of a beast; I may also interpret that precept as applying to it as a sign (in signo positum). For the Lord does not hesitate to say, "This is my body," when He gave the sign of His body.

In the treatise De Doctrina Christiana (referring to John 6) 3, 26 (16) He interprets eating His flesh and drinking His blood as a figure, which is, according to the truth of the mystery, done in baptism. If a preceptive expression seems to command a crime or act of wickedness … it is a figure. "Unless ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you." It seems to command an act of wickedness or crime, it is therefore a figure telling us to have communion with the passion, and laying up sweetly in memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us. In the Enarratio on Psalm 98:9, he says, speaking of eating His flesh, "It is the Spirit that quickens. Understand what I say spiritually. You are not going to eat this body which you see, nor drink that blood which those who will crucify me are

about to pour out. I have commended to you something sacramental (sacramentum aliquid): spiritually understood, it will vivify you. Although it is necessary that that should be visibly celebrated, yet it ought to be invisibly understood." I may quote one passage more from Tr. on John, Tr. 26 (on John 6), "The manna signified this bread: the altar of God signified this bread. They were sacraments; in the signs they were diverse; in the thing signified, they are alike … all have eaten the same spiritual food. The same spiritual indeed, for the bodily is different, for they had the manna; we another thing, but as to the spiritual what we have."

Now you know, Mr. R., that to maintain transubstantiation you have, believing that Christ is in heaven as a man, to hold that Christ is not in extension as filling space in the Eucharist. This is distinctly held and asserted, but only as substance according to the unfounded and obsolete scholastic material philosophy. But though Chrysostom and Ambrose in East and West speak in the strongest terms rhetorically, the doctrine of the ancient Fathers was not transubstantiation, but the contrary. Such a thing was never thought of as its not being bread, only they would say it was not common bread, after the epiklesis or invocation to which they attributed the change, which made it a sacramental figure of Christ's body and blood, efficacious in blessing where faith was, as Augustine diligently insists. It is historically certain, that some of the greatest scholastic doctors, as Scotus, did not hold it; that even down to the Reformation it was said by the Romish doctors and prelates that it could not be proved by Scripture, so that Bellarmine says this is probable; and that it never was decreed as a dogma till 1215. Bellarmine asserts that a

local Roman council had a short time before. The contrary doctrine was used as an argument to prove that Christ had taken flesh and had two natures. Of all the Fathers, Cyril is perhaps the strongest in the Catechetical discourses which he delivered, says Jerome, when a young man. Not only he speaks of the bread and wine as Christ's body and blood, but calls them, in his lecture on the sacramental service, a sacrifice of propitiation.

But, after all, I do not see any sign of the thought of transubstantiation, unless in the comparisons he makes, and these have no value, because in these the form was changed as Moses' rod into a serpent, and the water into the best wine, known to be such by tasting; whereas Cyril told them they are not to mind the taste: in the form (tupo) of the bread and wine they have the body and the blood which will sanctify body and soul, and being distributed into our members, we become, as Peter says, partakers of the divine nature. "But," he says, "do not regard (proseche) [them] as mere (psilois, the word constantly so used) bread and wine."

Now Cyril teaches it is a propitiatory sacrifice, and good for souls dead in their sins or without any, and refers to intercession of saints, but I do not think that he had the thought that there was no bread and wine there. He uses the word tupos (Cat. 13, 19) as do the other Fathers constantly, for the figure, as did the Latins typus. This is used by Theodoret as equivalent to symbol, and antimpos, the word used in the Hebrews for the tabernacle compared with heaven. Procopius uses it as identical with image or effigy, on Genesis 49:12. So that far as Cyril went in the system of superstition, it is (I think) plain he did not believe in any real change of

substance. The strongest term he uses is metabebletai, cap. 23, Myst. 5, 7; the Holy Spirit sanctifies and changes all it touches, but it is clear that this cannot be said of everything. Was Christ changed, transubstantiated, when the Holy Ghost came upon Him? or the hundred and twenty on the day of Pentecost? A change took place, but there was no transubstantiation, and this is so clearly the case that he uses the same language in Cat. 21, Myst. 3, as to the anointing: it is not mere (psilon) oil, but efficient for communicating the Spirit, comparing it in terms with the Eucharist. “For as the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Ghost is not mere bread, but the body of Christ, so this holy ointment is no longer mere [ointment] but the charisma of Christ made effectual by the presence of His divinity, and is symbolically applied to thy forehead and other senses. And while the body is anointed with visible ointment, the soul is sanctified with the holy and vivifying Spirit.” (Compare 23, 7, and the language of 22, Myst. 4, 6.) He calls it tupon of bread (Cat. 13). If you desire to see the uncertainty and absurdity of the Father’s interpretation, read this Cat. 13, 21. The idea of transubstantiation was foreign to Cyril; but what his language shews is that, with these Fathers, those who use the strongest do not mean transubstantiation thereby as now held at Rome.

R. But Cyril’s language is very strong.

N*. It is the strongest, I believe, used, and therefore I refer to it, and false doctrine I believe, if Scriptures be true, as to its being a propitiatory sacrifice. But this is the force of my argument, that the strongest language does not mean what is now taught; for he says, after the

invocation, the bread is not mere bread, using the same words as to the ointment, where there can be no supposition of any sort of change, and which he makes merely efficacious in the anointed and expressly compares with the Lord's supper.

D. But why should we not take his statements simply, that it is the body? These great Fathers whom you treat so lightly use language which all those who reject the Catholic doctrine decline using.

N*. Why should a man have authority because he wrote fourteen centuries ago?

D. Because of the universal reverence of the church, and being nearer the fountain-head.

N*. In the first place they were four and five hundred years from the source, a lapse of time which disappears in the distance. They had fallen into the doctrines and commandments of men; and, remark, the early Fathers held unequivocally the contrary doctrine: replying to the Docetæ and afterwards to the Eutychians that there being two things in the Eucharist proved that there was more than one in Christ.

R. That is true.

N*. And further if these later Fathers held it, which I do not admit, the consent of the Fathers is a fable, for it is certain that the earlier ones did not, but insisted that the bread was there. I would now shew that the doctrine was not made a matter of faith in the church till quite late in its history. I might quote a multitude of passages from the Fathers to the same purpose as those I have already brought forward, which are to be found in treatises on the subject, but what I have given is

sufficient. I add some lower down in age. Thus Ephrem, archbishop of Antioch in the sixth century, quoted by Photius, Bibl. 229, to prove there was no confusion of natures in Christ, compares the case of the Eucharist (as Irenaeus had done with the Docetæ, which was indeed usual in writing against the Eutychians), and says, “Thus the body of Christ, which is received by the faithful, does not put off substance known by the senses, and remains unseparated from the grace known by the thought; and baptism, while it becomes wholly spiritual and one thing, preserves what is proper to it as perceived by the senses, I mean water, and does not lose what it has become. So Facundus about the same time, “The sacrament of adoption [baptism] may be called adoption, as the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ consecrated in the bread and wine is said to be His body and His blood, not that His body be bread or His blood wine, but because the bread and wine are the sacrament of His body and blood, and therefore so called by Christ when He gave them to His disciples.”14 Bede, in the eighth century, is express. (Compare Luke 22 and Psalm 3.) In the last he says, “Neither did He exclude him [Judas] from the most sacred supper in which He delivered to His disciples the figure of His most holy body and blood.” So in the Ambrosian office, so-called, it is said, “which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.” With this we must remember that the elements are constantly called types and antitypes. I now turn to Bernard.

In his sermon on the supper of the Lord which is much more one on indwelling sin, he says, however, “A sacrament is called a sacred sign or sacred secret. Many things indeed are for themselves alone, others to

designate other things, and they are called signs. That we may take an example from common things, a ring is given, absolutely a ring, and has no signification; it is given as the investiture of some inheritance and it is a sign so that he who receives it can say, The ring is nothing worth, but the inheritance which I seek. In this manner therefore, the Lord, drawing near His passion, took care in His grace to give investiture to His own, that invisible grace might be afforded [prsestaretur] by a certain visible sign. To this purpose all the sacraments were instituted." Then he goes through these; the partaking of the Eucharist, washing the feet, and baptism. He had said these would be enough for them. He was the last of the Fathers so-called, and was after Berengarius as to whom the question had been very rudely agitated. Aucalaurius, deacon of Metz, in the ninth century, says (De Euch. Off. 1, 29), "For sacraments are somewhat to resemble these things whereof they are sacraments … the sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner the body of Christ. For sacraments should not be sacraments if in some things they had not the likeness of that whereof they are sacraments. Now by reason of this mutual likeness they oftentimes are called by what they represent," 3, 24. Yet he also uses language which is tantamount to transubstantiation, so uncertain were these men.

D. But these are very late, and can hardly be called Fathers.

N*. Exactly so, I cite them not as any authority, but to shew how late a doctrine which subverts transubstantiation passed current in Christendom as orthodox and right. Bernard is generally counted the last of the Fathers: I have already quoted him shewing

that till the twelfth century the most eminent men of their day held this with impunity. Bernard had more influence in his day than any man in Christendom.

D. But it was opposed and condemned in Berengarius.

N*. It was, but that did not hinder multitudes of eminent men from holding and defending it. It was in the ninth century especially discussed, and both doctrines were held and taught. There were partial condemnations of this denial of transubstantiation, Paschasius Radbert leading the way for the doctrine. Rabanus Maurus, the most famous man of his day in the middle of the ninth century, was wholly opposed to it, as was John Scot Erigena, Ratramnus, or Bertram who wrote a little later. So we have Alfric in a homily ordered to be read in the Anglo-Saxon churches; the last in the tenth century,15 Berengarius in the eleventh, and he was called up about it! All these wrote against transubstantiation; as we have seen, Bernard did too in the twelfth. Paschasius Radbert first wrote insisting on it in the ninth, Lanfranc afterwards against Berengarius. In 1215 it was established as a dogma, in the time of Innocent III, who established the Inquisition and set on foot the crusades against the Albigenses and Waldenses.

Let us look a little into these cases, for this is the true epoch of the establishment of the doctrine by Rome. I may first mention the second Council of Constantinople of three hundred and thirty-eight prelates (Hard. Cone. 4, 367; 2nd Cone, of this Action 6) in 754. The Council was against images, but they say, “you could not bring the divine mfiniteness of Christ in glory into a painted finite image,” and adds, “he chose no other form under heaven or type to give the image (eikonisai) of His

incarnation than the Eucharist which “He gave to His initiated (mustais) for a type and effectual remembrance… He ordained the substance of bread to be offered having no way the form of a man that idolatry might not be brought in.” They call “the bread of the Eucharist” a true image (apseude eikona) of his natural flesh (phusikes sarkos). And a good deal more; but this suffices. His flippant respondent Epiphanius objects to calling it an image after it has been consecrated, saying it has never been so called; a statement so notoriously false that the Roman Catholic annotators have corrected it and cited instances in the margin.

The second of Nice (787) brought in images again under the influence of Irene; put down under Leo, they were set up again under Theodora his widow, and a festival established in commemoration. In England (792) and at Frankfort under Charlemagne (794), where some eight hundred prelates were assembled, the second Council of Nice was condemned. So was the doctrine in the Council of Illiberis in Spain at the same epoch, noticed here to shew the dates of these questions. Up to 824 purity as to this was maintained. In the middle of the ninth century Paschasius Radbert introduced transubstantiation in the West, as John of Damascus some few years before the Council of Constantinople (654) in the East, just a century before Radbert. Sirmondi, in a short life prefixed to Radbert’s works in the Bib. Max. Pat. says (14, 353), “He first so explained the genuine sense of the Catholic church, that he opened the way to others who in numbers wrote afterwards on the same subject.” And Bellarmine says he was the first author who wrote seriously and copiously concerning the verity of the body and blood of the Lord in the Eucharist.

Paschasius Radbert does not speak of transubstantiation, but he does speak of the Eucharist being really the body and blood of Christ; and that body and blood which was born of the virgin and which suffered, as there could not be any other. That as Christ as man was created in the virgin's womb by the power of the Holy Ghost, so by the operation of the Holy Ghost it is Christ in the Eucharist—faith knows Him to be there as it would the divinity in Christ hanging on the cross. There is nothing of the school doctrine of substance and accidents, and so far from its being a church dogma, he says in his second treatise, to Frudegarde who doubted through reading Augustine, that many doubted. The whole work is tie reasoning of an individual to prove his point. He fully holds it is the flesh of Christ, but speaks of eating it spiritually interiorly; and that he who is not dwelling in Christ, though he seems to receive it with his mouth, does not really.

D. But you do not mean that Radbert did not believe in transubstantiation?

N*. I do not say that exactly. That he believed the Eucharist was the true body and blood of Christ is quite clear. But the scholastic view, brought in later by Lombard, was not yet established. He was the first that spoke as plainly as he did, but he does not bring it out as it was brought out afterwards, and has no thought of it being a dogma of the church, but twice over in his second letter says many doubted it. And he puts baptism, the chrism, and the Eucharist on the same ground, but he holds that it was the same body that hung upon the cross. He calls it a figure, but says it was the truth of the thing too as Christ was as to God. What I insist on with Sirmondi and Bellarmine is that he was

the first that propounded the doctrine; and this tells the whole story: it is a doctrine which came in quite late and was opposed, as we shall now see, by the greatest men of the age.

Bertram or Ratramnus I need hardly quote. The Emperor Carolus Calvus had asked him the question whether it was literally or figuratively Christ's body, and the book is to shew it was the latter. His doctrine is the usual doctrine of the Fathers, that by faith they partook of Christ's body and blood in spiritual efficacy, but that literally it was bread and wine as before, and as we have seen others do, he refers to baptism and anointing as a similar case, nobody pretending the water or oil was changed, only it became spiritually efficacious. In the preface, London, 1688, a list of those who taught the same doctrine at the same time, beginning with Charles the Great to Alcuin, is given. Alfric, whom I have named, is a proof how Ratramn was received, as his statements are taken from Ratramn. The whole history of the writers of this age shews it was now first introduced, and at once called in question. Rabanus Maurus, the greatest man of his day, opposed it. He says (De Institutione Clericorum, 1, 31), "Because the sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the sacrament another; for the sacrament is received by the mouth; by the virtue of the sacrament the inward man is satiated; for the sacrament is reduced into an aliment of the body, but by the virtue of the sacrament the dignity of eternal life is obtained." And just before, "and as the invisible God appeared in visible flesh, so also He demonstrated an invisible thing by visible matter," and again as Melchisedec offered bread and wine, the great high priest should do the same. He says (Penitential, 6, 33), "For some of late, not

thinking rightly of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said that the very body and blood of our Lord which was born and in which the Lord Himself suffered on the cross and rose out of the sepulchre … [in opposition] to which error as far as we could in writing to the Abbot Egilus, we have opened up what is really to be believed about His body"; where, for what specifically was spoken, a blank was left in the copy, but plenty is left. In my copy of Rab. Maur. (lib. 6 on Matt.) he tells us He (Christ) "substituted the sacrament of His body and blood for the flesh and blood of the Lamb and breaks the bread which He handed to the disciples, to shew that the fraction of His body was not without His own voluntary act." "Because therefore the bread strengthens the body, and wine produces blood in the flesh, that refers mystically to the body of Christ, this to His blood." There is no doubt that Rab. Maurus was wholly opposed to the doctrine, though held to be the greatest light in his day. There is a curious circumstance, shewing how we have to be on our guard in these inquiries. The works of Fulbert of Chartres were published in Paris. Referring to eating Christ's flesh, it is said, "It seems to command a crime or atrocity. It is therefore a figure, saith the heretic, commanding only communion with the passion of the Lord." But some one reminded the publisher that the words were Augustine's own. Unless the fraud was still more wilful, in the hope nobody would look to the errata, he puts in the errata that the words: "the heretic saith," were not in the MS.

R. But do you mean that the text was wilfully changed?

N*. Judge for yourself. He tells us the words were not in the MS.

R. This is very bad.

N*. Surely it is, but they changed Ambrose in the same way. He writes, speaking of the elements, that “they should be what they were, and be changed into another thing,” they published it as “what they were should be changed into another thing.” They changed passages in the imperfect work on Matthew, ascribed to Chrysostom, from a direct testimony against transubstantiation to the contrary; leaving the part out or boldly changing it. The Benedictine edition has restored in Ambrose what flatly, in terms, contradicts transubstantiation. John Scot Erigena at this time also wrote clearly against this new doctrine. His book was not condemned for two hundred years. But the Emperor Charles asked Ratramn, a man much looked up to, to write his well-known book against the new notion. No Roman Catholic denies this, though they at one time attempted to father it on others. It only proves, says a Jesuit, “that the heresy of Calvin was not new.”

Thus what history clearly shews is that the introduction of this doctrine in the West was in the ninth century. But it was then and afterwards strenuously resisted by doctors, prelates, and emperors; it was then in no sense a doctrine of the church. But it gradually prevailed; and controversy broke out afresh when Berengarius maintained the ancient doctrine, and appealed to Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, etc. He was brought before several Councils under Leo IX, Victor II, and Nicholas II. In one he was made to sign a confession prepared by Cardinal Humbert, which says at the end, that the body and blood of Christ are handled and broken by the hands of the priests and ground with the teeth of the faithful and sensible (sensualiter), not

sacramentally only but in truth. The marginal gloss warns us to apply this only to the visible form, or we should be worse heretics than Berengarius. (Corp. Jur. Can. Deer, tertia pars, Dis. 2, cap. 42; Lyons, 1671, pp. 19, 31.) He speaks in the beginning of having held it was only sacramentally. (Bar. 1059, 13, 14, 17, 152-3.) John Erigena was also condemned: this was at Rome by the Pope and a hundred and thirteen prelates. Berengarius yielded to fear, but went on afterwards with his doctrine, and wrote against his recantation and denounced the Council. He was again cited by Pope Hildebrand, the most violent of popes who forced celibacy on the clergy. In this Council, Rom. 6 (Hard. 6, 1583), it is declared that the major part held the literal body and blood were there, but that many thought thus, and others thus, and a fast appointed and three months given to Berengarius, having had three days' discussion in the synod. Berengarius signed a confession that the bread was substantially changed. As some state, he sold all he had and worked for his livelihood. Lanfranc, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote against him and brought the doctrine to England. But at the time, as the English historians of the middle ages declare, almost all the English, French, and Italian bishops agreed with Berengarius; he had been acquitted at Tours, signing a confession which is not extant that I know. Lanfranc was his great opponent, and we have to learn all relating to him chiefly in Lanfranc's abusive statements. In the Council of Vercelh" (1050), where Lanfranc was and Berengarius sent two, John Erigena was condemned, and Berengarius. I should have noticed that Erigena was murdered by the students where he taught, it is said at the instigation of the monks.

D. But Berengarius was a worthless man, denying his own oath, and teaching the contrary of what he had sworn to.

R. I do not see that this proves much as to the history of the doctrine, Mr. D.; it proves his weakness.

N*. Berengarius was reputed both a holy and learned man. His denial at Rome of what he held proved his weakness assuredly, but we have never been tried or we might have to put our hand in the fire as Cranmer, for signing a confession he was gradually drawn into. It appears the prelate of Angers, where he was archdeacon, agreed with him, and he was defended by many of the French clergy; no doubt when he got back among them his courage, which had failed when alone among his enemies, revived. Lanfranc, then a monk in France, pursued his point with relentless and abusive violence.

But the question is not the character of Berengarius but the history of transubstantiation, and I hardly know how it would be made clearer than by the facts we have been surveying. The Roman historian admits there was only a majority in the Roman council, and decided after three days' discussion. It was not then a dogma of the church. That the doctrine at length prevailed in the Roman church we all know. I quote a summary (from Gieseler, 3rd Div. chap. 5, sec. 77) by Algenis of the current opinions about 1130. "Some think the bread and wine are not changed, but that it is only a sacrament, as the water of baptism and oil of the chrism; they say that it is called the body of Christ not truly but figuratively. Others say that the bread is not only a sacrament but that Christ is, as it were, embodied in the bread

[impanatum] as God was personally incarnate in flesh. Others that the bread and wine are changed into flesh and blood, but not that of Christ, but of some son of man holy and accepted of God, that what Christ said may be fulfilled, ‘unless ye eat the flesh of [a] Son of man [carnem filii hominis] ye will not have life in you.’ Others, that evil in the consecrator annulled the invocation of the divine name. Others, that it was really changed; but by evil in recipients it returned into a mere sacrament.” Now it is perfectly impossible a person, presbyter and afterwards monk, could write in this way if it had been a fixed dogma of the church. I have already referred to Bernard in the middle of the twelfth century (Sermo 1, in Coena Dom. 2). Indeed the mystics generally took the spiritual as contrasted with the material side. Finally in the fourth Council of Lateran under Innocent III in 1215, it was decided to be the faith of the church.

Other circumstances confirm this. It was then the giving the communion to children began to be set aside, it continued locally for two or three centuries; the cup began to be withheld from the laity, although by many such a practice was entirely condemned. Gratian (De ret p. 3, Dist. 2, 5, 12) quoting Pope Gelasius that they should take it in both species or not at all. And this was general, but the withdrawal of the cup began now. Alexander Hales (whose works I have not) discusses it at large. In two centuries the cup was universally refused to the laity. On all these things I do not insist for their own sake, but as a testimony to the epoch of establishing transubstantiation. It was when the Bible was forbidden in the Council of Toulouse and the Inquisition established to root out the Albigenses, and

the celibacy of the clergy insisted on to the universal ruin of morals; when the papacy was at the height of its power and morality at its lowest ebb, and when as Bernard says Antichrist was seated at Rome.

D. But the decree was founded on the church's authority by the consent of the Fathers.

N*. We can read the Fathers for ourselves and see if that is true, without blasphemously discussing, as Innocent and Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura and others do, what becomes of the Lord if a mouse eats Him or any other accident happens to the helpless elements, though His Godhead (they say) is there. And we have cited them; and though superstition grew apace, it is not true that there was any consent of Fathers. Many taught exactly the contrary, as we have seen in their controversy with the Docetae and Eutychians; in fact, Cyril of Jerusalem is the only one who at all draws near it; and a vast array of the doctors of the previous centuries opposed the doctrine. The first who really held it was a Greek Father, John Damascene, and there it was identified with the re-establishment of image worship. This was in the seventh century, but a few years after him the Council of Constantinople declared the bread to be the only image of Christ. Damascene says that if Basil calls it a figure (antitupon) he must mean before consecration,16 he adds it was not by the body in heaven coming down, but by a conversion of the elements. That it was called so before as well, we have already seen; so that the only effect of this testimony is to recognise the force of the word, and to prove that he was conscious that the word was used and meant to be as a figure. Though thus taught practically by Damascene in the eighth century in the East, it was

never made a dogma there till Peter the Great in 1725, though prevailing gradually. In the West, we have seen that it was introduced by Radbert a century after Damascene, and made a dogma of Rome in the thirteenth century; the earlier Fathers being clearly against it, and in the ninth century it was discussed and combated, and not only privately but in a Roman Council. The progress of superstition is seen indeed in John Damascene, he refers, as we have often seen in the Fathers, to the oil of the chrism and the water in baptism,17 to which divine grace was added by means of the invocation of the Holy Ghost, which was, and in the Greek church is still, what consecrates the elements. These are only set apart by the words, This is my body, as a preparatory service in what is called the prothesis, and then carried in procession to be consecrated on the altar. But the language of John Damascene does shew the progress of superstition, for the strongest part of his statement is, as the editor annotator of his works, Lequien, a Roman Catholic of the order of preachers (Paris, 1712) remarks, and as is easily seen, is taken from the letter to Caesarius attributed to Chrysostom, and of that epoch, though not probably his. Now this says, “Divine grace sanctifying it [the bread] by means of the priest, it is indeed freed from the appellation of bread, but is esteemed worthy of the appellation of the Lord’s body even though the nature of bread has remained in it, and it is called not two bodies, but one body of the Son,” whereas in Damascene we have, “By the invocation and coming of the Holy Spirit they are supematurally transformed (uperphuos metapeiountai) into the body of Christ and the blood, and they are not two, but one and the same thing.” This, “although the nature of bread remains in it “has passed away, but so

had some 400 years time. A century later Paschasius Radbert first publicly introduced it in the West as we have seen. But Damascene's views were not then publicly adopted. Some six years before his death, the Council of Constantinople (754) called as general, but not received in the West, nor in the East beyond the Emperor's rule, declared the elements in the Lord's supper to be the only image of Christ.18 Still though never dogmatically established, the superstitious feeling grew. I may add that in the Russian part of the Greek church, it is since Peter the Great's time in a certain sense established by law. It seems that through the efforts of Rome and the propaganda, persons from Eastern countries who had received their education there had widely propagated the views with which they had been imbued at Rome. Peter the Great brought many clergy in from the Ukraine, where Romish influence was considerable, and only then (1725) imposed on everyone consecrated bishop, an oath "that he believes and understands that the transubstantiation of the body and blood of Christ in the holy supper as taught by the Eastern and ancient Russian doctors is effected by the influence and operation of the Holy Ghost when the bishop or priest invokes God the Father in these words, 'and make this bread the precious body of Christ.'" Thus since Peter the Great's reign there has, at least by the prelates, been a positive profession of transubstantiation in Russia; but by invocation of the Holy Ghost and not as at Rome, but this is only since the beginning of the eighteenth century; that was rather late in the day. The way it came about was this: It seems Rome had been very active in seeking to win and influence the Greek church, which though itself corrupt enough, was a standing witness against her pretended

catholicity, and against some of her doctrines. It had had to do with the struggles in the case of Cyril Lucaris, who had embraced evangelical doctrine and was strangled by the Porte, as was the Cyril of Berrhcea who supplanted him. By like intrigues the Ukraine or Little Russia, and the provinces at the mouth of the Danube and neighbourhood in what had once been Polish, had been very much Romanized, at the same time the clergy had at least received some education at Rome. Peter the Great, who was the ecclesiastical reformer of Russia and remodelled the whole church and monastic system, brought in thence (the Russian clergy being utterly brutish), at least educated men, and then (1725) introduced the oath as to transubstantiation. Mogilas, Metropolitan of the Ukraine, had made a catechism, confirmed in 1643 by the patriarchs, and in vogue till the Synod's Catechism by the Archbishop of Novgorod in 1766 supplanted it. I do not question that the superstition insisted on by John Damascene had borne its fruits. At the time of the Reformation, the Wurtemberg divines wrote to the patriarch Jeremias, sending the confession of Augsburg, and in his answer he quotes the words of John Damascene; he says it is the body of Christ, not a type, he calls it bread when consecrated; nor is there a hint of substance and accidents. The best account perhaps of transmutation in the Greek church will be found in Covel (p. 122, c. 5, Camb., 1782). But all is evidently quite modern. I thought I might notice the Greek church to complete our review.

This much I think we have seen: first in searching Scripture, it cannot be said that Christ, in giving the bread and the wine, was present a glorified Christ as

actually existing, for then there can be no shed blood, as is evident, and He was not yet so glorified: nor would it be what He was then, for His blood was not shed. Its being done after He was gone and glorified, in remembrance of Him and His sacrifice, is as simple as it is blessed. Next, in the Fathers, we have found that many of them, though speaking in the highest terms of the Eucharist, insist earnestly on the exact contrary of transubstantiation. And this is true of the very early ones reasoning against the Docetae; and then, somewhat later, others in writing against the Eutychians, say things which modern Roman Catholics hold to be 'prave dicta,' and others excuse, saying, when the dogma was not settled they spoke in a way liable to be abused, 'in malam partem trahi.' We have seen that in the West, Paschasius Radbert was the first who positively and clearly expounded the doctrine, that is, in the ninth century, and that it was never formally decided to be the doctrine of the church till 1215. There was a great deal of intriguing of the Western powers at Constantinople on this subject to augment their influence, but into this I need not enter. I may note, however, that in Peter the Great's bishops' oath (and which is indeed its object), and all the Eastern documents I have come across, the change, as in ancient liturgies, is invariably attributed to the invocation of the Holy Ghost, and distinctively to that, the epiklesis of the early Fathers. This is wanting wholly in the Roman missal, so that an orthodox Greek does not hold the elements to be consecrated at Rome at all. In the Romanized liturgies of other bodies, as Armenians and Ethiopians united to Rome, in the former we find in the invocation bread changed into consecrated bread. The Ethiopic goes further, and says, "This bread, that is, the

body of Christ." They have not taken away the invocation, but changed it so as to make it an already consecrated bread. In the ancient liturgies, the oblation was before the consecration, from the very ancient habit of bringing the fruits of the earth in kind before the celebration of the Lord's supper. In all, we find the virgin Mary prayed for, not doing which Epiphanius notices as the distinction of a divine Person, as Christ, and many other traces, not of what was primitive then came in. In Justin Martyr's time, the president prayed and thanked as best he could, but at any rate of early times. The change in praying to instead of for saints is noticed in a question in the Corpus Jur. Can., and puzzled the Pope who could not account for it; only saints, could not, he said, be prayed for. But of this we have spoken. But as Scripture really cannot honestly be tortured to mean it, so that the Fathers shew that transubstantiation was not the doctrine of the early church, no honest man who has read them can deny; rapidly as superstition and immorality grew, and dark and ignorant as the so-called Fathers were.

R. It is distressing. I do not see how it is possible that Christ could have held Himself in His own hand, and broken Himself, and had His blood shed, it being truly and really Himself, when He was sitting there, and assuredly now His blood cannot be shed. I see too that Milner's statement cannot be trusted, and that the early Fathers, whatever we may think of the authority of their views, did not hold transubstantiation as we do, and that it was made a dogma very late indeed, and yet I may say all our system depends on it.

N*. I might add as a confirmatory fact historically, that the feast of Corpus Christi never existed till after the

dogma was established: first instituted in the diocese of Liege, dropped for a while, and then re-established in 1311. Other fables are connected with it, but the vision of a certain Juliana appears to have been its origin. At any rate the festival of Corpus Christi was not established before this.

R. My heart still clings to my old belief, yet I see I have no adequate ground for it.

N*. Trust God, Mr. R. He helps infallibly those that look to Him. It is written, “They shall be all taught of God,” and “if thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.” Search the word of God. You have ever a glorified Christ above, one who once hung upon the tree for us in love, the one real sacrifice of never-ending nor changing value, always before God accepted of Him, and on which true faith ever rests, while it feeds daily upon it, and of which the Lord’s supper is the special memorial and presentation, where we discern the Lord’s body, and are united as one body in Him. I commend you to Him and His grace.

R. Thank you. I must search the word and count on His goodness to guide me. We have to thank our kind friends here for receiving us and allowing us to occupy their house and time.

James. It is I that thank you, sir, and Mr. N. for coming here to my poor cottage. I have learnt much I never knew, though through grace I confided in Christ and His blessed work. My part was naturally to learn, but all is clearer to me than ever it was.

Bill M. I am sure I am thankful. Why I never thought of such things, and I see my salvation in Christ much better than I did.

N*. Well, we will commend each other now heartily to God. We all need His constant grace; and let us remember one another before Him and look to the faithful Saviour to help us on.

The reader is referred for other Dialogues on Romanism to Doctrinal, Vols. 5, 6 and 8.

1 One of the reasons for not keeping the wine with the bread is, that it might ferment and become acid.

2 They allege it is not a creation, but a change; but to have the body and soul of Christ, really, where there was only bread, He not changing His place, is creation. For that exists which did not exist before. They call it, however, a change.

3 I give Donovan's translation printed at the Propaganda press, Rome, superiorum permissu, with the imprimatur of the Master of the sacred palace, and of the vicegerent of Rome.

4 At the same time they admit an esse (something existing) in the accidents, so that, if one ate enough of the hostia, the body would be nourished by it [Thomas Aquinas, III, 77, 6] and Cat. Cone. Trent II. 40, already quoted.

5 The schoolmen Biel and Occam and the Bishop of Rochester are quoted by Cosins; so further Ocean says, it is better and more scriptural to say the bread remains; and Scotus. It was no dogma of faith before Innocent III.

6 The word "broken" in 1 Corinthians 11:24 is not genuine.

7 The officiating priest alone takes the cup in the Roman ritual.

8 He spent the property of the church of Alexandria, which was immense, in bribing the court and Empress-sister against Nestorius.

9 Trichous a rare word, if found elsewhere at all. See Valpy's Steph. under thrigkos. It is not in Suicer's Thesaurus. The sense is plain enough.

10 These words were left out, not in the earliest editions, but in one or two early ones, and then others said they are wanting in some copies. No doubt, they had left them out. There is no doubt of their genuineness. The Benedictines own they are pravè dicta.

11 Pope Nicolas I quotes it as his in the ninth century.

12 Quaere if sumus be not a mistake for sumimus? Then it would be we take, as at the beginning of the quotation.

13 The original Greek is found in the margin in Albertinus from a MS.

14 This I quote from a collection of passages.

15 Alfric (he lived about 990) writes thus: "After true nature that water is corruptible water, and after ghostlye mysterye hath hallowing might, so also if we behold that holye housell after bodily understanding, then see we that it is a creature corruptible and mutable. If we acknowledge therein ghostlye might, then understand we that life is therein, and that it giveth immortalitie to them that eate it with faith. Much is betwixte the invisible myghte of the holy housell, and the visible shape of his proper nature. It is naturally corruptible bread and corruptible wine, and is by the myghte of God's word truly Christ's body and hys blood. Not so notwithstanding bodely but ghostlye. Much is

between the body Christ suffered in, and the body that is hallowed to housell. The body that he suffered in was borne of the flesh of Mary with blood and with bone, with skinne and with synowes in human limmes, with a reasonable soul living. And his ghostlye body which we call the housell is gathered of many cornes, without bloude and bone, without lymme, without soule and there fore nothing is to be understood therein bodily, but all is ghostlye to be understood." I might add much more: one sentence may suffice. "Thys mysterye is a pledge and a figure, Christ's bodye is truth itself… And He (the Saviour) bad them not eate that bodye which He was going about with, nor that blood to drink which He shed for us, but He meant with those words that holy housell which ghostly is His body and Hys bloude." (Treatise at the end of Wm. Law's Demonstration. Testimony of Antiquities, 33.)

16 In Basil's liturgy it is expressly called bread, "this holy bread "after consecration.

17 His words as to the Eucharist are that the divinity being added to the bread, makes it the body of Christ (de Fid. Orth. lib. 4, 112), certainly not the Romish doctrine.

18 Image worship was restored in the East under Irene (787), but put down for a time by Leo Armenius, refuted in the Caroline books and by the Synod of Frankfort (794), and Paris (825).

Examination Of The Book Entitled “The Restitution Of All Things”

Editor's Note 19

This book denies all true sense of what sin is; that men must be born again; and the cross, as Christ bearing our sins. We die as He died; and that is all. And, I judge, there is more behind, which he says, aping Paul, he cannot utter (p. 75). I should add that guilt is never thought of or recognised, nor Christ’s work as meeting it in any way.

The book is written in the form of a letter to a friend. On page 2 he says, “Your difficulty is, How are we, as believers in Scripture, to reconcile its prophetic declarations as to the final restitution of all things with those other statements of the same scripture which are so often quoted to prove eternal punishment?” There are no such prophetic declarations as to the restitution of all things absolutely. He leaves out, as all such do, the words “which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began” (Acts 3:21), “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, so that the times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord, and He shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began,” Acts 3:20, 21. The “all things” refer solely to those things of which the prophets have spoken. The reading of the passage dissipates the notion based on it by leaving out the end.

Again, “scripture, you say, affirms that our God (whose?) is a Saviour full of pity towards the lost, seeking their restoration; so loving that He has given for man His only-begotten Son, in and by whom the curse shall be overcome, and all the kindreds of the earth be blessed; and yet that some shall go away into everlasting punishment, where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. How is it possible, you ask, to reconcile all this? Are not the statements directly inconsistent?” No. There is nothing to reconcile, no opposition whatever. Suppose He has been rejected—found none to answer? “He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him,” John 3:36. Those in hell are not kindreds of the earth.

Nature and providence are said to veil as much as they reveal. “We must confess to some veil or riddle here. It is precisely the same riddle which we find in every other revelation… Providence surely is a revelation of God; and yet is it not, like nature, a veil quite as much as a revelation?” Why so? All this is confusion and error. Nature and providence are under the effects of the fall, and the fruits of sin are there. If these last are in the word, I must cull out what is and what is not. But the word is perfect as Christ was. It is want of intelligence in me—unbelief in me—that hinders my understanding it, not the effect of sin in it. It is quite wrong then to say that “Scripture, as it appears to sense, makes out God to be just as far from what He really is as nature and providence seem to make Him.”

Again, “Even so it is with those other two revelations which, much as they have been gainsaid, the church has received and yet believes in, I mean the flesh of Christ and holy Scripture.” “The church”: what church? He

quite treats it all through as some known adequate authority.

What he concludes regarding nature, providence, and Scripture at page 14 is all false, as we have just shewn; and the esoteric referred to has been discovered by him!

That God was willing, in revealing Himself, to seem inconsistent by giving the law, is utter nonsense and confusion. There was no seeming inconsistency, for the law was the just measure of what the child of Adam ought to be, so as to convict him of sin; not the revelation of what God was at all. “If men are in the flesh, God comes to them in flesh,” etc. All are in the flesh (not disembodied) when God comes to them. All this section (pp. 14, 15) is a denial of the truth, where it is not pretty nonsense. “Why have men always heard God first speaking in law before a gospel dawned on them? Why must it be so, or at least why does He allow it? Is it a mistake of His which we must avoid when we attempt to make Him known?” etc. We may use law to convict of sin; but all up to Christ was a testing of man, not a revealing of God, save promise and prophecy. Then, in the fulness of time, God was revealed in Christ; light shining in darkness, and no man received Him because men were darkness. Then grace wrought to lead to it.

The concluding sentence of this paragraph is totally false; for God never revealed Himself till Christ came. “It was needful that He should shew Himself under the forms and limitations of that creature in and to whom He sought to reveal Himself, that is, by shadows before light, by law before gospel, by a letter before a quickening spirit—in a word, by the humiliation of His

eternal Word stooping to come out of man's heart and in a human form." Where? Nowhere in Scripture. When he says this "could not be done without truth "stooping "to come in human form, out of the heart of man, even as Christ came forth from Mary," we ask, Is man's heart the birthplace of truth, as Mary's womb of Christ? Man's heart indeed! And yet he says "this word is no stranger to me!" Also "knowing that it has many things to say which we cannot bear at first." Who? The disciples before Pentecost (John 16:12), or the little children whose sins are forgiven, who know the Father, and have an unction from the Holy One and know all things? (i John 2.)

At page 19 he begins to consider the question, "What then does Scripture say on this subject? Its testimony appears at first sight contradictory … there are direct statements as to the results of these [law and gospel] which at first sight are apparently irreconcilable." He first states the results as to law and condemnation, and at the close says: "Words could not well be stronger. The difficulty is that all this is but one side of Scripture, which in other places seems to teach a very different doctrine. For instance there are, first, the words of God Himself, repeated again and again by those same apostles whom I have just quoted, that 'in Abram's seed all the kindreds of the earth shall be blessed' (Gen. 12:3; chap. 22:18; Acts 3:25; Gal. 3:8); words which St. Peter expounds to mean that there shall be a 'restitution of all things'; adding that, 'God hath spoken of this by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began,'" Acts 3:21. This is utterly false, and a deliberate misquotation of Scripture. It is achri chronon apokatastaseos ponton on elalesen o Theos. Then our

author quotes more passages, but Paul in Colossians 1:16 leaves out ta katachthonia, the “things under the earth.” They are neither re-headed, reconciled, nor delivered. This is introduced in Philippians 2:10, where bowing to Jesus’ name is spoken of. The whole created scene is to be restored, but what is cast out of it is left out.

But the deliverance of a groaning creation in Romans 8 is at the revelation of the sons of God. The liberty of glory the creature will have part in, not the liberty of grace; Rom. 8:21. And when he quotes, “through death to destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil,” it is all right, but not to restore him. When he quotes, “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,” mark “was”; but the world, instead of being reconciled, hated both Him and His Father, and shewed their incorrigible enmity by crucifying Christ. The passage from Romans 5:15 (“If by the offence of one [the] many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto [the] many”), when quoted as now given, proves the contrary of Mr. Jukes’ doctrine. It is the many connected with the one respectively. “The many” connected with Adam are all his race; “the many” connected with Christ all His race, that is, all believers. The English translation of verse 18, as he gives it, is wholly false. It should be: “So then as [it was] by one offence towards all men for condemnation; so by one righteousness towards all men for justification of life.” He says: “To another church he states the same doctrine, that ‘as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.’” I do not accept the use made of the words. I have no doubt it is all in Adam, and all in Christ,

at any rate “the same doctrine.” It speaks of the resurrection of the body. The reading of the passage will dissipate his view of 1 Corinthians 15:24-26: “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death”: and this is at the resurrection of the wicked, so that no enemy is destroyed after it. He quotes further Ephesians 1:9,10, “That… he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth, even in him.”

But in Philippians 2:10 there is a third class. And this gathering together is in the millennium, “the fulness of times,” when confessedly the wicked are not restored. “That at [or, in] the name of Jesus [that is, Saviour] every knee should bow,” etc. The gloss, “that is, Saviour,” is wholly unwarranted in the passage noted. Again he quotes, “Who is the Saviour of all men,” 1 Tim. 4:10. But mark two things: first, “Is the Saviour”; and, second, it is providentially Saviour as the passage plainly proves.

Again, “will have all men to be saved.” No doubt thelei, but this is now in the day of salvation; 1 Tim. 2. It is all wholly a present thing. That Christ was a ransom for all, I believe. As to Romans 11, “that he might have mercy upon all” is, as he quotes it, the merest abuse of words. The Jews are come under mere mercy as Gentiles by rejecting Messiah and the promises. “That the world through him might be saved” it is too bad in the author to quote for his purpose, for that passage distinguishes believers as alone profiting, and the rest judged. “He is the propitiation … for the whole world.” So He is. “The Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” So He will. “That he might destroy the works of the devil.” So He will; but all this proves nothing at all as to

the rejection of rejectors. Destroying the works of the devil rather implies that the devil stays where he was, and that as a result “there shall be no more death,” etc.; and then without are “the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars,” who “shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death,” Rev. 21:8. His quotation for universal salvation of John 6 - 37-39; chap. 12:32, is too bad. The first passage spoken of carefully teaches that only those will be saved whom the Father has given Him: look at verse 36, and indeed at the whole chapter. The other passage— “draw all men unto me” — is the present effect of the cross in contrast with a Messiah to the Jews.

After giving several sets of passages, with the confusion indicated in the few we have remarked upon, he asks: “Now is not this apparent contradiction, few finding the way of life, and yet in Christ all made alive? God’s elect a little flock, and yet all the kindreds of the earth blessed in Abraham’s seed? mercy upon all, and yet eternal punishment? the restitution of all things, and yet eternal destruction? the wrath of God for ever, and yet all things20 reconciled to Him? eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and yet the destruction through death, not of the works of the devil only, but of him21 that has the power of death—that is, the devil? the second death and the lake which burneth with fire, and yet no more death or curse, but all things subdued by Christ,22 and God all in all? What can this contradiction mean? Is there any key, and if so, what is it, to this mystery? “The conclusive answer is, There is no “contradiction,” nor “mystery.” The above references are

all falsely cited apart from their context. This makes the apparent contradiction. Then he mentions the common answer, “That some are saved and some are lost for ever”; that therefore the words, “in Christ shall all be made alive,”23 only mean that all who are here in Christ shall be made alive; that the Lamb of God, though willing to be, is not really, the Saviour of the world, but only of those who are not of the world, but chosen out of it; that, instead of taking away the sin of the world, He only takes away the sin of those who here believe in Him;24 that all things therefore shall not be reconciled to God;25 and that “the restitution of all things,” whatever it may mean, does not mean the reconciliation to God of all men.

This (he says) is the approved teaching of Christendom; this is the orthodox solution of the mystery: the simple objection to which is, that in asserting one side of scripture it is obliged not only to ignore and deny the other side, but to represent God in a character absolutely opposed to that in which the gospel exhibits Him (pp. 26, 27).

The Lamb of God is “the taker-away of the sin” (not sins, a very diflferent thing), true in the new heavens and the new earth. “All things” here are the things spoken of by God through the prophets, and hence things on the earth.

Mr. Jukes then affirms that “the truth which solves the riddle is to be found in those same scriptures which seem to raise the difficulty, and lies in the mystery of the will of our ever-blessed God as to the process and stages of redemption.

“First, His will by some to bless and save others; by a firstborn seed, ‘the firstborn from the dead’ (Col. 1:18), to save and bless the later-born.” This is pure invention. Christ alone and the church are spoken of, in contrast with general restitution of the state of things.

“(2). His will therefore to work out the redemption of the lost by successive ages or dispensations, or, to use the language of St. Paul, ‘according to the purpose of the ages,’” Eph. 3:11. This, too, is mere imagination. We have only to read the passage to see that there is not one word about it. Nor has the “therefore” any ground, for he is concluding from his own fancy, and not from Scripture. Ephesians 3:11 is speaking solely of the church now.

“(3). Lastly, His will (thus meeting the nature of our fall) to make death, judgment, and destruction the way to life, acquittal, and salvation; in other words, ‘through death to destroy him that has the power of death, that is, the devil, and to deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage,’” Heb. 2:14. But this is through Christ’s death, and, as to sin, ours with Him. All is confusion. We have only to read the passage to see it. The power annulled is not that which dies.

The author’s simplicity is rare. He adds: “These truths throw a flood of light on Scripture, and enable us at once to see order and agreement where without this light there seems perplexing inconsistency.” “Truths! “They are no truths at all, but false “therefores” from falsely used passages. His questions a little farther on—“What was the object of the incarnation? … What was intended to be accomplished by the first and second

death?" etc., are all presumptuous folly, not revelation. When he writes, "inquire" what is the breadth and length, and depth and height "of their heavenly Father's purpose." It is not of this. Of what it is, is not said in Scripture; but it very certainly is not "the restitution of all things," as Mr. Jukes interprets that phrase. Again, we have a misuse of 1 Timothy 4:10, when he says: "By this light we see more fully God's purpose in Christ, and how He is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe"; for it is obvious that it means nothing about the future at all, but that Paul labours and suffers reproach because, as a present thing, God is providentially caring for all, but specially for "those that believe"; as says the word, "The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open to their prayers," 1 Pet. 3:12.

But our author is caught with the mere sound of a passage, regardless of the sense; or uses a mere change of sleight of hand to effect his purpose, as when he says: "While others not partakers of the first resurrection of judgment; that is, by the judgment of the coming age of ages." "That is," etc., is a mere gloss of his; entirely outside of all Scripture. It is very tedious to "look in order at each of these three points," when one has proved they are mere fancies. But it will only shew his false use of Scripture. "(1). First, the purpose of God by the firstfruits or firstborn to save the later-born. This, which is in fact the substance of the gospel, like all God's secrets, comes out by degrees; scarcely to be discerned in the first promise of the woman's seed; then 'in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed'; for the seed in which all the kindreds of the earth are blessed must be distinct from, and blessed prior to, those nations to whom, according to God's

purpose, in due time it becomes a blessing." All clearly false; unless it be Christ, and then the whole argument fails. As a scripture the contrary is here—the elder serves the younger; the Gentiles come in before the Jews. But the "seed" is declared to be Christ (Gal. 3:16), not "some" as he has said, "His will by some to bless and save others" (p. 27). The reference to Romans 11:16 will shew what is spoken of and what is done. Again, "Christ, says the apostle, is the promised seed (Gal. 3:16) and the firstborn (Col. 1:18), and in and through Him endless blessing shall flow down to the later-born." But this says nothing to his purpose. Believers are the seed in Him: not unbelievers; Gal. 3.

When he says "Christ, as Paul shews, is firstborn in a double sense: firstborn from above, first out of life," etc., it is all false. Nor is Christ ever called "first-fruits of the creature." When he says, "All things are of God; but it is no less true that all things are by man, as it is written,' Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead '; therefore, as by one firstborn death came into the world, so by another firstborn shall it be for ever overthrown," it is not true that all things are by man. Where is it so said? What he says is not "written." The resurrection came by man; it is nowhere said by a firstborn. When he says of Christ, "who by a birth in the flesh has come into our lot," it looks like positive error. When he speaks of its being "ever the firstborn from the grave that the law speaks of" (where?) and that is the woman's, not the man's firstborn, the whole thing is a rhapsody of nonsense. But the only proof he alleges is false; Christ is not called "firstfruits of the creature." All things are not by man; He who makes all becomes a man.

Again, “According to the law the firstborn had the right, though it might be lost, of being priest and king; that is, of interceding for, and ruling over, their younger brethren.” Quite false. They might be offered to God and redeemed, but had no rights as such. It is totally false about being priests. Aaron and his family alone had the right of being priests. In the passages quoted or referred to—Exodus 13:2; chap. 24:5; Numbers 3:12, 13; chap. 8:16; 1 Chronicles 5:1, 2—there is not a word about the matter. It is all a rhapsody in pages 32, 33 spun out of the writer’s own mind, even when quoting Scripture. When he says, “God’s purpose is by the firstborn from the dead to save and bless the later-born,” Scripture says they are quickened by Him.

“But the truth goes farther still; for there are others beside the Lord who are both ‘firstborn’ and ‘Abraham’s seed,’ who must, therefore [why?] in their measure share this honour with and under Christ, and in whom ‘as joint-heirs with him’ [God’s heirs?] the promise must be fulfilled that in them26 shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. … As if Christ and His body only should be saved, instead of rejoicing that they are also the appointed means of saving others.” Saving others! What does that mean? He applies the promise in Christ to us. It is folly, or it would be blasphemy. Ministers of blessing we may be; but does he mean to say that we, quickened and redeemed, when in glory shall shed our blood for them? Was ever such stuff?

Again, the references he relies on and gives on page 33 are all false; that is, there is nothing about a firstborn in them. “Even of the elect, few see they are elect to the birthright, not to be blessed only but to be a blessing; as firstborn with Christ to share the glory of kingship and

priesthood with Him, not only to rule and intercede for their younger and later-born brethren, but to avenge their blood, to raise up seed to the dead, and in and through Christ, their life and head, to redeem their lost inheritance." It is all utter stuff. "Later-born": how born? How "avenge their blood"? "Redeem!" What is raising up seed to the dead? "to redeem their lost inheritance?" Nobody did this, or had to give it up in the jubilee.

Mr. Jukes dwells on "firstfruits," and affirms that the sheaf at Passover, and the other at Pentecost in the form of cakes, were both called firstfruits. "Both in the law are distinctly called 'firstfruits,' though they are distinguished by a separate name, the ears at Passover being called Reeshith, the leavened cakes at Pentecost Bicourim." This is inexact; both are called Reeshith, both Bicourim, but Reeshith Bicourim is applied to the sheaf only. "Reeshith is put first. But the words give no ground for the alleged analogy. The church or assembly of the firstborn calls us simply "firstborn." Christ only is called "the firstfruits of them that slept." It applies solely to the resurrection, and only Christ's are spoken of— "they that are Christ's." The wicked will be raised; but the passage has to do with resurrection only, and has nothing to do with any general restitution—not even with wicked men. It is "the resurrection of the just." The parties are Christ, the first fruits of them that slept, and they that are Christ's at His coming; none else. "The offering of the firstfruits to God being accepted as the sanctification and consecration of the whole coming harvest." What "harvest"? At the "harvest" our Lord refers to (Matt. 13:40) the tares are cast into the fire. Scripture knows of no "harvest" in Mr. Jukes' sense, or general restoration. "Who share the honour with and

under Him of being the Pentecost first fruits." "With" is not said, but "they that are Christ's." "Who with Christ are through Christ Abraham's seed?" Galatians 3 says believers baptised to Christ; those sealed with the Holy Ghost.

Nothing he says of Scripture can be trusted; not even when he says in a note— "Saul, whose name means death or hell." It is not so; yod and vau are not the same. Saul means "demanded."

He goes on to say that the conversion of the nations will be accomplished by Israel, "who at their conversion converted, like Paul, who is their type, not by the knowledge of Christ in humiliation, but by the revelation of His heavenly glory, shall, like Paul, become apostles to the Gentiles, 'priests to the Lord and ministers to our God' to all the earth."27 This is a mistake. The testimony goes out before to both, and the remnant then own Christ coming in glory. Paul in his conversion is a type of the Jewish remnant, but there is no ground for the exclusion of others; he was one of the pre-trusters.

When he says (p. 38), "The church is also Abraham's seed," it is not so. We are, as Christ's; not in our church character. He adds: "To the church, therefore, belongs the same promise as firstfruits with Christ." In the firstfruits of the day of Pentecost there was leaven. When he speaks of the church with Christ being a blessing in its own heavenly and spiritual sphere, the statement is without foundation. The leaves of the tree, of which we eat the fruit, are for blessing down here. Full of his own thoughts, he mistakes when he says the church will act as priests; for a priest is for those out of the way, to minister to those who are out of the way; for

a priest did not minister to any but for accepted blood-washed ones.28 “This is the church’s calling … with Him to be both prophet, priest, and king; and this not here only, in these bodies of humiliation, but when changed in His presence to bear His image, and do His works with Him.” But we are never said to be prophets then. Priests and kings we are. But Christ Himself must give up the mediatorial kingdom. We reign over the earth, and, as priests, offer up the prayers of the saints; Rev. 5. At the end the wicked are “without.”

It is a fable, as it is nowhere written in Scripture, that believers’ “death and resurrection shall only introduce them to fuller and wider service to lost ones, over which the Lord shall set them as His priests and kings, until all things are restored and reconciled to Him.” There is not a hint of such a thing in Scripture; it is a stupid romance. “To whom, I ask, shall the church after death be priests?” We answer, In resurrection to those on earth. Not to those “who have departed hence in ignorance,” nor “to ‘spirits in prison’ such as those to whom after His death Christ Himself once preached.” It is said in Revelation 5 as kings we reign over the earth; as priests we present the prayers of the saints. We are not to be prophets then. All the rest is imagination. When Mr. Jukes says, “The words distinctly assert that our Lord went and preached unto the spirits in prison, who once had been disobedient in the days of Noah,” we affirm that they certainly do not; that is, it is not said He preached “in prison.” Not only so, but God declares, in Genesis 5, His Spirit should yet strive but those 120 years. And yet they would tell us that with these only He strove afterwards. He speaks as if we comfort the lost

where they are, in Gehenna! How they pass the “great gulf fixed” he does not say; Luke 16.

“I may add here, that this same truth that the first-blessed must save29 others is set forth, though in a slightly different form, in the kindred law of redemption touching the firstlings of beasts, whether clean or unclean. The lamb redeems the ass. So it must be.” No such thing! the owner redeemed it with a lamb. It is well that English is ambiguous. First-blessed may be plural or singular. To say that we are going to save others, because we are joint-heirs, is too monstrous to listen to. It is really awful to read of our joy “to be like Christ—that is, to be channels of blessing to viler, weaker souls—for all higher and elder beings serve the lower and younger. The firstborn, therefore, must serve and save others … like Christ, channels of blessing and life to thousands of later-born.” Is Christ no more than a channel, or do we bless as redeemers? Yet he dares say so.

When he speaks of the two leavened cakes being offered up together in “that great coming Pentecost,” we ask, Which is that? and surely in glory they will not be “leavened cakes” at all. When he says, “Oh, glorious day, when our Lord and Head shall give of His treasure to His Firstborn, that they may with Him redeem all lands and all brethren!” we say, It is infamous to link them and the Lord in redeeming. “Then shall the laver be multiplied into ‘ten lavers,’ till the water of life become a ‘sea of crystal’ large enough for even Babylon the Great to sink into it, and be found no more at all for ever.” This is senseless sentiment dissipated into mere air. When we ask, Who were cleansed in the lavers? Only actual priests, already consecrated, being washed!

So when we ask, Where is such a sea as he describes into which Babylon could sink? There is no such sea. The "sea of glass" was solid, and there was no sinking into it, and no purifying; Rev. 4,15,21. Were it so, this is the kingdom given up, while "without" are the wicked. Then we have a quotation from the Apocrypha, which has nothing to say to the matter either: "Then shall the elect run to and fro as sparks among the stubble." And when he romances about "Christ's members judging the world with Him, and consuming the evil with that same fire which Christ came to cast into the earth, and with which He is yet pledged to baptise all nations," we ask, Where is He so pledged? The Spirit is not for the world. No doubt the fire is, but it is "everlasting fire."

It is a mere assertion that the firstborn, though first delivered from the curse, have a relation to the whole creation, which shall be saved in the appointed times by Christ and His body, for there is no scripture; and to end the sentence with bring about "the restitution of all things" is false quotation, as is also what follows; for Ephesians 1:3-10 has not a word about it, nor has Ephesians 2:4-7. Ephesians 1:3 is falsely connected with verse 10, and this is given up too. "The church, like Christ its Head, is itself a great sacrament," etc. This is all romance and nonsense. So when he says the blessing of the elect is "but the means and pledge, as the apostle says, of wider blessing," it is not true, and the apostle does not say it. The reading of 1 Corinthians 1:27, 28, will shew that he misuses it for the future when it means the present. And so is it to utterly confound the day of salvation and the day of judgment to say that, when He comes in judgment on persons, it is "a priestly work of judgment and purification by fire which must be

accomplished that all may be ‘subdued’ and ‘reconciled.’” All this is before the “fire “save as “the perdition of ungodly men.” Then it is clearly not purification. What he says of Moloch is blasphemy, and as applied to us monstrous.

“But Scripture never says that these only shall be saved, but rather that in this ‘seed’ whose portion as the firstborn is double, ‘all the kindreds of the earth shall be blessed.’” This is a shameful abuse of Scripture. Christ is the “Seed”; and specifically one; and the blessing is of “the kindreds of the earth,” not of the lost in Gehenna.

As for his reference to the church ordaining “All-Souls’ Day “as well as “All-Saints’ Day,” and thus “may have been teaching more than some of her sons may yet have learnt from her,” and that “she believed that, like her Lord, she is truly linked to all, and with Him is ordained at last to gather all,” we ask, Where did she learn it? and to keep days? (Gal. 4:10,11). And to deduce such a conclusion from the unscriptural action of the church can only impose on those who are willing to be deceived by gratuitous assertion. But it were positive wickedness, if it were not absolute nonsense, to say “only by the cross30 can the change be wrought in us which conforms us to Christ and His image—which makes us, like Him, lambs for the slaughter, and as such fitted to bless and serve others.” His misapplication of Scripture is very painful: so he says, “And, indeed, so narrow is the way and so strait is the gate that leadeth to the life and glory of the firstborn, who ‘follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth,’” etc.—a misapphcation of what is wholly unconnected.

(2). “I pass on to shew that God’s purpose by the firstborn from the dead to bless the later-born—as it is written, ‘so in Christ shall all be made alive,’ is fulfilled in successive worlds or ages; or, to use the language of St. Paul, ‘according to the purpose of the ages,’ so that the dead are raised not all together, but every man in his own order. ‘Christ the first-fruits, afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming’; which latter resurrection, though after Christ’s, is yet called ‘the resurrection from among the dead,’ or the first resurrection.” All this about God’s purpose is false. Scripture states no such purpose. If “so in Christ shall all be made alive,” be the true translation, which I do not think, it is resurrection. But what does “raised” mean, as applied by Mr. Jukes to “the dead”? Does it not mean restoration in his sense of all? But mark the eras of resurrection as given by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15: (1) Christ the firstfruits; (2) Afterwards they that are Christ’s at His coming; (3) Then cometh the end, gegone,31 when there is a within and a “without” as Revelation 21:8, 27; chap. 22:14,15, clearly teach. At the “end” the wicked are “without.” The dead are not “raised “but to “judgment”; the result of which is not blessing, saving, and restoration, but to “be cast into the lake of fire,” Rev. 20:11-15. This is the express testimony of Scripture.

It is vain to reason because Christ was raised before the members of His body—also called firstfruits— “who will not be all gathered till the (fancied) great Pentecost,” that it is plain the purpose of God is wrought not all at once but through successive ages, and that this fact gives us a hint of further mysteries, and some key to “the ages of ages.” Firstfruits, and the morrow of the Passover sabbath, or Christ’s resurrection (Lev.

23:9-22), is all one period. Moreover, it is not said that the saints share Christ's glory as heirs of God, in subduing all things unto Him. This is nowhere said; nor that "all have been made alive in Him by His resurrection," but only all in Christ, all believers, and Christ gives up the kingdom when the wicked are "without," as we have already pointed out. And there is no scripture for their being "subdued." It is also false to affirm that there is "nothing in the gospel the figure of which is not in the law, nor anything in the law the substance of which is not found in the gospel," for there was only a shadow, not the image (Heb. 9); and the church was "hid in God," Eph. 3:9. As to Pentecost and Tabernacles (p. 50) we say, no doubt; but it is now or the age to come.

Where is it said that the "mystic periods are all different times for cleansing and blessing men; sevens and seven times seven; the former of which are figures of the ages, the last of the ages of ages in the New Testament"?

We ask for proof of this, or where it is so said, and why so? It is mere imagination. When he says of those who could not go free as some did at the sabbatic year, that they might at the year of jubilee "regain what had been lost, and find full deliverance," he ignores, what makes it wholly fallacious, that they were already the rightful heirs, are restored to their own inheritance. What he says of the jubilee is totally false (see Lev. 25:16), so that the proof is exactly of the contrary. "Not of persons only," it was not of persons at all. To what is Acts 1:7 applied? To what is quite different from that to which our Lord applied it. The Scriptures are everywhere pressed out of their express and obvious meaning, in

order to have some show of scripture for the creation of his own fancy.

Besides, one grows sick of exposing nonsense like the following: “For the woman is our nature, which—if it receive seed, that is, the word of truth—may bring forth a son, that is, ‘the new man.’” Our nature brings forth the new man! “In which case nature, or the mother which brings it forth, is only unclean during the seven days of this first creation.” Here again all is false. The old man must die. “And then in the blood of purifying till the end of the forty days, which always figure this dispensation.” Always? Genesis 7 is not the figure of it: Moses in the mount is not: Ezekiel 4 is not. It is all imagination. “But, if instead of bearing this ‘new man,’ our nature only bear its like, a female child,” etc. Bears it through the quickening word! Miserable trifling!

To those too who believe that the church was divinely guided in the order and appointment of the Christian year, etc., the apostle’s word is, “I stand in doubt of you” Gal. 4:8-20.

The statements as to the incarnation are, to say the least, extremely hazarded, and bear the stamp of some of the worst current errors, and the fact is quite false. The new man does not spring out of the weak nature into which the eternal Word is come, if indeed there is any sense in the passage. At the end of this purification of women he adds: “There is like teaching in every time and season of the law, and its days and years figure the ‘ages’ of the New Testament”; but he gives no proof, but expects, I suppose, “that there is some teaching here, though he cannot understand it.”

When he refers to such nations as Moab and Ammon being ejected in an earlier age and saved in a later, it is true of them no doubt; but what proof is there that it is a figure of others? And when he adds: “For them also must there be hope in the new creation according to the promise, ‘Behold I make all things new’; for Christ, who, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in Spirit, went in Spirit and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah,”32 is “Jesus Christ (that is, Anointed Saviour)33 the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever”; we must remind our readers that it is at the time when He makes all things new—this part of his statement is not honest—that Scripture tells us that the wicked “shall have their part in the lake of fire,” Rev. 21:8. His allusion to Christ passing over the sea and healing the man possessed with devils fails utterly; for they would not have Him. It is a picture of the world’s rejection of Christ when some were healed. It gives no countenance to his notion that Christ “casts out devils also on the other side of the deep waters.” “Such is the light which the law and prophets give us as to God’s purpose of salvation through successive ages!”

Creation and regeneration are next referred to, and said to “tell no less clearly, though more secretly, the same mystery.” “In creation each day has its work to bring back some part of the creature, and one part before another, from emptiness and confusion, to light and form and order.” This is utterly false; for so it was not creation, but bringing back something— reconciliation rather than creation. When he continues: “These first works act on the rest, for of God’s will this ‘heaven’ is a fellow-worker with God’s word in all the change which

follows, till the whole is very good"; we ask, Where is that? His note from Parkhurst, in which he says that "heavens "means the "arrangers," because the heavens have been the great agents in disposing all material things, shews us that Parkhurst had about as much childish fancy as Mr. Jukes. He was a strong Hutchinsonian, and held this interpretation. It is all stuff.

It is equally false to say, as he does, that the quickening of the body will be in any way effected by our quickened souls. Scripture says (Rom. 8:11), zoopoiesei kai ta thneta somata umon dia to enoikoun autoi Pneuma en umin. "For our spirit is to our body what the spiritual are to this world" is distinctly false—and the conclusion false. "So surely shall the quickening and manifestation of the sons of God end in saving those earthly souls who are not here quickened." This is not only imagination, but deadly false doctrine.

But he is as unhappy in pressing "for ever" and "for ever and ever," into his service, and telling us that the word is literally "for the age," or "for the ages of ages": eis ton aiona does not mean "for the age," nor is aionios not eternal. See 2 Corinthians 4:18: what is seen is pros kairon, what is not seen is aionios. It is definitely what is opposed to for a time in its absolute proper sense. "Ages" no one denies. But, when he says that "God's wisdom was ordained before the ages to our glory," means God's bringing glory to the fallen creatures, accomplished through successive ages, we reply, Nothing of the kind. It was the mystery Paul preached ordained for our glory, and which he states to be what is now— not in the future.

Then he says, “We are told distinctly of the ‘purpose of the ages,’ shewing that the work of renewal would only be accomplished through successive ages”; it shews nothing of the kind. Paul writes the wisdom of God in the church kata prothesin ton aionon; Eph. 3:10,11. “By the Son, God made the ages” (Heb. 1:2) is quite false, even as to translation; and the reason given is also invented and false—that each age was made by what the word gave of God’s mind. It is “worlds,” not “ages”; also in Hebrews 11:3. It means in both places the universe. When he quotes “the end of the ages,” and that on us “the ends of the ages are met,” it does appear strange to say “words which … seem to imply that other ages are approaching their consummation.” How so, if it is in sunteleia ton aionon, the “end of the ages”? It is positively the contrary: we are in the sunteleia (the end), though the things are not fulfilled till Christ comes. And when he speaks of God’s shewing His grace in the “ages to come,” there is no restoration spoken of, but solely and expressly His kindness “towards us.”

“Now, what is this ‘purpose of the ages’ which St. Paul speaks of,” etc.? Paul states it expressly to be the church; Eph. 3:10, 11. Our author answers: “The ages are the fulfilment or substance of the ‘times and seasons’ of the sabbatic year and jubilee under the old law.” And we have seen that the Gentiles remained slaves for ever; Lev. 25:46. Again: “They are those times of refreshment from the presence of the Lord, when he shall send Jesus Christ.” But this brings in the end. It is strange to read that then cleansing and rest will be gained by those who now are without their rightful inheritance. What made it their rightful inheritance? Is God bound to save the lost?

When he affirms that in “the ages,” and in no other mystery of the gospel do we find those good things to come of which the legal times and seasons were the “shadow “; we must say that it is quite differently applied in Hebrews. One has to come as to fulfilment: for this (the church) is not one (p. 59). When he identifies those ages to come with “times and seasons which the Father hath put in his own power,” we ask our readers to turn to Acts 1:7, and read the passage. It speaks of restoring the kingdom to Israel, and not of saving those who died impenitent.

What he says of the book of Revelation is entirely false. It does not speak of these “ages of ages,” but the contrary. It goes through judgment; then says, “It is done.” There is no opening out of the processes and stages of the great redemption. But when the end comes, all is done (gegone); and sinners (as has been already noted) are “without.” There is no redemption of those who are judged. Mr. Jukes’ quotations or references are not to be trusted. He says the book of Revelation, more than any other, speaks of the ages, and he refers us to Revelation 1:6, 18; chap. 4:9, 10; chap. 5:13, 14; chap. 7:12; chap. 10:6; chap. 11:15; chap. 14:11; chap. 15:7; chap. 19:3; chap. 20:10; chap. 22:5. Look at them; never believe a quotation or reference till you do. Paul does no such thing as speak of “the ends” of some; but absolutely “the ends of the ages,” ta tele ton aionon.

When he says Christ’s mediatorial kingdom, which is for ages of ages, is one delivered up, he refers to a passage which only upsets his argument as to ages. The kingdom of the world, of our Lord and Saviour,34 is come,” Rev. 11. It is one state or dispensation shewing the vague

general use of ages (p. 61). He says the inspired writers, "when they had in view a greater or more comprehensive age wrote eis aiona aionon, that is, "to the age of ages." We ask, Where but in Ephesians 3? "When they intended the longer 'age' alone, without regard to its constituent parts, they wrote eis aiona aionos = 'to an seonial age'; this form of expression being a Hebraism exactly equivalent to eis aiona aionon, like 'liberty of glory' for 'glorious liberty' (Rom. 8:21), and 'body of our vileness' for 'our vile body,' Phil. 3:21. When they intended the several comprehensive 'ages' collectively, they wrote eis tous aionas ton aionon, that is, 'to the ages of ages.' Each varying form is used with a distinct purpose and meaning." This is all wrong: aiona aionon would be only one age so characterised. "Glorious liberty" does not give the sense; it is "liberty of glory" in contrast with liberty of grace, of which the mere creatures, not even our body, could not partake; and it is "body of humiliation," not "humble body." God lives, eis t. ai. t. ai. Does this mean "ages" collectively? The whole scheme of precision is a delusion, eis ton aiona by itself is "for ever," "eternal." There is an object in the change, but very often just borrowed, as Hebrews i:8, from the LXX olam we-ed. His quotations are incorrect, leaving out the article which is most commonly inserted. The only place where eis ton aiona toi aionos, is (I believe) in Hebrews i:8, and he quotes without the article to make it "an age," which is quoting it falsely in words and sense, eis tons aionas ton aionon is said of God (Rev. 4:10, and elsewhere), "who liveth," e. t. ai. t. ai. Does God only live for the comprehensive ages? Is that what the passage means? The saints reign eis t. ai. t. ai. In Daniel we have (chap. 7:10) eis aiona ton aionon. In Chaldee, "unto [the] age, and age of

ages." What does that mean? There is, according to Mr. Jukes, glory to Christ in the church for certain collective ages viewed as one, but that is all. He compares 1 Corinthians 15—Christ giving up the kingdom—and Revelation 11:15. But he forgets that the last enemy which shall be destroyed is death, and Satan is cast into the lake of fire with the beast and false prophet, and they are tormented for ages and ages; but the next thing to the resurrection of the saints is (eita to telos) the end. So the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. Then the wicked dead are raised, and Christ gives up the kingdom, the saints having lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years; and when the dead are raised and cast into the lake of fire it is the end, it is gegone. So that his confounding the ages of ages and the giving up of the kingdom denies plain Scripture. There is one thing singular, that Mr. J. never alludes to the commonest and simplest form of expression eis ton aiona, an expression which, according to him, must mean the age. Now, with "this" it may mean age; but when used abstractedly, it constantly means simply "for ever."

The fancy that Alpha and Omega seem to imply an end of the peculiar manifestation of Christ as King and Priest, under which special offices revelation shews Him, because there will be an end of lost ones to be saved, is all a delusion. (Compare Isa. 44:6.) He thinks it would have been more respectful to the word of God, if our translators had been content to give the exact meaning of the words they render "for ever," or "for ever and ever," but which are simply "for the age," or "for the ages of ages." But I deny it to be the exact sense. (See Rev. 4:10, and other places; and the passage

in 2 Cor. 4.) Does Peter (2 Pet. 3:1) wish Christ glory “for an age”? It is important to hold them fast on these proofs, that their statements as to it are false. The note on page 62, as to 2 Peter 3:18, is quite false: eis emeran aionos is not an exact literal translation of the words in Micah 5:1, mimei olam, and which in our authorised version are translated “from everlasting.” me is not eis, not “to,” but “from,” and it is “days,” not “day.”35 But if they were, what do they mean? The passage is, on the contrary, a proof of the use of aion for eternity, in contrast with time. “The ‘ages,’ therefore, are periods in which God works.” “Therefore”: why? His conclusion is drawn without any solid reasoning, as has been shewn. The end is next after the first resurrection, as Revelation proves. (Page 63.) It is totally false to say that “Christ, by whom all things are wrought in the ages, goes back to the glory which He had ‘before the age-times,’ ‘that God may be all in all,’ for the Son Himself is then subject,” 1 Cor. 15:28. Nor does “Jesus Christ” mean Anointed Saviour, but Jehovah the Saviour, the Anointed, or Christ. To apply Hebrews 13:8 to prove salvation through the ages, translating “for ever” for the ages, is very bad. And the scripture gives another reason for the name, which exactly sets aside this, “for he shall save his people from their sins.” Thus Mark 11:14, or Matthew 21:19; John 4:14; chap. 6:51-58; chap. 8:35, 51, 52; chap. 10:23; chap. 11:26. So eis tous aionas—Romans 1:25; chap. 9:5; chap. 11:36; chap. 16:27. Now these, and many others, it is absurd to say mean “ages,” as if God was to be glorified only for certain ages. So Philippians 4:20; 2 Timothy 4:18.

The same may be said of “It will, I think, too, be found that the adjective founded on this word, whether applied

to ‘life,’ ‘punishment,’ ‘redemption,’ ‘covenant,’ ‘times,’ or even God Himself, is always connected with remedial labour, and with the idea of ‘ages’ as periods in which God is working to meet and correct some awful fall.” (Page 64.) Romans 16 shews, with other passages, exactly the contrary. There were “æonial times” in which God was testing man till he rejected Christ. “Now,” says the Lord, “is the judgment of this world,” and the sunteleia ton aionon is come on us. But all is not fulfilled. Christ came in the end of the world to offer Himself; and then the things are reported by the gospel preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; and we wait for them to be brought when Christ is revealed; 1 Pet. 1:12, 13. Of this the prophets spoke. When He gives up the kingdom, “it is done.” And it is false to say that eternal life is æonial life: “but the end everlasting life”: “this is life eternal”: and as to God Himself “who liveth for ever and ever.” There is nothing about the “ages”; and his assertion, “ages during which Jesus Christ is the same, that is, a Saviour,” is a mistake. The word is unto, eis,36not during: Yesterday, to-day, and for ever, eis ton aiona. Mr. Jukes’ statement is wholly unfounded. “For ever” does not mean æonial (p. 65):.. “The aeonial God” —the God who works through these “ages.” Instead of this, it is in contrast with temporal or repeated workings. And so of the rest, “redemption,” “spirit,” “fire,” or “inheritance,” all which in certain texts are called “aeonial.” All false! So again: “As the context of Romans 16 shews God as working through aeonial times.” How? There is not the smallest allusion to it.

Redemption was by a work done once in the end of the world (sunteleia ton aionon), or He must often have

suffered; Heb. 9. It was the Father our Lord addressed when He said, “This is eternal life, that they might know thee, the only true God.” The rest is not there—that this marks the renewed life peculiar to the ages. It astonishes by its rashness to read “Æonial or eternal life therefore is not, as so many think, the living on and on for ever and ever,” when we read in Scripture that Christ is the true God and eternal life which was with the Father. “He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” When he gives as the Lord’s explanation of the word eternal, a life that has to do with a Saviour, and is part of a remedial scheme, we ask where? “Æonial is simply of the ages” (p. 66). That is the question. “And the ‘ages,’ like the days of creation, as being periods in which God works, witness not only that there is some fall to be remedied, but that God through these days or ages is working to remedy it.” Creation proved nothing of the kind: I wholly deny it as a universal proposition. “The adjective æonial or age-long cannot carry a force or express a duration greater than that of the ages or æons which it speaks of.” If it means it! But the positive use of it in Scripture confutes all this. It is not even said they are partakers of Christ’s endless life: their life is only and always aionios, and if, for whatever reason this means endless, then aionios does mean endless duration, for that is the word always used for this life, as it is exactly in the same position for punishment. “By death, and by death only, that He destroys,” etc. Whose death? His citation and use of John 12:24 is the grossest misapplication. It is fruit in others, the saving of souls by the death of Christ, as He who gave His life a ransom for many. He could have had twelve legions of angels. “Advance “of what, and of what character, was it in Christ? (Page 69.) Christ has shewn

us the way, we are told. He has shewn us we must take up the cross and follow Him, though to do it till He had dried up the swollen waters of Jordan was impossible. But is that the meaning of Christ's death bearing fruit? that we have to tread the same path? The elect yield themselves to the same great law of progress; and this he calls salvation, the way they are saved. This is a fatal denial of the truth of God and Christ's glory.

As to the passages quoted, page 69, "goes from strength to strength" and "from glory to glory," neither of them applies to death or any like change. "Christ has shewn us all the way down from" the lowest parts of the earth, "from the virgin's womb," etc. This is all dormer la change sur la parole. "The elect yield themselves to the same great law of progress through death." Then Christ did not go through death for them; they do the same! "Others may think they will be saved in another way than that Christ trod." To save whom did He die, if all save themselves by going through the path Christ trod? All this contains abominable false doctrine, and denial of real Christianity.

"Nature and sin must be judged and die." Judged in whom? Scripture says it was condemned when Christ was [a sacrifice] for sin. Mr. Jukes complains of some "seeming to think that Christ died that we should not die, and that their calling is to be delivered from death, instead of by it and out of it; because the meaning of Christ's cross is not understood, but rather perverted, and therefore death is shrunk from instead of being welcomed as the appointed means by which alone we can be delivered from him that has the power of death, who more or less rules us till we are dead, for sin reigns unto death, and only he that is dead is freed from sin;

because this, which is indeed the gospel, is not received, or if received in word is not really understood. Even Christians misunderstand what is said of that destruction and judgment which is the only way for delivering fallen creatures from their bondage, and bringing them back in God's life to His kingdom." First, Christ's death for us, as guilty, is ignored; next, that sin in the flesh was condemned in Christ's death; next, sin must reign, more or lessi, till we actually die, and our own dying is the gospel, not Christ's dying for us! That we reckon ourselves to be dead in the power of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, and so are delivered as crucified with Christ; and that Christ lives in us, are equally ignored. We are delivered by our own death, and sin reigns till we die! Christ has not made the Jordan dry for us, destruction and judgment delivering us by our going through them ourselves! I may add "freed" (though we are made free then, chapter 8:2, 3) is not the true word in the passage cited; it is "justified." This is very bad. Whose "destruction and judgment"? That we reckon ourselves dead to sin because Christ died is true.

But if we examine Scripture and compare the contexts, we shall find the whole scheme, giving the clue to all the judgments of Him who killeth and maketh alive, Mr. Jukes' fancy, and confuted by the connecting of the passages with the Lord's coming and reign, and "Then cometh the end." But it is a doctrine worse than mere fancy. He adds: "As this is a point of all-importance, lying at the very root of the cross of Christ and of His members, and giving a clue to all the judgments of Him who 'killeth and maketh alive,' I would shew, not the fact and truth only, that for fallen creatures the way of life is

and must be through death, but also the reason for it," not that Christ died for our sins and to sin on the cross, and that we reckon ourselves dead to sin as well as justified, but the cross of Christ and ours!

Now, if we weigh this linking "the cross of Christ and of His members," he shews that he has no thought of the atonement—guilt is ignored; but as He died thus, they die and so live. This he says is "the root of the cross of Christ." He then goes on to say why this is. The cross is not a fact only, but power—God's power and God's wisdom, to set heart and mind free! Scripture says He was crucified in weakness, but liveth by the power of God; and it is not said that the cross is God's wisdom and power, but that Christ is. His word ascribes peace, propitiation, forgiveness, to the cross, of which Mr. J. says nothing: what Mr. J. says, it does not. Finally, we do not actually die. We have not to die to sin, but to reckon ourselves dead, then to mortify and carry about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus. Death is ours, and gain. The whole system is unscriptural and false.

"For both to head and heart life is a terrible riddle, which neither Greek nor Jew, the head and heart of old humanity, could ever fully solve… To both God's answer was the cross of Christ, which gave to each, to head and heart, what each was longing for: power to the one to escape from that which had tied and bound it, for by death with Christ we are freed from the bondage of corruption, and from all that hinders the heart's best aspirations; wisdom to the other to see why we must die, or what is the reason of all present suffering." Is this all that the cross is? Is there no thought of guilt which is met by it? No craving of the conscience of convicted sinners? The very reading of such a quotation will

deliver the simple that know what the cross is. The way to life is not for fallen man through judgment, or he is condemned. (Page 72.) His teaching of the cross is only dying with Christ; of which Scripture always says as to believers that they died, not that as He died so we die—as the same path of life. There is no dying for us in his perfect cross. Here are his texts—Matthew 16:25; Galatians 2:20; Romans 6:3, 4; 2 Timothy 2:11, 12; Romans 8:12, 13. This is significant; atonement there is none.

‘“Why is the way of life for us through the cross? “Whose? He says that the way man got away from God must be retraced, if by grace we come back to Him. But Scripture says, No: it is “by a new and living way.” (Page 73.) He says “… poisoned and destroyed the divine life in man’s soul.” What divine life? Equal nonsense is talked about Eden being the paradise called by Paul the third heaven. Did Paul go back to Eden? “It was by death to God we fell out of God’s world.” (Page 74.) We did not fall out of God’s world. Man was a guilty transgressor and driven out by God. Though we reckon ourselves dead to sin by Christ’s death (Rom. 6), all our author says is hollow. What “spiritual world” are our souls living in? All is vague and loose. “Christ died this double death for us, not only ‘to sin,’ but also to ‘the elements of the world.’ And to be free we also must die with Him to both.” I repeat Scripture says we have died; and was He in nature and in the world of darkness?

On page 75 all is nonsense about quickening God’s life again in man. “As the life of hell was quickened by a lie, so the life of God is quickened by the truth.” What is that? “Even by the Word of God, who came where man was to raise up God’s life in man, in and by which,

through a death to sin and to this world, man might be freed perfectly." "In Christ the work has been accomplished." What work? He adds— "In Him by God's word and Spirit God's life has been again raised up in man," etc. God's hfe was not in man at all. There is the life, a new one, when man has received Christ; and he reckons himself dead as crucified with Christ; but, for all this, all that Mr. Jukes says is false, as "God's life" and living in the heavenly paradise are spoken of as to Adam.

The note to page 75 is also a mistake. He says, "Not without a deep and wondrous reason is bahsahr both goodness and flesh in Hebrew." It is nothing of the kind. Besorah is good news, from Baser, to bring good news. Basar is flesh. If he applies it to Christ, as it would seem he does, it is yet worse. What does he mean by "again raised up in man in Christ"? In Him was life. He was eternal life come down. There are things concealed here which, as he says, "it is not lawful for a man to utter": he is concealing thoughts he dares not state. "Come back out of darkness." Is that of Christ? What work "in Christ" does he mean on page 76? "Die to that which keeps him far from God." Was that so of Christ?

There is the most absurd misapplication of passages of Scripture, using them in a sense they do not bear: "Kills to make alive," "turneth man to destruction, that He may say, Return, ye children of men." This is God's judgment to bring about the death to that which keeps man far from God! Satan's double he was that God grudges and is untrue, and that by self-will man may be as God, and God's two methods, law and gospel, meet this state of things. "By the one God's life is quickened in man": What is that again? It is not a new one then,

anothen. By the other, through present or future judgment, “the hellish and earthly life is slain and overcome.” I ask: What judgment? for if saints were crucified with Christ, and no longer live, they have not to die, but to reckon themselves dead. “Is man as God? The law settles this.” It does not; it settles that he is not as man ought to be. “The law”… “to be abolished”: this he quotes as if scripture; but Scripture does not say “to be” but “is abolished,” Heb. 10:9; 2 Cor. 3:13. “He taketh away the first.” His use of Scripture is not to be trusted; his whole book is built up out of a misuse of it.

His reference to promise to Abraham not being disannulled by the intervention of law to prove that, though men are judged, condemned, and sent to hell for their sins, the judgment thus endured “cannot disannul the previous covenant,” is a specimen of this absurdity. (Page 78.) And law is not judgment, but death and condemnation; 2 Cor. 3. “But this killing is to make alive.” There is no such thought or expression in Scripture. Where is it so written? His theory requires such a passage, and there is none, and yet this for him is the whole point; for he is going to make damnation do it. “Judgment therefore (?) must end in blessing.” Why?

“God our Father judges to save.” Scripture tells us (the Lord Himself says), “The Father judgeth no man.” It is a name of grace and relationship; and Christ the Son, to whom judgment is committed, does not judge to save. The Father judges in chastising His children here; 1 Pet. 1:17. Christ died to save. Mr. J. says: “He only saves by judging what is evil.” Is that true as fully judging it in the persons guilty, and if by that means, what did Christ do for them? “The evil must be overthrown; and through death God destroys him that had the power of death.”

Whose death? The devil's? For in Mr. J.'s system it is the death of him in whom the power of the evil is. This is utter perversion.

"A new creation, which is only brought in through death, is God's remedy for that which through a fall is held in death and bondage." (Page 79.) This is totally false, confounding two distinct truths; in Ephesians and in Romans. A new creation is not brought in through death, or it is not a new creation. When we were dead in sins, says Ephesians. Romans teaches us to reckon ourselves dead to sin because Christ has died. When he says we die more quickly to sin through the burdens and infirmities of "this vile body," than those will who reject God's judgment here, and meet it in a more awful form in the resurrection of judgment, it is all totally false, both as affirmed of us and them; for Scripture nowhere teaches that believers die to sin, in their own proper persons: Christ died to sin because He had none.

"Such is the reason for salvation by the cross." Is it that Christ had to be saved through dying? Or whose death or cross does he speak of? If we are dead to sin by Christ's cross, all his system denies the truth. Whose is he speaking of? And note how guilt and bearing sins are left out. "But the great illustration, here as elsewhere, is to be found in the law, that appointed 'shadow of good things,' which in all its varied forms of sacrifices asserts the same great truth, that only by the fire of God and through death can the earthly creature be changed, and so ascend to God." (Page 80.) But these sacrifices were the substituted death of a victim for others. How can this apply to those who have rejected salvation, and for whom the scripture tells us there is no more sacrifice for sins? Hence for Mr. J. it is personally dying to sin, which

Scripture never speaks of—save as to Christ; carefully the contrary.

As to the sacrifices shewing that the creature cannot be changed through death, were they not types of Christ, and therefore spotless? Had He to be changed? What he says of the sacrifices is all wrong as to fact. Only very rare ones were burned: most were eaten. The fat only of some was burnt: as a whole the sacrifice did not "perish in its first form to rise in another as pillars of smoke before God. If then all this was 'the pattern of things in the heavens,' we have another witness that a transformation wrought by fire is yet being carried on in the true heavens, that is, the spiritual world." There is no such witness. They prefigured Christ, and no one else. There is no question of "our nature not being spared any more than the animal was not spared by the priest."

Mr. J. tells us that "no divine change can be wrought even on God's elect, save by passing through the waters and through the fires." They are born with a wholly new life. He says, as the Lord "fulfilled the types of suffering, so will He fulfil the same in the bodies of those who are His members." How so? we ask. Are they to do that same work which Christ did? Or what was He doing in dying? anything as to Himself? All he says on page 81 of the uniting power of fire and of fires for the elect is idle and false. And his use of Scripture, as of casting fire into the earth, and salting with fire being the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and fire which Christ desired to be kindled, mingles the most opposite thoughts together, so as to make falsehood and error of all. What is united? Bathing with fire is not baptising with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The baptism with the Holy Ghost took place on the

day of Pentecost. Fire is always judgment. Christ does not say He desired the fire to be kindled.

His theory is salvation by chastening; and a denial of divine life given, and atonement for sin. But chastening is another matter. There must be life and relationship for that. And reconciliation is not transmutation of our nature "by the fire of God into partakers of Christ's flesh and blood." And what is "partakers of Christ's flesh and blood"? Is there no new life? "In and through Christ we have received this transmutation; and through His Spirit which is fire, is this same change accomplished in us." Same change with what? Says Scripture, "Through whom now we have received the reconciliation" and katallage (Rom. 5:11) is not "transmutation" but an entirely different thought and thing. And the footnote to page 82 completes the absurdity, where, founding his remark on a false reading of the Hebrew,37 he affirms—"His purpose to the creature is through destruction to perfect it, and by fire to make it a bride to the Lord." How unlike His purpose as expressed in God's word; Ephesians 5! "The Christ also loved the church, and delivered Himself up for it, in order that He might sanctify it, purifying it by the washing of water [not fire] by the word, that He might present it to Himself a glorious church, having no spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it might be holy and blameless."

"And as with the firstfruits, so with the harvest" ("This same change!") Was Christ really changed? "The world to be saved must some day know the same baptism." Will it be saved? For "the Lord," Mr. Jukes adds, "will come by fire," and "by fire and by His sword will He plead with all flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be many." It is also mere trifling with words to affirm, as he

does, “The promised baptism of the Spirit must be judgment, for the Spirit cannot be poured on men without consuming his flesh to quicken a better life.” But the Spirit is given only when we believe. As to “consuming his flesh to quicken a better fife,” whence is the life thus quickened, and what is a quickening like? Is it a life already there in embryo? Besides, Christ says, the world “cannot receive” the Holy Ghost. Where in Scripture do we read that God’s “warfare and wrath … works both righteousness and life”?

On page 84, while he rejects the Annihilationist doctrine, “that those who abuse their day of grace will be utterly annihilated,” he asserts that God’s plan is, with regard to man, “out of, and through the fall, to raise him to higher and more secure blessedness, as it is written, ‘As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive’; not all at once, but through successive ages, and according to an appointed order, in which the last, even as the first, shall be restored by the elect,” etc. Read the passage “as in Adam,” etc., and see of what and of whom it speaks. There is not a word of all this in Scripture, but the contrary (as we have shewn already). It is the same blasphemous nonsense I have already spoken of in which he makes us save others as Christ did. As to 1 Corinthians 15, it is altogether about the righteous dead.

Page 85, the answer Mr. Jukes gives to What is conversion? is all false. It is not at all, as he says, “a change involving a death unto sin,” etc. He has purposely made it vague or false. Where do the condemned get their new life, and when? “There is but one way to bring seed out of the earth… Nothing is done without the water and the fires.” But the life is already

in the seed, to be quickened and eventually ripened. “Conversion is only wrought through condemnation.” All is fundamentally false here. Instead of conversion being through condemnation, condemnation of self is through conversion. “The law condemns and slays us, not to annihilate, but to bring forth a better life.” How? Law did not, and could not, give or bring forth a better life. To confound (p. 86) my spiritual judgment of sin and self with God’s judgment of guilty sinners, is stupid and senseless. The way in which Christ’s passing through death, which he calls the baptism which awaits Him, and a baptism of the same kind for us, so that we may say, too, “How am I straitened till it be accomplished,” is as unscriptural as it is shocking, and disgraceful trifling with Scripture. We are baptised to His death; and we have only to read Acts 2 to see that his appropriation of baptism for the remission of sins is the grossest abuse of words to suit his purpose. Christians are baptised to Christ’s death, died with Him, and have received the Holy Ghost.

“And that therefore, and to the same end, those not so baptised here must know the last judgment.” Who says this is to be to “the same end”? It is the folly of confounding dying to sin and God’s final judgment. “Judgment which is to meet the greater hardness and impenitence of the reprobate.” Miserable! Not an idea of Christ and of a new life, nor of peace through grace? “It is, therefore, simply because God is what He is, that He is through love, and because He is love, the curse and destruction of the impenitent.” (Page 87.) Was it love, we ask, that Christ experienced on the cross when He was made a curse for us? He was made sin for us that we might be the righteousness of God in Him. All this

and bearing sins is wholly left out; and also wrath revealed from heaven. Christ went by the cross, and so got the blessing; and so must we; and so must the wicked for themselves!

No one denies chastisement, but we are chastened that we should not be condemned with the world.

Paul does not tell the church to deliver to Satan. “Souls are taught not to blaspheme by being delivered to Satan”; why withhold “for the destruction of the flesh”? “What does this not teach us as to God’s purpose towards those whom He also delivers to Satan and disciplines by evil, since they will not learn by good? “He does no such thing. Satan is there then himself!

In page 88, “for man bears God’s image” is never said in Scripture. 1 Corinthians 11:7 is man contrasted with woman. The rest is utter nonsense. In the judgment of the great white throne (Rev. 20), there is not the smallest intimation of salvation or recovery. The judged go into the lake of fire, the second death. And in quoting Revelation 21:5-8, why does he leave out gegone, It is done? The becoming is over. “What does He say here but that all things shall be made new?” It is contrast with the former state of things, and all is finished, gegone, and the wicked, in contrast with the overcomers, are in the lake of fire. Yet He does not say so, but “I make.” He says their “part” is there. The accomplishment of the earthly promise to Abraham is past, and the promise does not refer to that time when gegone by his own shewing is there (p. 90).38 As to Paul’s two passages, “wished himself accursed for them,” and have “hope,” not fear, “that there should be a resurrection of the dead,” etc. The first has no connection with the subject.

He had loved them as Moses, who had said, “Blot me, I pray thee, out of the book which Thou hast written.” Then he also says that the saints are said to have died to sin, “that is, the dark spirit world”: we ask, Where is this said?39 As to the second, he expresses his convictions and hope of resurrection, adding, as part of it, this important fact, “both of the just and of the unjust.” The rest are within the limits of that dark and fiery world, the life of which (p. 91) is the life of their spirit—a strange idea, whose value is to shew that he feeds on German notions, which can identify clairvoyance and animal magnetism with the life of Christ in man as man, owning withal his fall.40 They get out of the dark world by the second death! “Even if we have not light to see this, ought not the present to teach us something as to God’s future ways; for is He not the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever? “Why” for ever “here, when elsewhere only “for the ages”? “We know that in inflicting present death His purpose is through death [whose?] to destroy him that has the power of death, that is, the devil.” Not at all. Christ became a Man to do it. This is totally false, and it confounds, as elsewhere, Christ’s dying for us, and the person’s getting free through his own death. Our reckoning ourselves dead to sin with Christ is, for him, the same thing as the judgment of sinners by God in wrath! “How can we conclude from this that in inflicting the ‘second death’ the unchanging God will act on a principle entirely different from that which now actuates Him?” On whom would the second death, in order to save, be inflicted? On Christ? It must be so to have any show of truth, for that it was in the first case. “Or shall the greater foe (the second death) still triumph, while the less, the first death, is surely overcome? “Satan, the great foe, does not, but is judged

and in the lake of fire. Being judged is not “triumph.” The resurrection of the wicked is the destruction of death, “the last enemy.” Who has taught us to limit the meaning of the words, “Death is swallowed up in victory”? Scripture: “Then shall come to pass that which is written.” It is at the resurrection of the just; 1 Cor. 15.

“Is God’s will to save all men?” (1 Tim. 2:4). The word used for “will” in Greek does not mean purpose. “His appointed means for our deliverance” is not our death, as he speaks of it, but Christ’s. The last sentence of page 92 is filled with dishonest quotations, for the passages which he cannot but know refer to the Lord’s coming are dishonestly applied to another time. Why not add, “of which the prophets have spoken” to “the restitution of all things,” and thus honestly declare that it refers to this earth? “He shall save his people” is the scriptural application of the name of Jesus, his last reference.

As to freeing bondsmen and debtors, as a type it proves the contrary. Only Israelites were set free (p. 93); as to the heathen the bondage was for ever. It is therefore the contrary to what Mr. J. says, “Fallen still are his children.” They are not. Scripture says we are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; Gal. 3. Where there is no faith, there the person is not a child of God. “A larger mercy from our Father in heaven.” Whose Father? All this on page 94 denies sin and guilt, judgment and righteousness. And judging sin is not being overcome of evil. And the whole of his closing remarks are without one word of sins, guilt, responsibility, or righteous judgment! His whole system is a mere dream of his own imagination, outside of Scripture and against its plainest teaching. His view of Job, too, is wholly wrong; but I do not pursue the

question here. His “testimony of scripture” we have now examined, and next come to his examination of

“Popular Objections”

It is said that this doctrine [of restitution] is opposed to the voice of the church, to reason, and above all to Holy Scripture. “For the rest, if the church speak with God, woe to those who disobey her.” What is “the church”? Who set her to teach? And where is her teaching? “Where then, I ask, and when has the Catholic church ever authoritatively condemned this view of restitution?” Who set her to do it? What council had any warrant? The church teaches not. “It [the doctrine of endless torments] can never be classed under ‘Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.’” Nor can anything else. All that he says of the Fathers east or west I leave. What matters it who held it, or who did not? Is it in Scripture? is the question. Mr. Jukes appeals to this, and asks, “What does this prove if the doctrine is really taught in Scripture?” Nothing, assuredly. If it was from the beginning, it would be.

But what he says immediately after is unfounded. “Many things have been hid in Scripture for ages. Paul speaks of the revelation of the mystery which had been hid from ages and generation, some part at least of which, though hidden, had been spoken by the mouth of all God’s holy prophets since the world began.” Utterly unfounded, or Paul was all wrong. This is ignorance, but I fear I must say wilful ignorance. “But when have God’s people as a body ever seen or received any truth beyond their dispensation?” Only Mr. Jukes, then, we are to believe. The ways of Israel are not examples to us. The things happened to them for ensamples. (Page 98.) The

doctrine of the union in one body is never spoken of. The call of the Gentiles is expressly spoken of in the scripture, which Paul uses. It is a false suggestion of Scripture's silence where it speaks plainly. That is, Scripture spoke plainly, and Paul used it. It was absolutely silent on another point, and it required a positive revelation to declare it. Both were the word of God. God's unerring word is final. "But when I see the church's blindness," etc. (Page 99.) Where is the church's teaching now? "For if the flesh that bore Christ was not ours, His incarnation does not profit us." I thought there was something at bottom as to this. I quite think "that the church's judgment cannot decide a point like this, if that judgment be in opposition to the word of God." But the church is a mere deception—where is it? For Mr. Jukes, the papal system "is its widest branch." And who gave her authority to teach? God teaches finally as to doctrine in the Holy Scriptures.

The church has nothing whatever to do with even the teaching of the truth. It is not hers to teach, but to be taught. What is truth is all in the Scriptures. But it is natural, with what he makes of the church, to flatter it. (Page 100.) "Tran-substantiation is a mistake built on Christ's very words, and the doctrine of endless torments is a like misunderstanding." Poor work is this! Did He wish His disciples to believe that He held Himself in His hands when He took the bread, as indeed Augustine says we must, in a manner, believe, and when He was not crucified? But the words were used when He was alive in the body, so that the disciples could not have mistaken Him. So much the more when we think of His saying "My blood," and even, "This cup is the new covenant." They could not have misunderstood Him

then; no more could any now who were not wilfully ignorant. The words which declare everlasting punishment are, if possible, plainer still.

Then, on pages 101-2, he takes up the objection that "this doctrine militates against the atonement, for if men shall at length be saved, God became man to redeem from that which is equally remedied without it." But how "saved"? According to Mr. Jukes they are saved by their own suffering and death. Atonement in its scripture sense is everywhere left out; and guilt too. Salvation is only the change of a nature by dying. His teaching as to the fall and its consequences is not scriptural. God drove out the man. Guilt and judgment are ignored. Here, too, we have this German semi-infidelity: "In this fall God pitied man and sent His Son, in whom is life, to be a man in the place where man was shut up, there to raise up again God's life in man, to bear man's curse, and then through death [whose?] to bring man back in God's life to God's right hand," etc. Was He in the distance, away from God, dead in sins, raising up God's life in man in His own Person? Or did He go into man's place and suffer death as made sin, bruised for our iniquities? "Obtain the life by which these shall rise." Not so. They do not rise by that life. They are raised. Of what was Christ the firstfruits? Of those "that are Christ's." But how does it follow hence (from this doctrine) that those who are not firstfruits, if saved at all, are saved without Christ's redemption? "God's word could quicken and deliver us out of the horrible pit, that we might be firstfruits of His creatures; why should we say He cannot bring back others out of death though they miss the glory of being firstfruits?" Redemption by bearing sins in death and forgiveness are wholly ignored! Mr. Jukes

uses the Bible terms in another sense than they mean in Scripture: even hell is used in another sense. (Page 103.) “The other part of the objection that none believe in redemption who do not believe in hell, is true”; but this is dormer la change. “Hell” is used in another sense from the objector’s. So going to hell is not delivery to Satan—he is in it himself. It was prepared for him.

The second objection, “It is further argued that, if grace does not, judgment cannot, save man. How can damnation perfect those whom salvation has not helped? Can hell do more for us than heaven? The answer to this lies simply in what has been said above as to the reason why the way of life for us must be through judgment … judgment therefore to shew us that what we are is as needful as grace,” etc. Then we must all go to hell, and that by judgment. But life-giving and judgment are contrasted, and those who have life do not come into judgment (krisis). “If we want further examples, Nebuchadnezzar shews us how judgment does for man what goodness cannot. The remedy is to make him a beast.” This begs the whole question, in making the chastening of the living the same as the final judgment of the adversaries of God. Besides, chastening itself does not change the heart unless grace work.

“Let the nature of the fall be seen, and the reason why we are only saved through judgment is at once manifest.” This is utterly false to say “only”; and the whole question remains. By whose stripes are we healed, how was peace made? So the statement, “The firstfruits from Christ to us are proofs that by death, and this alone, our salvation is perfected,” raises the question—By whose death, Christ’s in atonement, or ours in judgment? That this is his meaning appears from

his saying, “unbelievers who will not die with Christ are lost because they are not judged here.” But suppose that “by the ministry of death and condemnation in another world the work of judgment to salvation were accomplished,” what puts away their sins? For unbelievers die in them, and there is no more sacrifice. He has perfected that work, and He came to do it once. Hebrews 9 and 10 are urgent on this point. It was in the end of the world He appeared once to put away sin. He dies no more. Mr. Jukes makes our death and condemnation here what saves us, and so of the lost afterwards!

(3). “But it is further objected that this doctrine gives up God’s justice; for if all are saved there will be no difference between St. Peter and Nero, virgins and harlots, saints and sinners.” The objection if so made, and the answer ignore Christ’s atoning death. His error is not that he saves the condemned without redemption; he denies all redemption as Scripture states it, though the word ‘atonement’ may be thrown in to blind people. Christ’s own case he is afraid to utter. (See page 75.) It is absurd, he alleges, to say, “God’s justice is given up because He saves by judgment.” But do we get what our sins deserve from justice? We do not come into judgment. He says “the elect being first quickened by the word, and then judging themselves in this world, or being judged by a death to sin are freed from Satan.” Even death to sin was Christ’s; Rom. 6. We reckon ourselves dead, and if all are freed by our own dying, what, then, did Christ do for them? But Mr. Jukes goes farther. “What scripture teaches is that man is saved through death … that others not so dying [as the elect] to sin remain in the life and therefore under the curse

and power of the dark world, and are therefore delivered to Satan41 to be punished, to know, since they will not believe, their fall and their need of God's salvation. But all this simply asserts the justice of God." This is dreadfully bad, and sets aside Christ's work altogether, save as the first dier! It is, in fact, a purgatory which does the whole work.

As to "no distinction," he asks, "Is there no distinction between reigning with Christ, and being cast out and shut up in hell with Satan?" But then that is all; and in the long run one is saved as much as another, only in another world, having rejected Christ. Receiving a wholly new life and guilt are both ignored in Mr. Jukes' notions. He falsely uses and indeed translates Romans 9. And it is merely slurring over the real question to talk of an outwardly pure and blameless life needing the blood of the cross.

(4). The fourth objection he answers is from analogy—that, as many creatures in this world fail to attain their proper end and perfection, so thousands of our race may miss their true end, and be for ever cast away. This is mere reasoning with which I do not meddle. Assertion may be met by counter-assertion; but where Scripture is claimed for anything, it needs to be examined. But then he says:— "Why not go further, and argue that death, and not life, must be the final ruler of the universe?" Through sin it is so of this present world. Nor does he deny it, but declares apparent death is only a change of form, the change being a witness of present imperfection, but not of eternal bondage in that form, nor of destruction or annihilation when that form perishes. He insists on change, and that analogy shews that what appears worthless or destroyed may contain

what is precious. But all this remains the same nature. But Christianity depends essentially on our receiving a new life, anothen, not a mere change, which in mere nature may take place. (Pages 108-9.) We know there is nothing precious. “I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing.” And “he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.”

(5). “The greatest difficulty of all is that which meets us from the existence of present evil.” “Was He not infinitely wise, and holy, and powerful, when the earth was without form and void? Why, then, should this state ever have been changed by Him till all was very good?” Here creation is ignored, and whatever judgment brought it into the ruined state. No recognition of sin bringing in the misery and evil of the present state. Then, on page 3 he speaks of the “Day of Judgment, and the promised Times of Restitution.” Judgment is not restoration, and there are no promised times of restitution of the wicked, as he makes it. It is positively false, and not in Scripture; and it is equally false, as he means it, that the Father will go on working till all things are made new, and everything is very good. When God makes all things new, He leaves the wicked “without,” and “everything very good “is never said but at creation.

As to Romans 8:20, 21, he has quoted it falsely in saying “through Him.” It is “on account of him who has subjected [it],” dia ton. It was not the creature’s own will, but on account of another; and Adam, not God, is the “him” referred to. And “the creature into the liberty of glory of God’s children,” has nothing to do with restoring the wicked spiritually, for which Mr. J. falsely uses it; and the deliverance of the creature is when His

children are glorified and judgment is on their adversaries. Evil subserving some good purpose (otherwise God would never have permitted it), or, say, "I form peace, and I create evil," just shews the false use he makes of Scripture. He does not create moral evil: it is temporal evil as contrasted with peace—not with good. Again, "Prophecy announces a day when there shall be no more curse or death, but all things made new. In this witness we may rest, spite of the fact and mystery of present evil." This is before the final judgment; a settled fallacy that runs through the book. "No curse "is the millennial state (Rev. 22:3); "all things new" after it, and then the wicked are without, outside the scene where there is no more crying, pain, or death; Rev. 21:1-8. "Curse" is not spoken of as no longer the question. In Revelation 21:1-4 are new heavens and new earth, and in verses 5-8. These passages prove just the contrary of what Mr. Jukes affirms.

(6). He says truly, "What saith the scripture?" is the only question on this subject. Mr. J. speaks of sin creating an antagonistic world. Sin creates nothing. It is always enmity. It is judged; this is not equal power. "Willed" is falsely used; and will in this passage is not purpose. "And all this (antagonistic world) in opposition to the word of God, which says that God's Son 'was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil,' who, if the so-called orthodox views be right, will succeed in destroying some of the works of the Son of God for ever." So the Son of God does; He destroys the works of the devil. The judgment of Satan is not Satan's work, nor that of wicked men. He has morally destroyed them already.

On page 115 he tells what his reason concludes, as to those being punished for their sins with everlasting punishment. He gives no scripture for it, but exculpates the sinner as much as possible, and speaks of weakness, the tempter, strong passions, conscience not helping him, failing to avail himself of mercy. The Lord says "They have both seen and hated both Me and My Father"; and Paul, of the least enlightened, "that they are without excuse." There is no true sense of sin; no power of the word of God in the conscience. "I cannot say my reason would conclude on his ground" and this is the root of all these reasonings. "Once God's child," he says. Only in nature and at the outset, as His created offspring, and that is exactly what makes it eternal misery. "Even nature teaches … to act more generously." That is "nature" is to judge God, instead of having a sense of sin deserving judgment! As one said, "God condemned men for eating an apple." The truth is, man gave up God for an apple, believing Satan, not God!

Mr. Jukes represents man only as unfortunate, like a child which has hurt itself, and God as indulgent. But God is a holy and righteous Judge, which is all left out (p. 116), for death and hell are only to save—not judgment of sin or exclusion from evil. His statements are a mere expression of natural human kindness, as it may be found in an animal, and a totally false representation of both God and man; nature's reasoning, but not the Holy Ghost's. A child falling or hurting itself is all his thought of man's sin, and human pity for man's misery is all his idea of God. All this is nothing but the absence of the just sense of guilt. Have we deserved to be forsaken of God? or why was Christ? He thanks God we have revelation. Thank God we have; but he adds,

“That word declares man’s final restitution.” Not so; it does the contrary. It says, “Hath never forgiveness,” and see Revelation 21, as already quoted. God seeking the lost till He find them is the grace of the present time; and the elder brother would not go in, and did not get in.

(7). “But it is said,” he says, “certain texts of holy scripture are directly opposed to the doctrine of universal restitution. We have already seen that, taken in the letter, text clashes with text on this subject.” I do not admit it. To say that all those texts which speak of “destruction” and “judgment” have been explained by what has been said by him above as to the way of our salvation, is simply lying against the truth.

What he says (p. 117) of Romans 2:12—that it is the state of all by nature—is utterly false. It is expressly said, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men’s hearts. It is very bad thus to pervert God’s word. Again, 2 Corinthians 4:3 refers to those who are being lost, in contrast to being saved—apollumenoi—sozomenoi, those to whom the gospel is hid when preached, not their mere common natural state. In all the quoted texts, it is so. In Luke 15 and 19 it is apololos or os. There is actual state, so that the force of the passages against his argument is very strong. “For the Good Shepherd must go after that which is lost until he find it.” Where is this said? It is according to him God’s duty, and the point of the parable is that it is His sheep. Page 118, “By faith Isaac,” etc., is a temporal prophecy.

When he affirms (p. 119) that “there is scarcely a doctrine of our faith which, at first sight, does not seem to clash more or less with some other plain scripture,”

we reply, only when man's mind is at work. After much more human reasoning he speaks of a superior intelligence overruling all, according to a scheme of perfect love; a statement never made in Scripture, which tells of judgment of sin, not of overruling in result. But when perfect love was manifested, for His love Christ had hatred: "They have both seen and hated both Me and My Father."

The texts chiefly relied on as teaching the doctrine of everlasting punishment are then looked at by Mr. Jukes. The first is what is said of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: "shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor in that which is to come," Matt. 12:32; Mark 2:29; Luke 12:10. Of these he says that, so far from teaching that sin can never be forgiven, they teach the opposite: "first, all sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; secondly, that some sins can be forgiven as against the Son of man in this age; and thirdly, that other sins against the Holy Ghost cannot be forgiven either here or in the coming age, which last words imply that some sins, not here forgiven, may be forgiven in the coming age, the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost not being of this number. This is what the text asserts." As to what he says in the note (p. 120), the words, two ages being specified, prove that the passage could have only an absolute sense.

But the whole statement is all a blunder. This age is before Messiah, "the coming one" when He is revealed, but two only are admitted in the passage. It is Olam haze and Olam ha vo. Certainly in Messiah's age there was forgiveness larger than under the law. What does he mean by saying, "Man cannot reject or speak against the Spirit until the Spirit comes to act upon him"? There is

no question of rejecting the Spirit. They blasphemed in saying Christ cast out devils by Beelzebub. The Spirit did not act on them but by Christ. In Stephen's case (Acts 7) it did act on the Jews; the conscience reached, with the will unchanged, led to his stoning by them. "To reject this last [the Spirit] cuts man off from the light and life of the coming world." His whole statement as to the Spirit convincing the heart, and then being rejected, is false. "This sin, therefore, is not forgiven, neither in this age nor in the coming one. But the text says nothing of those ages to come, elsewhere revealed to us; much less does it assert that the punishment of sin not here forgiven is never-ending." Scripture says, it is not forgiven under the Messiah— hath never forgiveness, ouk echei aphesin eis ton aiona—shall not be forgiven unto men absolutely. This age and the coming being mentioned, the words shew the absolute force of eis ton aiona. With two ages specified it could have no sense but as absolute. As to the ages to come, all is unfounded and hypothetical. In Ephesians 2 it is expressly "His kindness towards us"—not others, that we read of.

It is all fancy and false on page 122 about the mystic seventy weeks. One is amazed at the utter absurdity. Daniel's prophecy of "the seventy weeks" is quite clear, and so is what it refers to, ending with the Lord's coming, and applying to Jerusalem. There is nothing about a jubilee. "I believe in the forgiveness of sins even to the end, as long as God is a Saviour." And what, when He is a judge? Are to be sentenced, and to be forgiven, the same thing?

(2). A second text, "The wrath of God abideth on him." His plea is that it says that "Man, so long as he is in unbelief, cannot see life," "but an unbeliever, though

while he is such God's wrath abides upon him, may pass by faith out of. the wrath to life and blessedness." It is not a question of nature, but that, when in the state of sin and ruin by nature, and Christ presented to them in grace, they rejected Him and grace; then they should not see life. Christ does not say cannot, but "shall not see life," etc. Nor does it say so long as he is in unbelief. It is a broad statement that he who does not believe "shall not see life," and the Son is referred to as having all in His hands. The wrath of God (for there is wrath) abides on him; John 3:36. "If it were not so, all would be lost," he says. This is a proof that all is false. It is totally untrue that, if this text bears the meaning we affirm it does, an unbeliever could not have any hope of life or deliverance, for it puts the turning-point on faith, and he that does not believe shall not see life. (Compare i John 5:12.) The text is as plain as possible. Some do believe; some do not. If not, they shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them.

(3). Another text is, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," Mark 9:42-50. "For every one shall be salted with fire," etc. That is, all shall be judged —the saints, that they may not be condemned with the world—the rest by final judgment; but salt, separation from evil, belonged to sacrifices thus given to God. "And every sacrifice must be salted with salt." Those who were consecrated to God, whose life was an offering to Him, should not lack the power of holy grace which binds the soul to God, and inwardly preserves it from evil. Mr. Jukes' explanation of it from the law really shews nothing but a total want of spiritual understanding. Making the meat-offering duty to one's neighbour, when it was a sacrifice by fire to God, and

Christ's leavenless Person, shews a mind away from all truth.42 Page 126 is all wrong, from beginning to end, in every point. The bodies of the sin-offering were not burnt as unclean; nor, generally, were they burnt at all: only very particular ones referring to the people or the high priest were. Those parts which were not burnt were eaten. What does he mean by "worm," alluding to the consumption of those parts? They were eaten. On page 127 we have a continuance of the same absurdity. It would seem the altar was hell; and yet he says the sin-offerings were burnt outside! It is all conflicting nonsense. The fire never being quenched43 "typifying the preservation of that spiritual fire, which it is Christ's work as priest to kindle and keep alive." That is in hell! The passages he quotes just state that nothing should intervene to stop or arrest the judgment; the fire would not be put out. The words "the fire never shall be quenched" have the same sense in Mark as in all the rest—that nothing shall avert or suspend the judgment of God. It was not chastening, but final judgment. In Isaiah it refers to the valley of the son of Hinnom, hence Gehenna; where the fire was kept up continually to consume the filth of Jerusalem, and the carcases of the rebellious remained a constant spectacle. Was the burning of the sin-offering without the camp a fire never quenched? (Page 128.) Was ever greater nonsense?

(4). All that he says about everlasting, as not being never-ending in Matthew 25:46, proves that he has nothing to say. Nor does the word translated "punishment" ever mean in the New Testament a corrective discipline, as he alleges. It is only twice used; and the verb twice. (Page 129.) If the bliss of the righteous be eternal, so must be the punishment of the

wicked. If Scripture be examined, there remains no question as to the word kolasis, that it is judicial torment, or torment, where the verb is used—never correcting. The other place where the word is used is 1 John 4:18—the verb in Acts 4:21; 2 Peter 2:9, in neither of which is there any other thought than “punishment.”

(5). Another text: “Good were it for that man if he had not been born.” As to what was said to our first parents, it was only what came on earth.. If Judas’ fall end in the restoration of the fallen one to more secure blessedness, then it would have been good for him to have been born —the highest witness of grace. What he says, “It is surely significant that one and the same awful prophecy is by the inspired writers of the New Testament applied to Judas and Israel,” is not the case. Psalm 69 and Psalm 109 are both quoted in Acts 1:20, but the part of the prophecy used in Romans is not that quoted in Acts. That Israel came under the same judgment as Judas in this world is quite true; but this has nothing whatever to do with what the Lord says of him. This is a mere come-off. The words, “Let his habitation be desolate,” are founded on Psalm 69, and Israel never will be restored as they stood on the old covenant. They are, cursed as the fig-tree was, never to bear any fruit. What is said of Judas is absolute—good not to have been born. And to say that Luke 19:42 is in substance the old man and the new is tampering with the Lord’s words. Is that what the Lord means?

Page 134 is too gross perversion of the Lord’s words. “Good44 not to have been born” means better through this very wickedness!

“For all that rose in Adam falls in Christ, even as all that fell in Adam rose again in Christ.” Where is this in Scripture? The quotation of Psalm 37:35, 36, is an absurd use of it. “I sought him, but he could not be found.” That is, he rose again, and was blessed!

His interpretation of the rich man and Lazarus is all wrong. It shews a change of dispensation, and the introduction of eternal and unseen things, as to which Christ withdraws the veil, in contrast with earthly things; and to say that the gulf was impassable for man, but that Christ might pass, is trifling with the word of God. Abraham says, “they that wish cannot pass,” but this only means they can pass in another way not named. Dives did not so understand it; that is, the Lord who makes him say, “I pray thee,” etc. “It is no use,” says Abraham; “if the word will not do it, a man going from the dead will not.” Yet we are to believe it can be done after all, and saying that, because man cannot make himself good, it does not follow God cannot. He does not change the flesh, but gives a new life, and the unbeliever shall not see life.

He next takes up the objection (p. 140) that it is opposed to the obvious sense of Scripture, and Scripture being written for simple and unlettered men, the simplest sense must be the true one. There is no such testimony in Scripture as that all death shall be done away; it is never said of the second death, which is the whole point. On this point Scripture contains no “apparent contradictions.”

He quotes Romans 5:14-21, and then asks what is the obvious meaning of these words: “Can a partial salvation exhaust the fulness of the blessing which St. Paul

declares so unequivocally?" Certainly. It is carefully stated to be "the many" connected with the obedient One. "Why, then, not receive the teaching in its plain and obvious sense?" This is just what we have to do; only one verse in our English version is utterly mistranslated: "Therefore, as by one offence toward all men to condemnation, even so by one righteousness toward all men to justification of life," Rom. 5:18. This is what has happened for justification of life and so reigning in life, which he admits they lose. "The many," not "all," are constituted righteous. This passage, instead of teaching Mr. Jukes' doctrine, carefully teaches the opposite. All connected with Adam have sin, condemnation, and death, and are lost; all connected with Christ have righteousness, justification, and life, and are saved. Surely we need the Spirit to understand the revelation; but it is not Scripture, that the death we see, and this only, is the way to fuller blessed life: we shall not all die. He takes up this objection next: "If you indulge the hope of the final restoration of all men, why not lost spirits also? Why should not the judgment of angels be their restoration?" "Why," he asks, "if He died for all, that by His death He might destroy that evil nature, and deliver them?" Through all this he drops atonement, and only looks for change, for which he absurdly quotes Hebrews 1:11, 12. I answer, the thought sets aside Christ's work. He does not take up angels at all; He does not take up their cause. The flesh is never changed.

Mr. Jukes says, after giving more than two pages to it, "I confess I cannot see that God would be dishonoured by such a conclusion of the great mystery." And on his principles the restoration of devils is necessary; and

then we have this rhapsody:— “When I see that man contains all worlds, and is indeed the hieroglyphic of the universe… but hell and heaven, and the life of each in him!”45 How is the life of heaven in him? “Ye are of your father, the devil,” said our Lord. “Lucifer and Adam, the two first great offenders, the one in his male, the other in his female property!” Simple truth is worth a good deal of this kind of trash. That “the hellish life can be transformed,” he says. It never is. All these interpretations and answers to objections only shew that scriptural proof is against him, and his answers are the best proof that he is wrong. As to the case of Jonah (p. 148), grace individually, without promise, has nothing to do with natural judgments.

(4). “Concluding Remarks.”— “Then cometh the end” settles the question as to receiving truth beyond our dispensation; it is error we reject—not truth. “It is humbling to proud spirits that all their pride and rebellion must be overthrown.” Are they saved, not being born again? “For teachers to learn is to unlearn!” No doubt ye are the men! “We are saved by hope,” not by fear (p. 150), is an entire abuse of the words of Scripture perverted by what he adds. We are saved en elpidi, not we are saved dia. “I rather believe that, if the exactness of final retribution were understood, if men saw that so long as they continue in sin they must be under judgment, and that only by death to sin are they delivered, they could not pervert the gospel as they now do, nor abuse that preaching of the cross, which is indeed salvation.” As to “exactness of final retribution,” we ask, exact to what measure? And his statement leaves out the gospel, or rather sets it aside. “God consigns,” he says, all but a few to endless misery. (Page

150.) They are enmity against God, and have rejected His love; they have both seen and hated both Him and His Father.

“Can such a doctrine be true? If it be, let men declare it always, and in every place.” (Page 153.) So they do, and it is a powerful means of conversion. “If we think Him hard, we become hard.” Does he think he deserves to be shut out from God? “The Gospels,” he says, “shew that God is love,” and that as manifested in Christ. But when Jesus came, how was He received? “Wherefore when I came, was there no man? “He came in the fulness of grace, reconciling; but they drove Him out of the world; they killed the Prince of Life, and preferred a murderer! “Because we were in the flesh, He came in the flesh.” He expatiates on His grace coming “to bear our burden, break our bonds, and bring us back in and with Himself to God’s right hand for ever,”46 but never one word of His bearing our sins. “How He did it, with what pity, truth, patience, tenderness, and care, no eye but God’s yet sees fully.” But what effect had all this? Christ’s own testimony is, “Now they have both seen and hated both Me and My Father.” Of what he says (p. 156), “Will the coming glory change all this?” —that is, the love which seeks the lost. The reply is—Christ as a Judge is different from Christ as a Saviour in what He is to others, in what He is doing in bearing sins, and judging men for them. The grace manifested did not change men, nor does it now without quickening grace. And “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” When judgment comes on men, it is not the time of saving them. (See Heb. 6 and 10.) Christ cannot then die for their sins; it is too late. And who says that “with Christ in heaven believers will look upon the

torments of the lost in hell”? (Page 157.) It is not true that those who know the love of God are indifferent to the case of the lost. Known love acts as love; but there is no great need if all are to be saved at any rate. But Christ, through an unwearing love when on earth, did not win men to God. For His love He had hatred. All this denies the need of being born again.

It is wretchedly false to say, “With their views they can only judge the evil.” This is not true—they can serve in grace. “They do not believe it (evil) can be overcome by good.” Nor can it. “Salvation through the cross—that is, through dissolution, above all in the face of Jesus Christ47—tells out the great truth that solves the great riddle, and shews why man must suffer while he is in sin, that through such suffering and death he may be brought back in Christ to God, and be remade in His likeness.” I pray the reader to mark this passage; it shews clearly what Mr. Jukes’ system is, and propounds a gospel wholly different from and subversive of the gospel of God. It is through a man’s suffering while he is in sin he is brought back in Christ to God. Christ’s dying for our sins, His atoning work, is left out, as is our receiving a new life in Him. All that constitutes the gospel and truth of God as our salvation by grace, and God’s gift of eternal life in Him, and we are saved by our own suffering death while we are in sin. Nothing can be worse. “The cravings abroad,” of which Mr. J. speaks, are not “the work of God’s Spirit,” but of man’s restless mind, and those which the Spirit of God does produce cannot be met by Mr. Jukes’ speculations, which contradict the word of God.

On the page (159) where he says, “I conclude as I began. The question is, What saith the scripture? “He

misuses and misapplies Scripture, as he has done from the beginning. He says, “the question is, in fact, whether God is for us or against us; and whether, being for us, He is stronger than our enemies? “This is set aside by asking, Of whom is Paul speaking, believers or unbelievers? All this is heedless of truth.

“Postscript.”—The extract from William Law (pp. 161-168) denies what is said of God in Scripture: “Vengeance is mine, I will recompense, saith the Lord.” There is not one word either in Jukes or Law of guilt, bearing sins, forgiveness, justification by faith, or of the blessed Lord Jesus’ work for us. A work in us both speak of in the same way.

“Appendix, Note A,” attempts to give the scripture use of the words “death “and “destruction,” in order to combat annihilationism. This deadly and anti-scriptural doctrine, which upsets atonement, repentance, and responsibility, I repel more absolutely than Mr. Jukes; but this is not the place to go into the question.

“Note B.”—Extracts from the fathers. Where do you find Christianity in them? I never did, and it is denied in some of these extracts. None except Diognetus, and perhaps Irenasus, were sound on the divinity of Christ. The believer can receive only what was from the beginning, that is, what is in the word of God. “He that is of God heareth us.” The abuse of Scripture in Mr. Jukes’ book is flagrant. The remarks from page to page in what precedes will shew this.

19 The Second Death and the Restitution of all Things. By Andrew Jukes. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. Third edition.

20 Only all things in heaven and earth, not the things under the earth in Philippians 2.

21 katargese, which is not destruction but annulling his power. The word used as to the works is an entirely different one: luse.

22 But then all things are not restored.

23 “All in Christ” is the real force; and, at any rate, it refers to resurrection.

24 All these passages have only to be read in their connection.

25 We have already seen it is the state of things in creation, while those under the earth (infernal, katachthonia), mentioned in Philippians, are omitted; and further, the reconciliation of believers is spoken of as a distinct thing.

26 Paul carefully insists it is only in one, Christ.

27 The footnote about the seventy Hebrews that went down into Egypt, the seventy heads of nations, and the sending out of the seventy by Christ, is all wrong.

28 Hebrews 5:2 does not apply at all, nor does Revelation 1:6, or chapter 5:10. In Hebrews we are not kings; in Revelation we are not for those out of the way.

29 How?

30 What cross?

31 Or as Lachmann, gegonan (Rev. 21:6).

32 The Spirit spoken of was in Noah (see 1 Pet. 1:11), “a preacher of righteousness,” who “prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by which he condemned the world.” God had said: “My Spirit shall not always strive with

man; for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years," Gen. 6:3. Christ by His Spirit in Noah then preached to the spirits now in prison; and note that the only persons spoken of are those of whom it was said, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man. His days shall be an hundred and twenty years." With these only He is said to strive again!

33 It is not.

34 Or, according to the now more received reading, "of our Lord and of his Christ." [This seems strangely obscure, as there never was a doubt about the text here, but as to the plural form of the phrase instead of the more correct singular: "there is come the world. Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ."—Ed.]

35 [So in the LXX we have ex emeron ai.—Ed.]

36 In note to page 64, what he affirms is incorrect. In Genesis 21:23 it refers to Abraham's confidence in the promises. Isaiah 26:4 has nothing to do with the matter. He is the Rock of Ages—abiding ground of confidence. Nor, indeed, has Isaiah 40:23. "In Exodus 2:15 we read of God's onoma aionon, that is, His name as connected with deliverance." It is nothing of the kind; it is His constant name with Israel. His comment on 2 (or chap. 4:17, p. 67) is puerilely false. The connection of the word baros with aionon shews it plainly. Again, the use of akatalutos with punishment would have no sense, if I should say indestructible judgment or punishment.

37 Page 82. His note about Hebrew words is not true. The reason why the first two mean also perfection is because it is complete or finished. What he says of ishah is not true. Esh is fire, once Keth (Jer. 4:29) eshah. Ishah is from ish or more fully enesh.

38 A. L. Newton.—She never thought a right thought on this subject. The curse did not involve the blessing. The second Man, not the first, was to overcome.

39 It is borrowed from the Germans, I think from Lange, who is as wild as he is full of error.

40 See Lange's Life of Christ.

41 This, as we have seen, is a gross perversion of the words of Scripture.

42 The footnote about the sacrifices is incorrect; the fat was consumed on the altar; and only when the blood went into the sanctuary was the body burned without the camp: otherwise it was eaten by the priest.

43 It is no more "quenched" than "go out," save in one place; perhaps "let go out" would be the truest. But "not go out" is quite right.

44 In the footnote, page 134, he says it is kalon, not agathon, that the kalon may be missed, while the agathon may be by grace obtainable. Now agathon would have no sense.

45 This is pretty exactly Swedenborgianism.

46 This is quite unscriptural.

47 This again is a gross perversion of Scripture. It is the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, then when He is in glory.

On The Greek Words For Eternity And Eternal

(aion and aionios)

I have thought that, as one of the forms in which infidelity circulates at present is Universalism, or the Restitution of all things, it might be well to put out clearly and simply some facts (for that is what they are), which may deprive its advocates of one main ground of their reasonings, and that without any reasoning on the general subject of a doctrine, which, when examined, sets aside the truth of Christianity. I refer to the meaning of aion, and also of aionios. We are told by Dr. Farrar, with much pretension to competency in affirming it, that “everlasting” or “eternal” ought not to be found in the Bible; by Mr. Cox, that it means properly an “age” and “age-long,” and that it cannot be right to translate them eternal or everlasting. Mr. Jukes, with a wild imagination, takes the same ground. They simply echo one another. Now all I purpose to do here is to state some passages from other authors, which prove that (while used in other senses, some of which are not found at all in Scripture), it does mean “eternity” and “eternal.” I will afterwards examine some of the passages in Scripture in which it is found.

Aion in Greek properly means “eternity.” I do not dispute here, whether we are to believe with Aristotle, that it is derived from aei einai; or with other modern writers from aio, I breathe, whence it had the meaning in Homer, Euripides, and other authors, of life and breath; or possibly these may be two different words, one from aei on, the other from ao spiro, whence the two very

different meanings. This is certain, that the word is distinctly used by Plato, Aristotle, and Philo (and, according to the dictionaries, by Lycurgus, whom I have not the means of consulting) as “eternal,” in contrast with what is of time having beginning or ending, as its definite and proper meaning.

Plato (Timceus, ed. Steph. 3, 37, or ed. Baiter, Orell. et Winck. 712) says, speaking of the universe: “When the father who begot it48 perceived that the image made by him of the eternal (aidion) gods moved and lived, he was delighted with his work; and, led by this dehght, thought to make his work much more like that first exemplar.” Inasmuch therefore as it (the intelligible universe) is an eternal (aidion) animal (living being), so he set about to make this (the sensible) universe such with all his power. The nature therefore of the animal (living being) was eternal (aionios, before aidios), and this indeed it was impossible to adapt to what was produced (to genneto, to what had a beginning); he thinks to make a moveable image of eternity (aionos), and in adoring the heavens he makes of the eternity permanent in unity a certain eternal image moving in number, that which in fact we call time; that is, days and nights, and months and years, which did not subsist before the heaven began to be, then with its being established he operates their birth” (beginning to be, genesin auton). And after unfolding this, he says (p. 38): “But these forms of time imitating eternity (aiona), and rolling round according to number, have had a beginning (gegonen)… Time therefore began with heaven, that they having begun with it may be dissolved with it, if there be indeed any dissolution of them, and according to the pattern of eternal (diaionias, in some MSS. aionion or -as) nature

that it might be as like as possible to it. For that pattern exists for all eternity (panta aiona estin on)3 but on the other hand, that which is perpetual (dia telous) throughout all time has had a beginning, and is, and will be." And then he goes on to speak of stars and planets, etc., as connected with what was created in time. It is impossible to conceive any more positive statement that aion is distinct, and to be contrasted with what has a beginning and belongs to the flux of time. Aion is what is properly eternal, in contrast with a divine imitation of it in ages of time, the result of the creative action of God which imitated the uncreate as nearly as He could in created ages. It is a careful opposition between eternity and ages; and aion and also aionios mean the former in contrast with ages.

I now give Aristotle peri ouranou, 1, 9 (ed. Bekker, 1, 279): "Time," he says, "is the number of movement, but there is no movement without a physical body. But outside heaven it has been shewn that there is not, nor possibly can come into existence, any body. It is evident then that there is neither place, nor void, nor time outside. Wherefore neither in place are things there formed by nature; nor does time cause them to grow old: neither is there any change of anything of those things which are arranged beyond the outermost orbit; but unchangeable, and subject to no influence, having the best and most independent life, they continue for all eternity (aiona). For this expression (name) has been divinely uttered by the ancients; for the completeness which embraces the time of the life of each, outside which there is nothing, according to nature, is called the aion of each. According to the same word (logon) the completeness of the whole heaven, and the

completeness which embraces all time and infinitude is aion, having received this name from existing for ever (apo ton aei einai), immortal (athanatos, undying), and divine." In 10 he goes on to shew that that beginning to be (genesthai) involves the not existing always, which I refer to as shewing what he means by aion. He is proving the unchangeable eternity of the visible universe. That is no business of mine; but it shews what he means by eternity (aion). It cannot be aidion and genesthai at the same time, when, as in Plato, aidios is used as equivalent to aionios. Aristotle has not the abstract thoughts of Plato as to ideas, and the paradeigma of what is visible, the latter being a produced image of the eternal paradeigma. He rests more in what is known by the senses; and makes this the eternal thing in itself. But the force of aion for both is a settled point; and Aristotle's explanation of aion as used for finite things, I have long held to be the true one; that is, the completeness of a thing's existence, so that according to its natural existence there is nothing outside or beyond it. It periechei the whole being of the thing.

As to Philo, the sentence is in De Mundo, §7, en aioni de oute pareleluthen ouden, oute mellei, alia monon iphesteken. Such a definition needs no explanation: in eternity nothing is passed, nothing is about to be, but only subsists. This has the importance of being of the date and Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament, as the others give the regular, and at the same time philosophical force of the word, aion, aionios. Eternity, unchangeable, with no 'was' nor 'will be,' is its proper force, that it can be applied to the whole existence of a thing, so that nothing of its nature was before true or

after is true, to telos to periechon. But its meaning is eternity, and eternal. To say that they do not mean it in Greek, as Jukes and Farrar and S. Cox, and those they quote, is a denial of the statements of the very best authorities we can have on the subject. If Plato and Aristotle and Philo knew Greek, what these others say is false. That this is the proper sense of aionios in Scripture, is as certain as it is evident. In 2 Corinthians 4:18, we have ta gar blepomena proskaira, ta de me blepomena aionia. That is, things that are for a time are put in express contrast with aionia, which are not for a time, be it age or ages, but eternal. Nothing can be more decisive of its positive and specific meaning.

I will now quote various passages of Scripture to shew aion or aionios has the definite meaning of “for ever,” or “eternal,” in English. No one who has examined its use in Greek questions that it is used for life, or the whole period of a man’s existence till he breathes his last; nor that it may be used for ages or periods, looked at as a whole. The question is, Does it not properly mean eternal or for ever, and that where age and age-long would have no sense? Thus Matthew 21:19, of the fig-tree: Let no fruit grow on thee eis ton aiona. “For the age” has no sense. It never was to grow. So Mark 11:14. That eternity is not grasped by man as a definite idea is true, because definite is finite, and man, being finite, cannot grasp what is m-finite. It is known only as that which is absolutely; or negatively as that to which end is denied.

Again, Mark 3:29, oik echei aphesin eis ton aiona. What age? It is not in the age, as some have fraudulently translated it, but “has not ever forgiveness.” It is not any particular age; the eis allows no such sense, and the ton

would require some particular age, which even so would leave no sense to eis. It can only mean here “for ever.” There was a present age and age to come, o aion outos, and o aion o mellon, and well known to the Jews, the olem hazeh, and the olem havo; and an increased measure of forgiveness was looked for in Messiah’s age. This sin could be forgiven in neither; no additional increase of forgiveness was looked for beyond Messiah; and each measure belonged to its own age; it was not a prolonged process, but what occurred in each as proper to it. But eis ton aiona, can only mean “for ever,” though “for ever” may be used metaphorically when there is no withdrawal of the gift or promise, and the effect cannot last longer than that to which it applies. The gift has no limit (it is, as Aristotle says, apeiria\ the existence of that to which it applies may. I do not lend it, I give it for ever; yet what I give, or the person to whom it is given, may cease to exist; but the gift is for ever, without repentance, out and out.

So John 4:14, shall not thirst “for the age”: is that the meaning? or never? John 6:51, 58, “live for ever”; John 10:28, not perish “to the age”: is that the sense? John 13:8, thou shalt not wash my feet “to the age!” A multitude more may be quoted to the same effect; some with the modified sense I have spoken of above of absolute gift and calling never to be retracted. But eis ton aiona never means “to the age” in any case.

Take 1 Peter 1:23, 25, logon zontos theou kai menontos eis ton aiona. Does it last only “to the age” (applying it to the logon, not to theou as some do)? So verse 25, rema menei eis ton aiona. So 2 John 2, the truth shall be with us “to the age!” So Jude 13, wandering stars, to

whom is reserved the blackness of darkness eis ton aiona. Here again “to the age” has no sense.

The case of aionios is just as strong. It is used seventy-one times in the New Testament. Of these it is connected forty-four times with life, where “for an age” or “age-long” is just nonsense, as believers to have age-long life and shall not perish. It is in contrast with ever perishing. The knowledge of the Father, and of Jesus Christ, whom He has sent, is life for the age. Is that all? The words of Jesus were remata zoes aioniou not tes zoes. It was that in its nature, not a specific period: indeed believers have it now. In Romans 6:22 the end is everlasting life. So that the life of that age, though no particular one is ever spoken of, is the end of the matter. It is not merely dark beyond as to a Jew, but there is no object beyond. My object is not to argue the point, but to consider the words here; but I must say that, if anything could lower and degrade the hope and present joy of the Christian, it is this miserable notion that “eternal “does not mean eternal.

But, farther, Christ was that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested to us; 1 John 1:2. He is our life; he that hath the Son hath life. He is the true God and eternal life. Five, I may say six, times it is used of “eternal fire,” or “punishment.” The rest are various, glory, salvation, redemption, inheritance, Spirit, God Himself. But none of them is eternal! all belong to this wonderful unknown age, and no more. But the eternal weight of glory is that of which the apostle speaks, when he says that the things are not for a time, proskaira, but eternal, aionia, chapter 5:1 going on to say that he was looking for a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. We have the word used with chronon (times) in

plural for the times of God's active dispensations. Before anything was created, this life was given us in Christ; putting it in its nature out of time.

Read these passages, and say if (while no one denies that there are ages and dispensations in which God has wrought and works), it be so that eternity is excluded from the revelation given to the Christian, and from the rest of God (for the promise is left us of entering into His rest), and that eternal glory, the eternal God, only means a God that has to say to that age. That God having called us to His own kingdom and glory, specifically that as our calling, this means a temporary period, an age which characterises Him, so that the eternal God is only the age-long God. That this life promised before the ages (chronon aioniori), and which Christ is in His Person as with the Father, is only a life in one of these ages; and that when I read that the God of all grace has called us to His eternal glory by Jesus Christ, for which we may suffer a while, it is only a temporary glory of His for some special age; 1 Pet. 5:10. That the glory of God, for which we hope in contradistinction to the peace and favour we possess, is only a temporary thing, for I suppose His own glory is the glory we boast in Romans 5. That language of exuberant apprehension is used, such as "ages of ages," and all the "generations of the age," or "eternity of ages," we know. But this does not alter the meaning of the word: aionios is properly the opposite to proskairos.

48 Both Plato and Aristotle treat the universe as a living animal, proved so by its constant movements: from them also Philo.

Dr. Farrar on “Everlasting,” “Damnation” and “Hell”

Dr. Farrar, with a great deal of pretentious language, appealing to his own perfect knowledge, his own deep sense of responsibility, and speaking in the sight of God (he says) and of the Saviour, perhaps of angels—he would hardly be so narrow-minded and illiberal as to speak of “elect angels” with Paul— and of what never crossed Paul’s narrow mind, “the spirits of the dead” — declares that not one of the words, “damnation,” “hell,” or “everlasting,” should be found in the English Bible.

Now with (I dare say) less knowledge than Canon Farrar, no unusual conscientiousness, still in the fear of God, I beg leave to say that what Canon Farrar says is entirely unfounded, in the essential point wholly untrue. I am not, in a note, going to enter into much Greek or Hellenistic learning, though both refute what Canon Farrar says as to “everlasting”; nor is there need. One passage suffices to shew as to this word that his statement, with all its pretension, is false. “The things which are seen are temporal (proskaira); but the things which are not seen are eternal” (aionia; 2 Cor. 4:18); that is, eternal is the opposite of what is for a time.

Need I quote more? Let the reader take a Concordance, and see the passages where “everlasting life” is used (or eternal), and say if everlasting should not be there. And note, “eternal life” in the Person of Christ was with the Father; 1 John 1:2. Is “eternal Spirit” wrong? (Heb. 9:14.) God has called us to His eternal glory; 1 Pet. 5:10. God lives for ever and ever (Rev. 5:14), the everlasting God; Rom. 16:26. I might multiply quotations; but these

suffice to prove, or even the first alone, that the statement of Dr. Farrar, with all his boasted knowledge and conscientiousness, is, as to this word, either ignorance or dishonesty. Would Dr. Farrar in the Old Testament change the word “everlasting” in Psalm 90, “From everlasting to everlasting thou art God”? is “eternal power and Godhead” wrong? (Rom. 1:20.) Is “eternal glory” (2 Tim. 2:10), eternal salvation, eternal redemption, wrong? Is “everlasting God, Jehovah, the Creator of the ends of the earth,” wrong?

As to “damnation,” the English word was used more loosely when the Bible was translated than it is now. In 1 Corinthians 11:29, it is used in contrast with final condemnation. The translators, where one word was used in Greek, took pains to use several in English, and thereby disfigured the sense of many passages, or at least obscured the connection. Thus in John 5 we have “judgment,” “condemnation,” “damnation,” all used for krisis, where “judgment” is the only true translation; but this does not affect the substance of Canon Farrar’s assertion. He speaks of the word in its ordinary modern acceptation. “Damnation “is used frequently in the English New Testament for judgment, as in Matthew 23:14; Mark 12:40; Luke 20:47; Romans 3:8; chap. 13:2; 1 Timothy 5:12; and this is the sense of 1 Corinthians 11:29, in contrast with condemnation with the world. Now, even if this “judgment” be everlasting condemnation, still the word means judgment.

But there is another and a stronger word than krima used, even in express contrast with it, so as to plainly mean final, absolute, condemnation. The word is katakrima. What a man is condemned to must be known by the sentence. We have both words in Romans 5:16,

“For the judgment (krima) was by one to (katakrima) condemnation,” and in verse 18. So, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” Romans 8:1. “God justifieth. Who is he that condemneth?” (vv. 33, 34). “When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world” (1 Cor. 11:32), where partial earthly judgments are contrasted with a final absolute condemnation. It is not therefore the mere word “damnation” for which I contend, nor to which Dr. Farrar objects, as all his sermon proves; for it is used in the English version many times, not in the sense of eternal condemnation; but that eternal condemnation meant by the word in modern times is spoken of in contrast with judgment, and as a distinct thing. Hence the apostle speaks of “eternal judgment” (Heb. 6); “eternal punishment” (Matt. 25); “everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord”; and (Mark 3:29), “hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of (enochos, subject to) eternal damnation.” And where the wicked have their part in the lake of fire it is said, gegone. It is done, when Omega is written on all things.

Now it is not the use of the mere word “damnation,” which had not then the definite force it has now which is insisted on or objected to. In Mark 3:29 it is krisis, judgment; but it is eternal, conclusive, absolute, and final. The objection made is to what is meant by the modern use of the word, and that is definitely stated in Scripture.

The other word is “hell.” Now, unfortunately, two words are translated “hell” in the English Bible—Hades and Gehenna: one meaning the temporary state of departed spirits, the unseen world without saying more; the other

used for the fire that never shall be quenched. Its meaning is, etymologically, the valley of Hinnom, where people offered their children to Moloch, and which was defiled by Josiah; and, it seems, a fire kept up to consume what was filthy and unclean out of Jerusalem and called Tophet. Hence we have in Isaiah, “For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large; and the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it,” Isa. 30:33. “And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcases of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh,” Isa. 66:24. This is, on the face of it, a material fact; there was a constant fire enduring continually, to which those bodies were enduringly subjected. Now Scheol, or Hades, is never confounded with this. It was an actual valley between Zion and what is called the Hill of Evil Counsel, south of Jerusalem, where tradition places the house of Caiaphas, if my memory serve me. This valley, where the unquenched fire consumed what was unclean, which yet, according to Isaiah 66, should remain in the consuming fire unconsumed, an abhorring unto all flesh, was used for an image of a sorer punishment, and was called Gehenna (Anglice, “hell”); that is, literally, the valley of Hinnom. Now this word is found in Matthew 5:22, 29, 30; chap. 10:28; chap. 18:9; chap. 23:15, 33; Mark 9:43, 45, 47; Luke 12:5; James 3:6.

In Matthew 5 the statement is general: danger of hell-fire— thy whole body cast into hell; referring to sacrificing one member rather than sin; clearly not the valley of Hinnom. “Fear him which is able to destroy both body and soul in hell,” chap. 10:28. It is not the

valley of Hinnom. They do not put souls there. It is metaphorically used for the place of final judgment and punishment. Chapter 18:9 is as in chapter 5; in chapter 23:15, a child of hell—one who is the natural heir—belongs to this place. That it is the place of condemnation in judgment Matthew 23:33 shews: “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the judgment (kriseos) of hell?” (Mark 9:43-48.) We have solemnly repeated the call to sacrifice the dearest thing that is a snare to us, under penalty of being cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. It is a judgment, a judicial punishment, for which there is no relief, of which there is no cessation.

In Luke 12 it is used as a known thing, a place, the effect of divine judgment. James 3:6 is only of importance as shewing that it is connected with pure unmitigated evil; where nothing else is. Now a person who reads all this cannot doubt that that which the word “hell” is used for in English is fully contemplated. The desirableness of not confounding it with Hades, the vaguest possible word for the unseen world, no reflecting mind would deny. It is a place into which God’s judgment casts the unrepentant and rebellious wicked, where their worm does not die, and the fire is not quenched. That human figures of fire and worms are used may be; but the force of it is plain enough—it is the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, where God casts in judgment those that are righteously rejected, where there is no remission, when God says gegone, It is done; and without are whoremongers, and all who love and make a lie. Hades is not Gehenna, and Gehenna in the New Testament is never used as the

Valley of Hinnom. The proper English word is “hell”; that is, the place where pure evil, if such a phrase may be used, meets its final doom, after restoring means (even to God’s giving His own Son, and beseeching men to be reconciled) are exhausted, and where the effect of judgment remains unquenched.

Canon Farrar is wrong in saying ‘everlasting’ should not be used: no other word but that, or an equivalent one, would give the sense of what is not pros kairon for a time, or temporal. He is wrong in saying “damnation” should disappear, though it is used with uncertainty of meaning in the English version; nor is the mere word what is really in question, but what it is now used for—full and final condemnation; and this is used and contrasted with partial judgment.

Finally, “hell” is the only true English word, as usually employed, which answers to the word Gehenna in the New Testament. With great and boasting pretension to knowledge, and a conscientiousness which the spirits of the dead are to be witnesses of “perhaps,” I find (in the report given in a weekly journal, which is all I can speak of) ignorance as to the use of language in the New Testament, or, if it be not that, a want of conscience in the solemn things of God.

Natural And Supernatural

“Natural” is that system or kosmos in which we are placed, and which follows constant natural laws; and therewith man’s agency, placed in that system, and in power over the lower part of it, according to his measure—a sphere whose laws are the subject of man’s will, and in which he disposes of their agencies in this lower world. “Supernatural” is a power which in its activity is above and beyond that system. It may use the ordinary powers of nature; miracle does not consist in acting without them; but if it use them, they are not set in activity by the sequence of natural law, but by the will of the supernatural power, and by it directly. I light a fire, and produce steam from water; but here it is not the simple fiat of power that heat should be of itself; I produce it by natural laws on which I am dependent. God may by an east wind blow and drive back the Red Sea, or bring quails; but He causes the wind to blow where He will: this I cannot do. If Satan can do it as permitted, it may be supernatural also, but this is limited. God may order things so that we may fall under the effect of natural causes; but this, though divine ordering, is not a miracle, though equally divine power; it belongs to another sphere, the relationship between man and God. It is not in the sphere of natural causes, acting above or beyond them, to produce effects in that sphere.

But then, as to miracles, and the idea of making them the result of natural causes, in a sphere of which much is yet unknown to us, Christianity rests on the truth of resurrection, which is certainly not according to the

course of nature. And of this the Duke of Argyll can only say, Why should it seem incredible to you that God can raise the dead? No doubt God can, and He has raised Christ Himself. But that is shirking the question.

But besides, to a man lame or blind from his birth a word heals or gives sight. This is not the unknown course of nature, unless you make God's power (which is to Him the course of nature and will, in which He does what pleases Him in heaven and earth) to be the course of nature. But a word, and the word of a man, doing this is not the course of nature, save what is natural to God. To talk of it as such is to make the course of nature and fixed laws mean nothing. It is God's nature in goodness and power, if you will, but acting in sovereign goodness; for love, though His nature, is in its operation sovereign, and, if it acts according to laws, they are moral laws, the laws of His own nature. That word commands the agencies of the physical laws as in the lame or blind, and they then produce their natural effect. But in that word of command is the power of the miracle, according to the centurion's faith; "Speak the word [logo], and my servant shall be healed." Natural action was restored, but by direct power.

But this thought of God's acting according to laws involves a great fallacy from using the term in a double sense. God does act according to His nature, or, if you please, according to the laws of His nature, that is, its uniform unchangeable principles when He acts, and the manifestations of which constitute His glory. He is righteous and holy; He cannot he, and He cannot be not Himself. His acts manifest Himself. Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father; but this was no physical effect of a cause operating without will in itself.

God has ordered a system of cause and effect, but there is no will in it. We call its laws, established fixed laws, because the effect is uniform, regularly and always produced, though I doubt not the causa causans is always operative, and necessary to the effects. But in the acting of God, though all such acts are consistent with His nature, and must be so, it is not the cause of acting. God's will is the cause, though we readily understand His will cannot act contrary to His nature; nay, His nature may set His will in activity.

"God so loved the world, that he gave," etc. This is not a material necessity imposed apart from will in what acts; it is moral, displaying a nature by a will. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord"; but this does not make holiness something necessarily producing an effect, as gravity acts universally in matter. There is nothing to do with cause and effect in it. So miracles of goodness prove God's nature when wrought because He works them, but they are not always wrought as a natural consequence attached to anything. God acts. These, when they are wrought, are according to, and display, His nature: but they are not the necessary and constant effects of that nature as a producing cause. God is always such, and, if He acts, so acts as not to deny Himself—it were impossible; but He does all things according to the counsels of His own will. To confound the physical laws of the creature, always operating as constituted by the Creator, with the sovereign power who constituted that order, to whom none can say, What doest Thou? is a great moral blunder.

Law is a uniform course prescribed by adequate authority.

The Duke of Argyll's book is useful in the main, but as in the case of miracles, so in creation, stops short of Christian ground and truth. The things which were seen were not made of the things which do appear. In the beginning God created. That there may be proofs of progress and developed design, and of laws, and of uniformity in it, may be all true: but this does not hinder that they exist, and the law too, by the fiat of the Creator.

Science And Scripture

It is far happier to take the word of God simply as the word of God, and have nothing to do with the infidelity of man. When in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe: and that is the true ground for the soul. “He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar.” If man does not bow to what God says now, God will shew he had enough evidence of the truth in Christ and His word, so that the rejection of it proves what he is, and he will have to bow to it in that day. “The word that I have spoken” says the Lord, “the same shall judge him in the last day.”

But we all know that infidelity is rampant, and that numbers of young Christians, in houses of business and elsewhere, are beset by it; for “the unjust knoweth no shame.” I send you therefore a few remarks, very brief, not going into the discussion of the subject, but merely some general principles which may help them when they have to do with it—principles which set its just limits to science.

Science is occupied in phenomena, what the perceptive mind of man can take cognisance of. It may search into these with the utmost minuteness; it may see that these are regularly governed by general laws, and from the universality of phenomena discover a general principle which acts in all of them. It sees too that certain phenomena are constantly consequences of other phenomena, so far as that, when certain phenomena occur, they are, if not hindered by some external power,

followed by other phenomena which are their consequences. There are certain constant facts, and facts which flow from other facts, with (as a general rule) a regularity which constitutes a law of nature. All this science can investigate.

Doubtless there is a vast number of such facts and connections not yet discovered, and I know of no limit in principle to any discovery of the order of nature. But science can go no farther; it deals with phenomena (that is, the perceived course of nature), and cannot go beyond them. These, as ordinary and universal phenomena, can be (if science has gone so far) traced to causes which have produced them, and regularly produce them, or to some general uniform principle, such as what is called gravity; so that there are, as to the course of nature, general laws and productive causes. Still the way this is spoken of is very commonly incorrect; as if there were a succession of events. Now this is not the case in much referred to.

A general principle is discovered, as gravity, or the action of acids on certain other substances, or the laws of electricity. In these cases there is no succession or series of events, but either constancy in fact, as in the movements of the heavenly bodies, or, if certain substances are applied to others, uniform effects produced, and new combinations formed, and the like. This has nothing to do with a succession of productions. I do not say everything produced has proceeded from an antecedent, and this from another. It only proves that there are certain general laws which govern what exists, so that they as a rule act uniformly, or perhaps constantly. Adams or Lever-rier could discover that there must be a planet in a certain place because of

certain disturbances in the movements of Neptune, and there it was found.49 So Kepler discovered elliptic orbits, and equal spaces in equal times, and the like: and chemistry ascertained the combination of elements in regular proportion. That is, regular and orderly (or, as they are called, general) laws of the operations of forces in what exists in the visible universe have been discovered constant in their nature. What exists moves in a regular way, or, when the occasion is there, the same thing produces the same effects; not a succession of productive causes, but uniformity in the actions of each, so that we can calculate on effects if nothing hinders. But that is all. Science informs me of these general laws which govern what exists; but the things must already exist so to act.

Science can go no farther than the phenomena, and consists in generalising them under a uniform law. But, before the course which existing things follow, the things must exist which follow that course, though that course may have begun with their existence; and no doubt they did. But that course only is the subject of science, its general principle as a fixed law. The existence, and probably the law it follows, is there before the researches of science can begin, and the laws of force and phenomena when they have begun; and these only are the subject of scientific generalisation. Of existence or the source of laws which govern force and produce effects, it can tell me absolutely nothing. They are not the subject of science at all. Many, very many, know a vast deal more of science than I do. It is not my occupation, and I am willing to learn many interesting facts from them; but they cannot tell me better than I can know myself what the domain and sphere of science

is. I can judge of that as well as they—perhaps better, as it is not my idol.

Science is occupied with phenomena, and phenomena only, and that to discover the facts and the laws which govern them; but all they search into is only the actual uniform operation, where it exists, of that whose existence is there before the inquiry could arise. They must take that for granted when they search into the laws which govern its present phenomena. Science can discover the laws of what does exist, but there it must stop; its existence they have no law for. With all respect for their skill in what mentally is very interesting, if they go beyond it they are simply sutor ultra crepidam. I suppose for some I must translate the rebuke given by the Rhodian sculptor to the cobbler who could shew that the shoe on the statue was not rightly made, and, famous by correcting the work of a renowned artist, would go farther, and judge the work, but was only the cobbler beyond his last. With the existence of the creation, or of the laws which govern it, they have nothing to do. They may investigate those laws when they exist; if they go beyond, I say, Ne sutor ultra crepidam.

But what they have discovered leads me to another point which they have obscured by their studies and constant occupation with secondary causes, and which is much more simply and clearly apprehended by unscientific minds. If a man of science met a peasant with his cart, and tried to prove the cart had not been made, he would bring Bedlam, not science, into the poor man’s mind. He might explain the curves produced by a fly on the periphery of the wheel as it turned, what the principles of the pressure of weight on the parts of the cart were,

and the plane of draught, how far equal wheels affected the draught, and much more. Nay, he might explain to him how the stimulus of the whip applied to the horse behind set the centripetal nerves to produce an effect on the cells, or combination of cells, in the horse's brain, and by some unknown reflex action set the motor efferent fibres in activity, so as to act on his hind heels, and even his fore-legs, at the same time, to move the cart. Still my poor carter would believe his cart had a maker, and was made with a particular design to carry manure or corn, as the case might be; nay, perhaps, in his ignorance, that, though born of a cart mare, the horse was made too, and would fancy, poor ignorant man with a whip in his hand, that it was made for him to have dominion over; nor would he be much in the wrong.

But I must turn to the direct point. A succession of produced facts they have not. They have uniform and universal continuance of force, operating in a constant way as a general rule, though perhaps not absolutely universal, as gaseous molecules or the satellite of Uranus, but enough to give a general fixed phenomenal law, and uniform effects of certain chemical substances; but this knowledge of phenomena brings out the principle of causation. Thus Mr. Mill says, "All phenomena, without exception, which begin to exist, that is, all except primeval causes, are effects either immediate or remote of those primitive facts, or of some combination of them." This science has no right to say. It can only say, This is the case in all the course of material nature which we have examined; and, as an induction, we reckon on it elsewhere when the same cause is in

operation, or from the same effect conclude to a similar cause. Nothing more.

But the principle of causation, intuitively believed in men's minds, so that he cannot think of beginning to be without it, is established scientifically as necessary to material existence, and the course of nature in what begins, by the infidel himself. He cannot think otherwise. As a scientific induction, then, it is necessary to the first existence of material existence and fixed laws. That is, I have a creative power. It is true that this leads me to self-existence, which, for the very same reason, I cannot understand, because it does exist without being caused. But this is merely saying man cannot understand what is beyond him. Of course he cannot, or he would not be man, that is, a finite creature.

That is, science must stop in—what belongs to it—the course and order of the kosmos, or ordered universe, and in its nature cannot go beyond it. It knows there must be a primeval or primitive cause for everything; for everything in its sphere is the effect of a cause, and, it asserts, must be. If so, material existence itself must be, and the fixed laws also. As to what and how that primeval cause is (which is not caused, or it is not primeval), it cannot tell. Of course it cannot; nor do I blame it. It is in the nature of things. But ignorance is no ground—I should say no valid ground; for ignorance is very fond of asserting—no valid ground of asserting. That is, science assures me from what it does know that there must be a primeval cause of the existence of what it searches into; but it is, and must be, wholly ignorant of that cause—cannot conceive it: it is not in its sphere of knowledge.

As to change of species, I must say, though I cannot enter into it here, there is no ground for asserting it. Mummies and geology all give us the same continuous species, as has been fully shewn, and no passing from one to another. Facts fail the assertors of it; and facts only are of any worth here. And as to evolutionism, while within the same species there is clearly development from the sperm to the plant, from the ovum to the full-grown creature, species appear perfect in starting, though in the kind of creature there is, as a general rule, progress up to man himself. And, so far from the stronger driving out the weaker during the subsistence of a race, the stronger are those that disappear.

Infidelity would exclude a Creator. Its will is in its thought. Mr. Mill talks of primeval causes, primitive facts, collocation of permanent causes;50 but this only proves that he was forced to come to what was primitive and permanent, what exists of itself. Another tells us we are compelled to admit a primordial cause or causes, of whose nature logic and science can tell us nothing. “Thus we are conducted to a blank wall by a method which is wholly powerless to penetrate the mystery which lies behind.” He adds, “This we may call logical or negative atheism.” Now I understand this; for this author, though an evolutionist, does not deny revelation, but avows himself a Christian; but it is not correct, because it pretends to think of what is beyond the blank wall, when it knows and sees nothing. It has no negative right even, but only to say, I do not know—it is not in the sphere of my knowledge; I am simply ignorant, and leave it to intuition and revelation, where all is plain. Indeed we may go farther, because the mind of man does conclude there must be a cause, nature.

It is a very simple principle, that the mind of man cannot go beyond the mind of man, or it ceases to be such; that it cannot reach God so as to know and grasp what He is. If he could, God is not God, or man not man. Cicero's subject a Veritas quasi materia can never take in God. It puts God and man wholly out of their place, and though in an innate sense there is a God remains, it is a fact that man by his own power has never known Him. His highest reach is an "unknown God." With conscience it is another matter; but that is not science. As to this it is clear, fixed laws cannot account for existence, for the things must exist to have the laws attached to them. They are forced to recognise causation; man does so necessarily, and that leads up to a first cause, but it is not science. This may occupy itself with fixed laws, but the laws were fixed somehow before it began its work. What they are when they exist, science may ascertain, but no more.

49 Though, it seems, there is a satellite of Uranus which goes contrary to the uniform direction of the solar system; I am not aware that it has been accounted for; but if not, I dare say it may be.

50 Afterwards in a wretched way he admitted one, and materials to hand, with a bungling result.

Christ On The Cross

Psalm 22

The more closely we look at the Lord Jesus on earth, at His path here, and at what He met with in that path, the more we see the terrible alienation of men's hearts from God; and the more too we see the blessing of the fact that the Son of God has been in this world, and has passed out of it by death.

This is a great fact, and there is none like it—not creation even. There is no fact so great as that of the Word being made flesh, and dwelling among us, and after all being utterly and wholly rejected, for Satan is the prince and god of this world, who exercised his terror on those who followed the Lord, and his full power on the world at large.

But everyone must see that such a thing could not have happened without God's mind. Christ could not have gone down to death had God not permitted it; as He said Himself, He could pray to His Father, and He would send Him twelve legions of angels; or He could have wrought a miracle and delivered Himself; or walked away in Gethsemane when all fell to the ground. But He did not come into this world for that; neither did He come into the world simply to go out of it as rejected. When we see Him dying, we cannot but see that there was some thought and intention which could only be made good through that death. Why should He go down into death and judgment if those to be saved were not there? Thus, seeing Him there, we get the condition of those about whom He came. Thus too we see One going down into that place, and rising out of it, so that the whole power

of the evil which He is come to set aside is annulled; and in this too we see His divine perfection—His perfect love. He had come to attract men's hearts; but, as He says, for His love He got hatred. Man would not have Him, and He goes on to the cross; and God, in all He is against sin and in His divine wisdom, was glorified in the death of Jesus.

It is this we are a little to weigh in this Psalm, which the Lord Himself quoted on the cross. The Lord here not only takes up the central truth that He was forsaken of God, but that His path on earth led to this—all the circumstances through which He passed; and all testified to the truth of the condition the world was in. All along for His love He got hatred; but this did not hinder the love, it only led to its full expression. And, as nothing but the cross shews out so completely the state the heart of man was in, so there only can we bear to look evil in the face—only in that cross in which I see sin and evil fully manifested, and yet perfect divine grace meeting it.

First see the blessed character in which the Lord visits the world. Certain truths may be learned elsewhere, such as creation and providence, but not judgment in righteousness, at least not until the end, and then it will be learned in the destruction of the wicked. This was what Job found so hard to understand—how those who did evil prospered, whilst the righteous were persecuted. This is just because the time of judgment is not come; the time of mercy is now going on, and we cannot have mercy and judgment at once. So all is a riddle now. There is too much of badness for man to be able to think that things are of God; and too much of goodness, even amidst all the ruin and wretchedness,

for him to see how it is not of God. Men try to get over it, and to be indifferent to it; but there is too much even for selfishness itself not to see it. However favourable exterior circumstances may, for a few, partially remedy things, we must see that, taken as a whole, there is but ruin and wretchedness in the world.

But when Christ comes, I find perfect goodness in the midst of this scene of confusion, where there is the power of evil and suffering and sorrow. It is quite another thing from all that went before, though prophets and the like testified of it; but what I see in Christ is God Himself manifesting goodness— of course manifesting men's hearts too—in the midst of evil and sorrow, and profiting by them to do it, and that in order to win men's hearts back to Himself. Government there is, and judgment there will be: that is the necessity of God's nature, for God cannot allow evil to go on for ever; but Christ's coming was to get back man's confidence in God by the presentation of goodness.

Satan had made man distrust God, saying, If you do what I bid you, you will be like God. Christ came to make us really so, and presented Himself to every sorrow and to the worst of sinners, saying, Can you trust God? Do not say you are too bad; I have come because you are bad. Do not say you are too wretched; I have come because you are wretched. Do not say the evil is too great; there is nothing so great as God. And, where this voice is heard, we see the sinner comes to Him, weeping—and it is all right to weep about sins—but confiding in this love which can be trusted, when nowhere else can the heart turn and confide.

That is what the Lord was. If any pretended to be good, He unmasked them. If any pretended to be above the evil, He shewed what they were, as He said, “Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!” They were “whited sepulchres,” He says. But there is always perfect grace for the sinner, as we see in the case of the woman they brought to Him. No doubt her guilt was great, and her sin horrid, and stoning justly deserved; but who is going to stone her? He detects all hearts. Though “love,” He is “light,” and it is impossible that any sinful heart can stand before Him. If they try it is only to have the veil drawn off as only God can draw it, and they must confess their guilt; one word of His reaches the conscience, as the woman of Samaria says, “Come, see a man which told me all things that ever I did.”

We must be before God according to what we really are: the effect of the light is to do this; and, when what we are is brought out, it is met by perfect love in the goodness of God. There is no hardness there. “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.” Christ was the manifestation of that goodness which never could be wearied—never could be irritated—never could fail in meeting sorrow—that goodness which had come to meet the badness.

We know that the world could not stand it. The Pharisee was too proud to receive it. The world cast out His name as evil; and at length, restraint having been taken away, and His hour being come, He gives Himself up. And now it is said to the world, “Him ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain,” He, of course, being delivered to this by the “determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.”

But oh, beloved friends, what a fact! To think of the idleness of the human heart! That God should have been in this world, and that man should have turned Him out, and that then man can go away and amuse himself! It is hatred to Christ at the bottom, or despising Him; but it is covered up with pleasures, amusements, vanity, anything. Man can go on amusing himself in a world which has rejected God! Still God has not given up His purpose; He is still calling out a people to His name.

See how, in this Psalm, everything brings out the state of the world. Look at all the circumstances which surround the Lord; every man is in his place. “Strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round” —that is, violence. As to His friends, they run away. Of His disciples, one denies, and the other betrays. Pilate washes his hands when about to shed the blood of an innocent man. The Jews say, “His blood be on us, and on our children,” as we know it is to this day. The high priest, who is there to intercede for those who are ignorant and out of the way, gives his voice against the innocent. All testifies to the moral darkness of the world. Some we know were beating their breasts with human feeling at what was going on, and the centurion gave a perfect testimony that this was the Son of God; but the world would none of Him. Still He was condemned in both cases on His own testimony to the truth; and then went on in perfect meekness to the cross.

If we look too at Gethsemane, when He was in an agony His disciples were sleeping. And, when the men come to take Him, He has not a thought for Himself; it is, “If ye seek me, let these go their way.” He puts Himself forward—stands in the gap—and then the disciples all run away. All the circumstances testified to what was in

the world, and He perfect through it all. And in this Psalm He, as it were, rehearses it all, and His own sorrow and suffering in the midst of it.

But these were, however deep and real, external, and from man. From these He turns to God. And here the proper subject of the Psalm and His unfathomable suffering is found; He looks to God in the trials, and there was no comfort in the cup He had to drink. “Be not far from me, for trouble is near.” Then, sorrows pressing Him still more closely, He says again, “Be not thou far from me, O Lord.” Still as yet they were but the outward pressure from the hand of man. He was not stopped by them. He was going on through them to the cup which His Father was going to put into His hand; and there He met that which made Him cry out, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” “Our fathers trusted in thee; they trusted, and thou didst deliver them. But I am a worm, and no man.” So deep and terrible was the cup of judgment against sin!

It is this we are brought to through the circumstances which surrounded Him. Christ was in the world, and His being there shewed out what man was. For His love He had hatred; and this is just as true of Him now. It is then that His love sets about its proper work: not to express what we are, but to put it away. Bringing out and manifesting what we are by itself, had it been possible, would have driven us to despair, but never could have done us any good without the work that brings us back to Himself, and makes us happy to be there.

Beloved friends, we must not deceive ourselves. They who seek pleasures and the like do not care to hear about Christ. Christ is not here now for you to put out

your hand to crucify Him again; but the world that did it is not one bit changed. The world does not like to have Christ pressed upon it, and the carnal mind knows that it is so. What is the effect on man naturally when Christ is pressed upon him? He does not like it. What could he say of all his thoughts, and feelings, and inclinations, if God were in the room and all were manifested? Bring Christ into any drawing-room in this country—not to speak of wicked places—and what is the effect? All is spoiled if God be there; and the reason is that, where man finds his pleasures, he cannot have God. Suppose you could take a natural man to heaven; what would he do there? There is nothing there which it would be possible for him to enjoy, and he would only wish to get out of it as fast as possible. This is all that it would come to: if God is brought where our pleasure is, it spoils all; and if it were possible for us to be taken where He is, we could not stay. And yet man is amusing himself, and that in the place where Christ was crucified! It is all well till judgment or death come; and then he finds that he has been walking in a vain show, and has disquieted himself in vain.

I find then the perfectness of the love of the Saviour. His rejection only served as a means of expressing His love still further. Mark the reality of this expression as meeting all our case. Were we lying in death? He puts Himself into it. Did we deserve the cup of wrath? He takes and drinks it. Was all the power of Satan against us? He goes into it and breaks it. Christ does not say, You come to Me properly, and then I will help you. No; He comes down into it all; He does not seek to escape; He does not turn away from the insults and violence of

men, but, through them all, He offers Himself without spot to God.

When I see God's love and purpose in dealing with sin in death and judgment—when I see this blessed One there—then I get this truth, that God has been occupied about sin in grace. When I see this blessed One putting Himself in such a place as this, I see that the whole question is brought before God and dealt with by Him in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. And then it is not as when God deals with us here, full of mercy and tender compassion for our infirmities; there was no mercy for Christ—no screen to hide and spare Him. He was the one divine Person capable of bearing all the weight of that burden, and willing to do so; and He did it.

And oh, what a spectacle it was! If God were to sweep away all in judgment, righteousness might be seen, but there would be no love; if He were to receive all passing over sin, there would be no righteousness. But, when Christ takes our place on the cross, we get divine righteousness against sin as nowhere else, yet infinite divine love to the sinner. Here all that God is was perfectly glorified, where sin was perfectly manifested, but where the Lord accomplished the work which put away sin.

Then we find in this Psalm that the Lord is heard in His cry. He says, "Thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns"; when the cup was drunk, and He had been, so to speak, transpierced by them, His resurrection was the public testimony that He was heard. But, even before He died, we find Him peacefully saying "Father—" "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." He did not die from weakness; He gave up His spirit. We have

thus the whole question of sin finished and settled; and, if not settled then, never to be. It may be in eternal judgment, if this great salvation be despised, but no more settling the question of sin with God. If settled then, it is perfectly settled—settled according to the perfectness of the divine nature, according to the holiness of God, and settled for eternity. Christ, having cried out to God in the place where He drank the cup of wrath, was heard; and His resurrection is the testimony that He was.

But remark another thing, and that is, the constancy of His love. Opposition does not stop it; through everything He goes on with His love. You cannot find a want that does not find grace in Him; you cannot find a sinner such that he does not meet grace for his deepest need. No power of Satan, no heartbreaking through the heartlessness of man, nor quailing before his wickedness could stop it. It only shewed out His love the more, the more opposition it met with. And He had no motive to go on but that love that was in Himself, and perfect obedience.

Then He says: “I will declare thy name unto my brethren: in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee.” What name? The name of His Father and God; the name of the One with whom He had found unclouded favour, sin having been put away. He is in the presence of one of infinite holiness; He had known and felt His power against sin; and now He gets back as man into the enjoyment of His own blessedness, not simply as the eternal Son of God before the world was, but as Son of man. He enters as having wrought the work, and now He says, “I will declare thy name unto my brethren,” So, when He rose, He said, “Go to my brethren, and say

unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and your God." He had never called them that before. Now He puts them in the place He had acquired for them. He had wrought the needed work, and now He takes His disciples into the relationship He Himself was in with God, in virtue of what He had done; for, what He had done, He had done for them, and that is where He sets them.

Thus we see what this salvation is, if our souls get into the truth of what that love was which made Him go down into the dust of death when all the power and malice of evil burst out against Him. God met Him with righteous judgment against sin when made sin for us. And then see how He glorified God about it, and understand that He, the forsaken One, got back into the full unclouded light. Then I say, There lam; for He has said, I go to my Father and your Father. I have taken your place, and wrought the work that was needed to bring you to God. You are made the righteousness of God in me, for I have been made sin for you. His first thought is, when heard, "I will declare thy name unto my brethren." I must make them as happy as I am myself; I must declare thy name to them. And His love passes on, unenfeebled and undiminished, to make good the effects of His work. He says, Now you are going to be with me; and marks how we are never separate from Him. When the cup was drunk, He drank it alone, but now we are never separated from Him. He does not say, Now they may sing; but, In the midst of the assembly I will sing. He leads the praises; He declares the name in which He rejoices. How wonderful that we should be thus associated with Himself! It is a figure of course—His

singing; but it tells us how He associates us with Himself in everything.

And how perfect this salvation is! Am I to believe this? Am I really to stand in the same relationship to the Father as He? This is what He tells me, and it is impossible that He should mislead or deceive me. If He say, “Peace I leave with you,” He adds, “My peace I give unto you.” He says, “That my joy might remain in you.” What does perfect love do? It seeks to associate the person loved with itself in the place where it stands; and this is the way Christ blesses. It is not only that He gives “gifts”; that He does too, for our need; but He introduces us into His own happiness. He says, “That they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves.” “The glory which thou gavest me I have given them.” “That the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.” “I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me.” That is His love—perfect—though we are such feeble vessels. He introduces us into the place on purpose that we may be with Him.

We find too, in this Psalm, that He goes on to the millennium. It is not now “Fear him” only, as we get in Revelation: but, if you fear Him you must praise Him. “Ye that fear the Lord, praise him.”

Now perhaps you would like God to bear with a little sin. No; He can bear with none; He puts it all away, and then puts the best robe on us, and brings us into His house, so that our hearts can go out to Him in liberty. There is truth in the inward parts; sin looked at in the light of God and put away. What peace this gives the heart! Can you look at the cross and say, I do not know whether my sin is forgiven? You know that at the cross all was out;

He was made sin there; there God dealt with it in His Person. “Once in the end of the world he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” I know the work is done, for that which He came to do He accomplished perfectly. I do not ask myself what I think of it; I know what God thinks. God has raised Him from the dead; not only accepted Him, but glorified Him as a man, in consequence of His having perfectly glorified Him about sin. Once seen, this clears away a thousand cobwebs of man’s mind and invention. I shall never get another Christ to do the work, and the One who has died never can die again. Blessed be God, He has done the work, and its value never can cease so long as He is before God.

I may be chastened, rebuked, encouraged, and warned; the revelation of His glory may draw me on, but nothing can ever touch the righteousness of God which I am made in Christ. “If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father,” and “He is the propitiation for our sins.” But the righteousness is never touched; in virtue of it, instead of imputing, He is our advocate if we fail, and the soul is restored.

How perfect is this! It is hard for us to beheve it, because it is hard for us to beheve in such love. Do you believe that Christ has really brought you into association with Himself? He sets the tune of praise, and you are to follow Him. If you say you do not know whether He has finished the work—if you do not know that you are in perfect light and favour—you cannot sing in tune with Him: He knows well that the work is done; He knows well that He is in perfect light and favour.

I know you will find difficulties, but that is another thing. You will find a grace that reigns through righteousness. He has wrought that perfect work that we may righteously trust Him. How is it with you? Are you reconciled? Can you say that through this work you have peace with God? Naturally, we know, we like pleasure, gain, society, amusements, anything, provided it is not God. Are you reconciled to God? If so, in the midst of all our feebleness, we can fly to God. When temptations arise, where do I go? I go to the strength which is “made perfect in weakness.”

It is sweet to see how the apostle, in Romans 8, applies this love of God to everything. He who has given His own Son, how shall He not with Him freely give us all things? He is for us in giving all things. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? He is for us in justifying us. He is for us, whether it be the giving on His side, or the guilt on ours. He is for us as to the trials, or the difficulties. No matter what, if God be for us, who can be against us? When trial comes, we remember that there is a rest. And, if there be a rest, it is for God’s people; and, if it be for God’s people, it is God’s rest, and He will come and take us to it. I may send and fetch a person to me, if I do not care particularly for him; but if I think much about him, I shall go and meet him myself. So He says, “I will come again, and receive you unto myself.”

Deliverance

The Epistle to the Romans, beloved friends, takes up the Christian, if we compare one aspect of his condition with another, on the lowest ground. If for instance we take the Ephesians, there we find the Christian spoken of as "raised up together, and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus"; but you never get him there in the Epistle to the Romans. Though in the end of chapter 8 it is stated that he is predestinated in God's original purpose for the glory, yet we never get him as risen and in the heavenly places, but looked at, as on this earth, and of course he is. We will see now a little, with the Lord's help, how He does look at a Christian on this earth.

Now thus looked at, though not sitting with Christ, yet Christ is his life. Here am I a sinner in myself, and my flesh has got no good in it. The whole Epistle develops very fully what the Christian is, looked at in this world, and the chapter I have read treats one special part of it, and that is his positive state and standing, not his guilt; as to his guilt, it has been treated very fully up to the middle of the previous chapter.

To begin with, the apostle says he is "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed." And then he goes on to shew why it must be God's righteousness that is revealed—simply because man has none. God's law had come and required righteousness in man, which it could not find; but the gospel comes and reveals God's righteousness,

and he is not ashamed of it because it is revealed in it. He shews us the Jews under law and the Gentiles without law, and proves “every mouth stopped, and all the world guilty before God.” Instead of the law making it any better for the Jews, it only proved their guilt; and as to the Gentiles, that which might have been known of God in creation left them without excuse when they went to idolatry.

He next shews us how “God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,” and applies that death to the past and the present, saying that it declared “God’s righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God.” God had been forbearing with them, but there had been no proof of righteousness in His forgiving them one more than another; but now on the cross it is explained. And not only this, but He is “just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” There it is the present time, His righteousness is now revealed, and we stand upon the ground of this righteousness that has been revealed.

The place where it has been shewn and manifested is in setting Christ at God’s right hand. This is a demonstration of the sin of the whole world, because it did not believe in Christ; also a demonstration of righteousness, “because I go to My Father, and ye see Me no more”: the Saviour they had rejected they would see no more till He came again as Judge. Thus the gospel comes and shews us that He is seated there (besides being the Son of God) in virtue of the work of the cross. There is where God’s righteousness is displayed for faith to look at. I see thus the perfect love of God which sought us in this way. I had sins, but no righteousness; I have nothing but Christ to look to, and

my eye rests through faith where God's eye rests; God is satisfied, and so am I through grace. I see the sins put away through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, so that there is no more question of sin, because my righteousness is Christ; He is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." All is perfectly settled once and for all, and I am made the righteousness of God through Christ—God's righteousness. What we rejected God accepted, and proved His righteousness thereby. All the fruit of the old man is done away, and we are in Christ accepted.

But now comes another question; not that of our sins being put away, but of our deliverance from the principle of sin. As we read, "As he is, so are we in this world." On the ground of what we are by faith all our sins are put away; but then comes the power of sin—this evil nature —what is in me, not what I have done. But can I in this world say that I am delivered from sin? that I am made free from sin?

Now this word "free" is often abused in English; it has two meanings. It is not here used in the sense that there is none in us, as I would say, "That horse is 'free' from vice"; but it is in contrast to the word "captive." It means we are not captive to sin. He takes up the question of law as he took up the question of righteousness. Man had not made out righteousness either with law or without it; then God gave him Christ to be his righteousness. Now the question is whether, we having thus got righteousness, the law can deliver us.

Well, in chapter 8 it says, "What the law could not do." It is not guilt now, but the flesh is not subject, neither can be. He means it has a will of its own. We know we have a

will of our own. Now a will of our own is the principle of sin: whenever I have got a will of my own, there is sin—self-will, just the same as Eve when she would go and eat the fruit. The law thwarted the acting of will, of course; it was “holy, and just, and good,” so it must; but it did not take away, nor did it alter sin; but “what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh”: the law of course had nothing to do with that.

There are three things the law could not do: it could not give life, and, even supposing we got life, it does not give strength; and, another thing of the deepest moment for our souls, it does not give an object. But in Christ I find my life, my strength, and my object. “They that are after the Spirit do mind the things of the Spirit”; they have the true object. I get in Christ an object that is sufficient to delight God Himself.

For the fact of life will not do; we must have it, of course, but that is not sufficient. The old man is here yet: there are lusts. The flesh lusts against the Spirit, and “it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be”; therefore the law instead of delivering me brings me into captivity. It is just what we get in Romans 7. Suppose a man quickened in this world, what will be the effect of the law upon him? It will give him the knowledge of sin; “I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment,, deceived me, and by it slew me.” Yet “the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good”; but it did not give anything of what we want;

it was only the rule outside it, and gave us nothing to enable us to walk up to it. Here was a man in a kind of sleepy indefinite way going on quite comfortably, a man with a good conscience; “I verily thought with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.” When the law came, it said, “Thou shalt not covet”; but it did not take away the lust; and he found at once another law warring against the law of his mind, and bringing him into captivity to the law of sin. There was no deliverance. God allowed him to use every kind of effort to get the victory; but it all only went to prove not simply that he was guilty, and that he had an evil nature, but that besides this he had no strength; and that is an exceedingly miserable condition.

If we were to tell the world that they had no strength, they would say, Why, there is an end to all morality! Even a child has faith in its own powers; it says, Oh, I will be good tomorrow! But I say, I am going to punish you to-day—for what you are now! And this lesson of no strength is a great deal a more humbling one to learn than that of the fact that certain sins have been done in some past time of my life. It raises the question, not of what I was before I knew Christ, but of what I am now that I do. “They that are in the flesh cannot please God”; but the effort made to do so is very useful in this way, that it brings us to the discovery of what we are. If you have found this out, you have found out what Paul did: “to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not.”

But now is there no deliverance? Of course there is—positive deliverance!

As I have been saying, the apostle shews us, besides the question of guilt, the question of state. I have been seeing what the state of bondage is of a renewed man under law, in contrast to the state of a renewed man knowing what it is to be risen with Christ. We are united to Christ risen, and, being thus, He brings in, not the death of the law, but our death. So that I have not got to hunt up things in my heart to see whether evil is present with me; this would be law, and the law cannot help me at all; but I have got Christ as my life, Christ risen and glorified too; and I am past death and raised up, though I do not go on to glory here, because it is a man here walking on the earth. I have got Christ to be my life, not Adam; I am not alive to God at all as born of Adam; we are "not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in us." When I stood as a child of Adam before God, the law was applied to me on that footing. I have not got what meets it. As long therefore as I am in the flesh, I cannot meet God or please God, and I never can get free or happy with God. So much the better, that I may find it out.

Now the flesh never changes; "it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." When man fell, the world got so awfully bad that God had to destroy it; when God's Son came into the world, they crucified Him; when the Spirit came, the flesh lusted against it; and when it has gone into the third heavens, it puffs a man up—if there were a fourth heaven, it would only puff him up more: that is the end of it!

But there is deliverance! If there were not, I would not speak of it. Then where is it? In death! It is when Christ has died and has risen that He becomes the power of life in me; but in itself this does not put away the flesh.

There is nothing for it but what is added: “God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh”; there is no pardon, no taking it away, nothing but absolutely condemning it. If I take the cross, the highest act of grace, I find that there God condemned sin in the flesh.

But then, beloved friends, this condemnation of sin in the flesh, what was it in? I cannot get away from this evil nature, and Satan too is against me. But Satan is nothing to the new man! Only “resist the devil, and he will flee from you”; but he is everything for the flesh, of course! The world is just a great system that the devil has built up round man to keep him easy without God. It began at once with Cain; he goes out from the presence of the Lord, and what is he to do? He builds himself a city in the land of the vagabond. God never made the world as we see it; of this world Satan is the prince. Cain built his city so as to be comfortable in the world; and there were the artificers of brass and iron, and there he gets Jubal with his music, and he calls the city by the name of his son, and there we see all the conveniences of life, and harps, and organs, and then people ask, What is the harm of brass or iron, of harps or organs? None! I do not say there is any harm in music and instruments; but this I say, there was a great deal of harm in his making himself comfortable in them without God. We have got capacities for music and art and so on, and people take pains to amuse themselves with them because there is a famine in the land.

I find in the cross of Christ “the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world”; I find sin and the flesh condemned there. Condemned in what? In death! If the law condemned sin in the flesh, it only got to the lust; it

was the ministration of death, and ministers condemnation. But what I get in Christ is death—the death of the old man. In His sacrifice I get death: He has not only been crucified for my sins, but I have been crucified with Him. Whilst He has become my life, His death is as available for the old man as His life is for the new. He not only died for our sins, but He died unto sin once; "in that he died, he died unto sin once"; not that He had any for Himself, but that He put Himself there for us; and then "likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord"; I have the full power of life.

"God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." I find sin a grief to my heart. Now, God condemned it in Christ on the cross; and as a believer I have death to sin just as much as I have condemnation for sins all gone. "He died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Well, now, that is where it comes out!—I cannot win the victory! But God is teaching me the whole thing is settled; it is, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." It is not simply that the old man is not there—that is not deliverance; nor that the combat is not there: but do you think it is the same thing if I am struggling with a man and I get him down with my knee on his chest, or if the man gets me down with his knee on mine? If I combat with Christ for me, I get my knee on him. Of course there must be combat, but meanwhile I am not saying I am captive to the law of sin, whereas what we see in Romans 7 is a man who is: his soul is all right, but he cannot do it.

I get in the death of Christ this testimony, “Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God”; and as to ourselves, we are to be “always carrying about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus.” I am thus set free. It is not that flesh is not there; it was in Paul, but he had the thorn in the flesh to buffet him; he got it to keep something down. Well, that proved it was there; the thorn kept it down so that it did not shew itself, but still it was there. If you fancy it is not there you lower your standard; but there is no reason why you should ever for one single instant let the flesh stir or shew itself. And what has brought you to this is death; of course, you must have life for it, or else you would be dead to everything.

Now, you are never called to die to sin, because the old man has died in Christ and the new man cannot die. Have not you been baptised to death? Then how can you Hve on in sin if you are dead to it? Are you dead? And where? In the death of Christ. It is always a past thing; there is no such thought in Scripture as our dying; it is we “are dead.” You have never any death for the old man but that of Christ on the cross. What faith gets hold of is this; I have died in Christ; then I am free. Therefore mark, beloved friends, what he says: “How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? “He brings in death instead of the law; he puts the flesh to death, to faith, of course; he does not look for fruit from it; but he comes and kills the tree and puts another in its place, and that is Christ, and says, “Yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace”; I am now free!

Well, you are free; and what are you going to do? Are you going to give yourself back to sin again? Why, “yield yourselves to God as those that are alive from the dead.” Of course He does not come and say this to unconverted men; but, the moment a man calls himself a Christian, I say, Now you are alive and free; to whom are you going to give yourself?

One word more. It is of great importance to grasp this complete redemption—the death and resurrection of Christ Himself become the power of life to us, so that we can reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God. “What fruit had you in those things?” But now, he says, you have fruit— fruit to holiness down here; you walk in a path that you know has beauties—positive fruit of holiness in this world, and “the end, everlasting life.”

But, I repeat, in this epistle you are perfectly in the world, and how are you to get power? Through death. Suppose for a moment that I always held myself dead, there would not be a movement—not a lust; therefore, John, speaking of it in an abstract way, says, “He that is born of God doth not commit sin.” It is just as if all sorts of evil things were outside in my passage, and the danger lay in my opening the door and letting them creep in; you will find all these evil things in your room if you do not watch. What we are called upon to do is, not to die, but to put to death; “Mortify your members that are upon the earth”; that is, I have power to do it, so I am to put them to death. Christ is my power, of course.

But, now, are you content to be dead? Of would you like to spare some of your flesh? Are you content to have no more of the world than a dead man has? Constantly we

shall find we have little chambers in our hearts that we do not like to open to God; we go on in our prayers until we come to that, and then we stop, and then God has to break the door open in some rude way. Practically you are saying, I would sooner have this idol than God; not in your soul, of course, or you would not be a Christian. But now, supposing you have not anything kept back from God, have you taken this ground with Him that you are practically dead? It is not perfection, because I know no perfection but Christ glorified. The only perfection that is before a Christian is conformity to Him in glory, and I am never satisfied until I am with Him in that glory. But are you free? Have you got real deliverance? "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." The first thing we want is forgiveness; but the second thing we want is deliverance, and it is there for us. I have my eye on that Man in the glory; I am going to be like Him; it is there I get the object that is before my soul.

God For Us

Romans 8:26-39

This is the only passage in the epistle to the Romans that speaks of the purposes and counsels of God. The epistle takes up the responsibility of man, shewing how grace has met it in the cross of Christ, and ends with exhortations founded upon this. Man is looked at as alive here on the earth, though justified, with Christ his life, and so dead to sin, and hence exhorted to yield himself to God as free. But in this one passage, which closes the doctrinal part of the epistle, the apostle gives us God's purposes.

In the previous part of the chapter he speaks of "no condemnation," of that which has been wrought out for us through the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. For it is not merely forgiveness and the clearing us of all our sins, it is positive deliverance from the power of sin in our Adam standing; it is not merely that which met the righteous judgment of God, but that which delivers us and brings us in Christ into a new place. And to this is added the presence of the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who first "bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God"; and, secondly, "helps" us as we pass along the road, "making intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered."

We are not in the flesh as to our standing before God, but our bodies are yet under the effect of sin, and being in the body "we groan within ourselves." Everything around us is in a state of confusion and corruption; we are redeemed in the midst of it, but we wait for the adoption, the redemption of the body.

The Christian, having thus the redemption of his sins, and the earnest and comfort of the Spirit, goes on to learn that God is for him. We do not know what to pray for as we ought. We have spiritual desires of good, and the sense of evil around us, though our intelligence is not clear enough; but He makes intercession in us according to God. We do not know what is the best thing to ask for: some things cannot be remedied till the Lord come; but, whilst we do not know what to ask for, we do know that “all things work together for good to them that love God.” On this we can reckon with unfailing assurance.

Job is a wonderful book in this way. There we are given to see how these divine dealings are carried on. The throne of God is set up, and the sons of God come in before Him, and Satan goes in too. Then come God’s thoughts about His servant; “for the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to shew himself strong in the behalf of them whose heart is perfect toward him.” But we must wait God’s time, and then we see “the end of the Lord,” for God was looking on all the while.

It began, note, with God. He says to Satan, “Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in all the earth, a perfect and an upright man?” God had considered him. Satan says, Well, You have made a hedge about him, so why should he not fear You? Then God lets Satan loose at him. He lets him take all that he has, his servants are killed, his children too afterwards, his fortune gone; and Job says, “The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.” Then Satan says, Skin for skin, a man will give anything he has for his life! Then God says, You can have his body,

but not his life. So Satan smites him with sore boils, so that he becomes both wretched, and the derision of his neighbours. His wife wants him to curse God and die, but in all this Job sins not; he has “received good at the hands of the Lord and shall not he receive evil?” So that I get this fact: all that Satan did against Job entirely failed, save that it entirely cleared him from Satan’s accusation and the charge of hypocrisy. All that Satan could do he did, but could do no more than he was allowed to do.

But now we see how God was watching over Job. Job was full of himself. He was doing blessedly, but he was thinking of it too. Supposing God had stopped short here, what would have been the effect of it? Why Job would have said: Well, I was gracious in prosperity, and now I have been patient in adversity; and he would have been worse than ever. God had justified him from Satan’s accusations, and his suffering had only prepared the way for closer dealings of God.

Job’s friends come and tell him that he must be a wicked man, or such things would not have befallen him; that this world was an adequate witness of the government of God. Whether his pride was hurt by his friends, or whether it was their sympathy broke down his spirit, as sympathy often does, I cannot say; but now Job broke down, utterly, and cursed the day when he was born. It brought the flesh out. The loss of the cattle and all that, had been nothing, but now the latent evil is laid bare. Still his faith recognises the good in God, though his flesh breaks sadly out. “Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.” So he says, If I could find God, He would not be like you. But his friends’ work was done now.

Then Elihu comes and takes the ground of special providence in God's dealings with His people. He says, Take heed lest God does not take you away with a stroke. But when God comes in, Job says, not "when the eye saw me, it blessed me," but, "now mine eye seeth thee, wherefore I abhor myself, and I repent in dust and ashes." He knows himself in God's sight. And all that Satan has done was merely as the instrument preparing for the work that God was going to do.

Thus we get an exhibition of God's ways. This world is not now an adequate witness of God's government. On great occasions it may be sometimes seen, and indeed, if we have eyes, in small. At the flood it was; and at the destruction of Jerusalem Israel was made to taste it. But, even now, God has the upper hand, and makes everything work together for good. In the book of Job we are let behind the scenes. We see God teaching the man's own heart what was in it, giving him to feel his utter nothingness, and outward blessing followed. For such was the character of blessing as known in that day in the way of government.

The apostle looks beyond all this discipline—beyond the ways of God on the road, which are only the instruments to work out His purpose. It is Satan's world in a certain sense, though he cannot take things out of God's hand. He could go to the Chaldeans and say, Take the cattle; and how little they knew they were doing God's will all the time, and that the hand of God was in it! They are all the ways of God with a view to His purpose, making everything work together for good, "for whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren." That is His purpose, and we are

even now nigh enough to see and trace His hand—anyhow we shall see it soon, if we do not now.

He goes through the whole course of God's sovereign purpose till it lands us in the glory. It is well to notice that predestination is always to something; it is not the persons merely, but He has predestinated them to something. Then He closes it all in with, "What shall we say to these things? If God be for us who can be against us? "Not only am I cleansed so that I can stand before God, but I get this immense truth— God is for me. As, by Christ, I believe in God, my heart knows that God is for me in everything; "He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous." The heart, in looking at God, can say as to every circumstance of the way, "God is for me." I may not always like what He does, but He is always for me. "Not a sparrow falleth to the ground," not without God merely, but "without your Father."

Job says, "Blessed be the name of the Lord," and it is lovely to see his patience and submission. But the apostle goes farther. It is another thing to "glory in tribulation." It is one thing to say, He is wise and good, and another to say, He is for me.

Another point, too, I would notice. When the Holy Ghost reasons with man, He does not reason from what man is for God, but from what God is to man. Souls reason from what they are in themselves as to whether God can accept them. No, I say, He cannot accept you thus; you are looking for righteousness in yourself as a ground of acceptance with Him. You cannot get peace whilst reasoning in that way, and I should be very sorry if you could. But "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." He loved

us from no motive at all but what was found in His own grace. We do not know Him. The prodigal did not know his father till his father was on his neck kissing him. He was reasoning from what he was, and not from what his father was, as to how he would receive him.

The Holy Ghost always reasons down from what God is, and this produces a total change in my soul. It is not that I abhor my sins; indeed I may have been walking very well; but it is "I abhor myself." This is how the Holy Ghost reasons; He shews us what we are, and that is one reason why He often seems to be very hard and does not give peace to the soul, as we are not relieved till we experimentally, from our hearts, acknowledge what we are. As in the case of the Syro-Phenician woman, the Lord does not seem to listen, and so He goes on until she owns that she has no title to anything, that she has no more claim through promise than through righteousness, till she only pleads that there is enough goodness in God to give her what she has no right to; and Christ cannot say that there is not.

Until the soul comes to that point He does not give it peace— He could not; it would be but healing the wound slightly. The soul has to go on until it finds there is nothing to rest on but the abstract goodness of God; and then "If God be for us, who can be against us?" There are three things here in which He is for us: God is for us in giving; He has given the very best thing, Him who is one with Himself, His Son. If God has given His Son, surely He will give everything else. Of course He will! It is reasoning down from what God is and what God has done. I ask, Will He give me all I want? Yes, indeed; and not only all I want, but He will set me in the glory, and I certainly shall not want anything there. This is the

giving part. If He have given His Son, He will certainly give less things.

Well, but what about my sins? This is the very place I learn how great the love is; where I get the answer, “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth.” Why, it goes up to God in justifying. It is not we are justified in His sight, but He justifies. Little matter who condemns if God justify. If I look at my sins I get this great truth, that “God is for me.” It is through the work of Christ I am justified, but here God is looked at as the source of it all.

It is just as in Zechariah, when Joshua stood clothed in filthy garments. Satan accuses him, and what has he to say for himself? Nothing. And who takes up his cause? The Lord Himself! And can Satan begin again after that, or put the brand in the fire which God has plucked out? God takes away the filthy garments; He replies to Satan and puts him to silence as the accuser, and that too when Israel were wretched sinners, just come out of Babylon. He says, Give him a change of garments. And so He is ever about our sins. He is first for us in giving, and then in justifying. He does not leave us in our filthy garments.

“Who is he that condemneth?” ought to be in the previous verse.

Then arises the third point: shall anything separate us from this divine love? “It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God.” He does not say God; we find God again lower down, but here it is Christ; and see how gracious this is. I get the love of One who has gone into all the difficulties, all the sorrows of the way. We do not know

much of them, but still there are trials, and what do we get in them? Divine love. Christ has tasted it all. God is for us in them. “It is Christ that died.” He has been down even into death, so I need not be afraid of that. Oh, but then He is so high up now! Well, if He be, “He ever liveth to make intercession for us.” He went through all these things that try and test the heart down here, and up there He lives for us. So “who shall separate us from the love of Christ?”

It does not say from Christ, but from His love. We certainly never shall be separated from Christ, but the point here is, that no circumstances by the way can separate us from His love. There are none that He has not been through. Perfect isolation in this world is perhaps the most trying thing a man can go through. Christ was absolutely isolated. As regards comforters here He had not one. At the very table where He told of one going to betray Him, they disputed who should be the greatest! The Holy God looks down upon us, and, in His love, counts the very hairs of our head as a Father; but here it is the love of Christ in that He has gone through the sorrows.

“Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution?” More perhaps than cares; it is the cross that answers to the crown. “Or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.” So the apostle had the thorn in the flesh —that which to human eyes, and to his own, was a great hindrance to his preaching, making him awkward in his ministry; but he gloried in it. The me was put down, and it paved the way for the power of Christ. It was not that

he did not feel it, but he says, “I glory in infirmities that the power of Christ may rest upon me”; and in Romans 5, “We glory in tribulations.” I have the key to it all in knowing that God is for me and that “He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous”; so I can glory in it. It is more than submission. It is the apprehension of the ways of God through this world, and the knowledge that there is a perpetual care over us making everything work together for our good. Let Him work, though in trial; He wants to do me good in my latter end.

“For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” No suffering that can come to me through a creature can separate me from this love which is in God. It is a love which is divine in its nature, and which comes down into all my circumstances. God is thinking of me in the trial; He knows beforehand all about it. He did not pray that Satan might not sift Peter, but that Peter’s faith might not fail. He had to be sifted. Why so? Because there was confidence in himself, and this must be broken down. But then there was the danger that he might despair, and go out and hang himself like Judas, and so the Lord prays for him. He must be sifted, like you and me, but it must be under God’s eye that he may learn the perfect character of God’s love to him in it all.

God is then for us in giving, for us in justifying, for us in caring for us in everything; even as with the children of Israel, He took care of their very clothes as they passed through the wilderness. God is for us through everything. If death stare me in the face, well, Christ

went through it. If evil powers be against me, well, I have a love with me that has been tried, and destroyed that power. I learn in these very things the perfectness of the love of God. It comes out in the minutest circumstances, in every little detail. I come up boldly to this truth, that “If God be for us, who can be against us?” There is nothing that can make me say, I do not know whether He be for me or not. If it be difficulties and trials, I say, Well, it just shews what pains God is taking with me.

And now, beloved friends, have you got to thus thinking of God? It may not be very pleasant, but certainly not a single thing can happen to me that is not the very best thing that God can do for me. Submission is all right, but it is “In everything give thanks.” Can you do that? Are you near enough to God to give thanks to Him for everything? Our wills must be broken (that is quite true); but our hearts meanwhile give thanks. We shall feel the sorrow; God does not mean that we should not; it is not insensibility; but I get this blessed truth, that He who works all things according to the counsel of His own will is the One who is for me. Then I can so trust His love, my will being broken, that I can not only bow but give thanks.

The Lord give us so to know Him that we can say, I am but a poor vile sinner, but I have learned this, that God is for me. Amen.

Sanctification

John 17

I have it on my heart to say a few words on this chapter in reference specially to the character of sanctification.

At this moment, as we all know, the Lord was rejected. From chapter 13 we get Him speaking on this ground: “Jesus knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father.” All through the Gospel, from chapter 1, He is unknown to the world, and rejected by the Jews. “He came unto his own, and his own received him not.” But from chapter 13 He speaks as going out of the world and ascending on high.

In this chapter, however, what is brought out is, that He came forth from the Father, not from God only; and this involves “eternal life”: “To know thee [the Father] the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” That is where eternal life comes in. Its character is that it is the knowledge of the Father; for the Father sent His only-begotten Son, that we might live through Him. Of course, therein we know God also, “who by him do believe in God”; but it is in the knowledge of the Father, and Jesus sent by Him, that there is eternal life. And then the character in which we know Him is that of “holy Father”; and this is sanctification. When it is a question of the world, it is “righteous Father.” It is not that grace does not go out to poor sinners in the world to deliver them out of it, but that saints are not of it and have done with it.

In some places it is a current thought that Christ came into the world to connect Himself with humanity—that

He united Himself to man in the incarnation—which is utter falsehood. He was a true man—in one sense more man than we are, for a perfect thing is more than a corrupt thing. The union of God with man—with humanity as it was—is wholly unscriptural; there is none before redemption. Nor is it ever said that God, or a divine Person, united Himself to us. The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, true man in the flesh, but no union with us; and to maintain that there is is totally false. I refer to it, because it is very current among Christians of all shades and forms. The doctrine of Scripture is that we are united to Christ after redemption is accomplished—to a glorified Christ. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone" —entirely and totally alone.

We have here a most important point practically, because "the friendship of the world is enmity with God." Wherever I let the spirit and associations of the world in, I am associating myself with that which has rejected Christ. It may seem harsh, but it is not so harsh as the world rejecting Christ when He was here in grace. So the judgment of God is connected with it. He says, Righteous Father, I have manifested thee, and the world has not known thee. So when it comes to the Holy Ghost it is, "Whom the world cannot receive," because it does not know Him; it is only the believer who can. The world is a judged system, "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The Lord laid the foundation of an entirely new state of things, as to which He says, "holy Father." As to the world, it is said, it "hath not known thee"; and you cannot present God better to the world than Christ did.

You will find as things go on in these last days that this question will come up. Faith sees by the Holy Ghost what God's thoughts about it are, and our part is to get hold of them. When the Lord comes, it will be too late for the world; that is the day of judgment.

"If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." The Father has a world of His own which He has given to us, to which He has taken Christ to be the centre—the new creation. The world, as it is, rejected Christ when He came into it; and now all that is over. He came in grace: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself"; "He came unto his own and his own received him not." And now we are to walk by faith as to these things, and not by sight, for the whole thing we belong to is a new creation. "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures." That is what a Christian is; and we have to keep hold of it in our walk and in our testimony. I do not know what good we are if we go along with the world that rejected Christ. It is true we have the treasure in earthen vessels, but we belong entirely to the new creation; the treasure is not in its natural associations as to its surroundings here.

It is a solemn thing to say, but it is the truth, that we are begotten by the word of God. Plenty of creatures He had before; you might call Adam a kind of firstfruits if you like; but the saints now are the firstfruits of a creation that is not manifested at all, except as they live according to it here. We have to shew it out in our bodies until Christ comes.

We read also, "By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once." In

Hebrews it is always sanctification by the blood—on the cross. There was a complete breach between God and the world, and the believer set apart to God. Here there is a double ground of sanctification, God's will and Christ's offering. And thirdly, which is the practical part of it, we get the Holy Ghost as Him who actually works it, the immediate agent of the work in us: "Elect, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." There is the communication of a new life in Christ: "He that hath the Son hath life: and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." It is the spiritual life, of course, he is speaking of; a man has not got life at all if he have not got the Son.

But, you say, do they not all know this? No. The common doctrine is that you are born again, but this is viewed as a change of the old man. They say that you were body, soul, and spirit before, and that you are only body, soul, and spirit after, only in a changed state, and that it is an exaggeration to speak of anything more—of two natures —of any new nature added. But it is a totally new thing—Christ our life, so as even Adam, innocent, had it not. And this is really the principle of holiness. That which is born of God is a holy thing; we are "born again … by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever," for the word of God does abide for ever. It is a totally new thing; in the unconverted world it is not there at all; and therefore the Lord stops Nicodemus by saying, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God"; he must be born of water and the Spirit. Many, I trust, do know this, but, where there is ignorance as to it, it will work gradually out in some shape, and it makes

all the difference whether I distinctly recognise that it is a new man, Christ living in me, by which I live to God.

Christ is that eternal fife which was with the Father, and becomes spiritually our life; it is nothing that is in man or of man. That gives it its true character. “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our. eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.” We have seen eternal life in the Person of the Son come down from heaven; He was made a man; so in John we read, “The life was the light of men.” It is emphatic there. It is not the life of angels. It is what you call a reciprocal proposition. That is, life and light of men answer completely to each other, and each may be affirmed of the other.

All that which was simple failure at the beginning came out as enmity against God’s own Son when Christ was in the world. He displayed divine goodness and power, all that divine grace could be; but this manifested God, and this man would not have at any cost. He says, “They have both seen and hated both me and my Father.” He was rejected in His word, and in His work, as is brought out in John 8 and 9. Thus it was not a question merely of failure and sin; there had been plenty of that before He came; it was that God Himself had been manifested in goodness before men, and because He was God they would not have Him. The world has been tested in this way, and the result is that, fallen man having been turned out of paradise, God, as far as man could do it, has been turned out of the world into which He had

come in grace, when it was in the sin and ruin into which man, that was turned out of paradise, had got. And so the world will not now bear a man that is like Christ. It will bear plenty of Christians; an amiable Christian it will get on with; but a Christian is called to be faithful. Remember the Christian has two natures, and wherever he gets on with the world, it is the Christian who goes to the world, for the world cannot go to the Christian; it has only one nature.

“The carnal mind is enmity against God.” Says the world, we will not have Him. So “He gave himself to deliver us from this present evil world.” Thus I get the One, the Man that the world rejected, and that God delighted in; and God says, I must carry out My purposes of grace; and to Christ, Come and sit at My right hand till I carry them out. So that is where He is gone, and the world sees Him no more.

Now for the character of sanctification connected with this.

In Israel it was a little different. God was amongst them as a delivered people. He said to them, “Be ye holy, for I am holy”; I will not have you in My camp without holiness. God was there; within the veil certainly; but still He insisted upon it that they were a people whom He had taken to Himself, and that they must behave themselves as such. The veil was there unrent, “the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest”; this characterising the whole of God’s dealings then with man as to the revelation of Himself. He was sitting within the veil; death to any man who came in! even the beast that touched the mount was to be stoned. God was saying, I

am so holy that I cannot let any one come near Me. I will give you laws and promises, but into My presence you cannot come.

It is not so now. When Christ died, the veil was rent, and we have “boldness to enter into the holiest.” What was was that God did not come out to man, and man could not go in to God. Keep the law, and have human righteousness, but still do not come near Me. All this closed in the rejection of Christ. What is is that the veil is rent from top to bottom, and that the only place I have to walk in is in the light as God is in the light, and if I cannot walk in the light I cannot walk with God at all. A Christian’s place is not that he ought, but that he must walk in the light as God is in the light, or he cannot walk with Him, or in relationship with Him at all, for now there is no veil. We have a title to be in the holiest by the blood that brought us there, and are fit for it as cleansed from all sin, and there is no other place to walk in with God. But we reckon ourselves also dead to sin, to all that is without. This is the very thing that gives us deliverance. I am not in the flesh at all, therefore I can go in with boldness.

We then come to what this sanctification is positively. God has personally accepted man in Christ; the Son of God is in the glory. Our actual condition is never spoken of except as being in connection with the second Man in glory; our only connection with God is in Christ; we are “predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.” This is not a question of our responsibility; it all depends upon the finished work of the second Man; it rests upon what is done. Christ has obeyed even unto death, and is glorified. As the result of His work, we have been

begotten again with the word of truth, we have been made the children of God through faith in Christ Jesus, and thus have a new nature. We are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ.

Now this new nature must have an object, and God has given it one that is not in this world at all. There is not a single thing in this world that will not unsanctify us if we go after it. Sanctification is all connected with Christ in glory. The whole thing is new: the nature, the character, the object by which we are sanctified through the Holy Ghost, is outside the world entirely. The work being fully accomplished, the Holy Ghost comes down and says, Now the world is done with, and if you do not come out of it in body, be out of it and in heaven in spirit. I have come down purposely to connect you with One outside it. The object before us is a glorified Christ; He is our life: we are “created in Christ Jesus.” The believer has duties here, and is not taken out of the world; but his life is wholly connected with Christ at the right hand of God, and everything that diminishes our perception of Him there diminishes our practical sanctification here.

Our testimony is that the Man whom the world rejected is at God’s right hand. Where the gospel begins is (not with Christ come into the world, great as was the grace and love shewn in that to win man’s heart, and to which he turns to feed on with delight when saved, but) with Christ turned out of it. The world rejected Him, and God took Him up into heaven and made Him there the head of the new creation, and we are to be conformed to it. “And now, little children, abide in him; that, when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his coming. If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth

righteousness is born of him. Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not." "Sons of God"; we have the title of Christ: "I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and your God." This was never said before redemption.

And just mark how the apostle identifies us with Christ; "the world knoweth us not because it knew him not." He completely associates us with a rejected Christ down here. "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be" —we have the treasure in poor earthly vessels now; "but we know" —we are so identified with Christ—"that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is"—up there in glory. We shall never see Him as He was down here in humiliation, but in glory we shall see Him as He is.

And now what is the effect of this? "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." I see the work of redemption accomplished; I see Christ at the right hand of God; that is the Man I am connected with; and as to this first Adam, I must reckon it dead; it is enmity with God, and I am not in it though it be in me. When we look at our portion, it is that "we are sons of God, and when he shall appear we shall be like him." That is the Christian hope, beloved friends, and the only thing that there is for the Christian's heart.

He "purifieth himself even as he is pure." I can never be as He was, for He never had any sin in His nature; but I am going to be perfectly like Him. Thus I may do without all the notions of men as to perfection in this world;

these are a mere delusion from beginning to end, for it is a glorified Christ we are going to be like, and no other Christ. He does not say we are to be pure as Adam was.

And why purify myself? Because I am not pure, and therefore I must purify myself. He does not say pure as He is pure. But He is the standard by which I purify myself— Christ, as He is there above. I am to be like Him, and the life I have of Him can never be satisfied till then. I have ever to purify myself.

You may find other passages on the subject, but there is no other way of looking at sanctification in Scripture. There is no setting apart to God except in the second Man. It is, “Beholding with open [unveiled] face the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory.” Into what image? Why, the image of the One I am looking at—Christ in glory. We have it expressed in three ways: “Beholding with unveiled face the glory of the Lord”; then “the glory of Christ who is the image of God”; and then “the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.” When I come to associate it with man, I must get it as it is in Him up there. If I say, Where am I to look at God’s holiness in a man? I answer, In Christ in glory. He was the Holy One and walked according to the Spirit of holiness down here, and I am to walk as He walked; but that by which the Holy Ghost works this in us is by looking at the glorified Christ up there, by having an object and a motive up there which takes my heart out of all that is here, as His was who walked through the world, as I have to do. I am going to be with Him and like Him. A man who, in heart, is not only with God and for God, but even now an imitator of God as a dear child—that is Christian sanctification.

And as when Christ appears, we shall be like Him, and we purify ourselves now as He is pure; our holiness, our walk now, is referred to that day in 1 Thessalonians. His coming runs through all our relationships here, and then as to holiness it says, “The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all, even as we do toward you; to the end he may stablish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father” —where? In our walk down here, of course, people say. But it is not so put. It is “at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.” It is quite true the work in us is to purify ourselves as He is; but it is to be “unblameable in holiness” when He appears. Of course if we are sincere, we purify ourselves now as He is; but God has taken man clean out of this world as to his living associations and his conversation, and “when Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory.”

What a blessed calling is ours! all connected with a glorified Christ—a Christ that the world has rejected; with a holy nature, born of God, and as an object for this life, He has given you the glorified Christ the Son of God. God, even in this way, is making you partakers of His holiness. You say, But I must get this holiness formed perfectly in a man to know its true character. You have got it in Christ up there. Now let us turn back to the chapter we read, and you will find it there.

It puts us in Christ’s place before God—before the Father, more strictly—and into Christ’s place before the world. The first verse begins by bringing in the Father’s name, Christ on high after finishing the work, and then the disciples are placed before the Father too, His name being manifested to them. “Jesus lifted up his eyes to

heaven and said, Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son." The verse beginning, "Now come I to thee" closes the first part. Then He says, "I have given them thy word, and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." This is our place. In the thoughts and mind of God we do not belong to the world at all. Christ tested it in every way, and never found, except in a poor woman who anointed Him at Bethany, a single comforter or capacity for sympathy in others, not even in His disciples.

How then am I to be set apart in the world? If I have nothing wholly outside it, my leaving particular evils comes to giving up one thing and taking to another; but getting something that is outside of it delivers me wholly from its power.

Let us keep to the word of God. The word of God is the word of God; it "discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart." Men when reasoning against the truth will reject the word of God; they will reject its authority, and say, "Do not quote the Bible to me." It is just as if, when I have a fine-tempered sword in my hand, they should tell me not to use it. When you meet with cavillers, the only way is to use the word, and you will find that it does detect. Just use the word, and you will be astonished to see how they come out with all their rationalism and infidelity.

But to turn to it now. "They are not of the world, even as J am not of the world." Well, He says, "sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." This is just what Christ the blessed Son of God was; He was the truth itself, and the truth perfectly suited to man's heart and conscience. This is what the word of God does, looked at

as a means. The Father's word brings the truth into my heart, and searches it, and detects everything that is there; it comes as a light and shews everything there that is not of the new creation. And it does so by revealing what is up there. The law did not do this; it came and claimed from man what man ought to be down here; no murdering, no stealing, and, besides this, condemning lust. It takes man as man, and says, That is what man ought to be. But this is not what we have got in Christ. What we have in the truth in Him is the bringing of what is heavenly down to a quickened soul, the bringing down to it all that is in God's mind about itself. It is set apart to God by the revelation of what is heavenly, what is in Christ above, and judges thus all that is not. They were believers, and now He is looking for them to be sanctified, and that is done by shewing them what is heavenly, associating them with what is in Him above by the Father's word.

"As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." To carry what? The manifestation of Christ revealed by the Father's word. I cannot be sent into the world if I am in it and of it, nor can I go there as sent by Christ, but as I am fully associated with Him in the spirit of my mind. He says, I send them into the world as Thou hast sent Me. What does that tell us of their mission?

"And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified by the truth." He is set apart as the Man of God's counsels and heart, as Man in glory. Nay, He says, "I set myself apart"; and the Holy Ghost brings the knowledge of it down, and, by the communication of Christ in glory, makes me more like Him every day. He says, You must not have a motive that is not drawn from

Me in heaven. All sanctification is referred to being like Him there, kept by the Holy Father to walk as He walked down here before His Father.

Whilst it is, “Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me,” it is, “Righteous Father, the world hath not known thee.” It is very solemn. He appeals to the Father as against the world. It is lying in wickedness. Meanwhile, Christ is “made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” “Imputed” cannot be applied to all these words. If to any, it is not the subject of this text. People talk of “imputed sanctification”; how about imputed redemption? What does that mean? I hope we shall get more than imputed redemption on going into glory! It is the kind and measure and standard of these things, and that is Christ, and He made them of God to us.

It is a question of partaking in God’s holiness. The world has rejected the Son of God. Up to the cross it was proved that nothing could win man’s heart: he must be born again; and now, being born again, I am associated with Christ. I am going to be in the same glory that He is in, and I am going on until I get there, purifying myself as He is pure. Then I shall see Him as He is, and be like Him. The world we are naturally of has rejected the Son of God, and the associations of the believer are with a glorified Christ, waiting till He comes to take him home. God has sanctified us to Himself by the blood of Christ.

The State Of The Soul After Death

The state of the soul after death is a subject which deeply interests us all. The rejection of the coming again of Christ to receive the saints, and to judge the earth, before the end of the world, and the losing sight of the distinctive importance given to the resurrection in the New Testament, has given in the common evangelical faith, and that where sound in the main, an absolute character to the vague idea of going to heaven, exclusive of all other conception of happiness and glory. But Scripture spoke too plainly of the Lord's coming and the resurrection of the saints, to allow the thought of going to heaven when we die to maintain the absorbing place it held in the minds of the pious. Strange to say, going to heaven is not spoken of in Scripture, unless in the one case of the thief upon the cross going to be with Christ in paradise. Not that we do not go there; but the scriptural thought is always going to Christ. Since He is in heaven, of course we go there; but being with Christ, not being in heaven, is what Scripture puts forward, and this is important as to the state of the spiritual affections. Christ is the object before the soul, according to the word, not simply being happy in heaven, though we shall be happy and in heaven. I speak of it only as characterising our habits of thought. Poor human nature is apt to fall into Scylla to avoid Charybdis. It is apt, too, to follow its own thoughts, not simply to receive the word of God. There was a reaction, and the recovered truth of the Lord's coming and the first resurrection obtained an importance in some minds, which eclipsed the going to heaven when we die, too vague, and too little formally scriptural, to satisfy those awakened to

search the word. It was stated that the soul sleeps, is unconscious, till the resurrection, even by some who, in the main, were sound in the faith; while with others this notion carried them on to deny not only the immediate bliss of the departed, with Christ, but that we ever went to heaven, and what constitutes distinctive Christian hope. Alas! soon very many were led to deny the fundamental doctrines of the gospel.

My object now is not to enter into controversy with these last, who deny the immortality of the soul; it has been done, and done very effectually, by more than one; my object is to give a plain scriptural statement and proof from Scripture, that there is immediate happiness with Christ for the departed Christian. It is an intermediate state, and so, as to His position as a man, is Christ's though He be in glory. The departing Christian waits for the resurrection of the body—and then only will he be in his final state in glory. Men speak of glorified spirits, Scripture never. The purpose of God as to us is, that we should be conformed to the image of His Son, that He may be the firstborn among many brethren. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." "As we have borne the image of the earthy, so also we shall bear the image of the heavenly." This was exhibited for a moment when Moses and Elias appeared in glory with Christ at the transfiguration. (See Rom. 8:29; 1 John 3:2; 1 Cor. 15:49; Luke 9:28-36.) This, and to be for ever with the Lord, received to Himself in the Father's house, is our eternal state of joy and glory. This latter part is seen also in the account of the transfiguration, in Luke, where they enter (Moses and Elias) into the cloud whence the

Father's voice proceeded. (See also 1 Thess. 4:17.) But this is our eternal state, when Christ shall have come and received us to Himself raised, or changed into His likeness, when our poor earthly body shall have been fashioned like His glorious body; Phil. 3:21. God hath wrought us now already for this selfsame thing, and given to us the earnest of the Spirit; 2 Cor. 5:5. To be with the Lord and like the Lord for ever is our everlasting joy, and that the fruit of God's love, who has made us His children, and will bring us into the mansions prepared in our Father's house. Two things belong to us: first, to be like and with Christ Himself; and, secondly, to be blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Him. Redemption has made this ours; but we are not in possession. We have only the earnest of the Spirit, though God has wrought us for that selfsame thing.

The first point, being like Christ, we have already spoken of, though what has been cited there introduces us with scriptural authority, to the second—so shall we ever be with the Lord. But I add here other proofs of the second point, namely, that our portion is in heavenly places. It is distinctive of believers who have believed and suffered with Him. God, we are told, will gather together in one, under Christ, all things, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; Eph. 1:10. So we read all things were created by Christ and for Christ (Col. 1:16, 20); all things will be put under His feet as man; Heb. 2; 1 Cor. 15:27, 28; Eph. 1:22. But we read in Hebrews 2 that all things are not yet put under Him. He sits now on the Father's throne, not on His own; Rev. 3:21. God has said, Sit at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. He is (Heb. 10) expecting till His

enemies be made His footstool. The time will come when not only all things in heaven and earth will be reconciled (Col. 1:20), but even things under the earth, infernal things, will be forced to recognise His power and authority. Every knee shall bow to Him, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ, the despised and rejected of men, is Lord, to the glory of God the Father; Phil. 2:10, 11. For this we must wait. But in this gathering of all things in heaven and earth under one head, Christ, our part is in heavenly places, and as it is our portion now in spirit, so it will be our part in glory. Nor is there any real separation between these two. Of course we are not in glory now, there is no need to insist on that, but that is our calling now, that which we are redeemed to, and wrought for, and wait for. Now we have the treasure in earthly vessels, and groan, being burdened. When we are out of the body groaning is over, and we are with Christ in joy; when He comes we shall have a body suited to that heavenly place, we shall be in glory. Thus (Eph. 1:3), “He hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (2 Cor. 5:1), “We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens”; Philippians 3:20, “Our conversation [citizenship, our relationship in life as Christians] is in heaven”; and in the same chapter, verse 14, where you have ‘high calling,’ the true force of the word is calling above, as may be seen in a Bible with a margin. We are called to be up above there. So, in Hebrews 6:19, 20, we read that Christ is entered within the veil, that is, heaven itself; chapter 9:24, and as our forerunner. So, Hebrews 3, we are partakers of the heavenly calling. As united to Christ by the Holy Ghost, we are sitting in heavenly

places in Christ—not with Him yet, but in Him, that is our place. So, when the Lord comes, He gathers, indeed, as Son of man, out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity. But the righteous shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Hence, Moses and Elias not only are manifested in glory on earth, to shew the state of the saints in the kingdom, but they enter into the cloud, God's dwelling-place, whence the Father's voice came.

It is thus clear that as God will gather together in one all things, both which are in heaven and on the earth, our part is to be like Christ in glory, and with Him for ever, and that in heaven itself, blessed with all spiritual blessings (as Israel with temporal ones) and in heavenly places (as they in earthly). If we are joint-heirs with Him (Rom. 8:17), we have what is yet better, to dwell in the Father's house where He is gone. Hence it is clearly and distinctly expressed (Col. 1:5), that our hope is laid up for us in heaven, and Peter tells us (1 Pet. 1:4) that an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, is reserved in heaven for us. All this clearly shews our blessings are where our hope enters, where our forerunner is gone; what our glory is, celestial, not terrestrial. We shall bear the image of the heavenly, and shall be for ever with the Lord. He has gone to prepare a place for us in the Father's house, and will come again to receive us there to Himself. He has declared, "Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me be with me where I am." One might expatiate on the blessedness of this, the wondrous place given to us, that in the ages to come He might shew the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness towards us in Christ Jesus! but my object now is to give the scripture statement of our

blessedness, and the proofs of it. What I have said gives our calling the same throughout, from the moment we are called, to the glory of eternity. There is no other, there is “one hope of our calling.” God has called us to His own kingdom and glory; we rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Their Father’s house is the home of His children. But this has not told us, in distinct statements, what the intermediate state is, though it has shewn us, as a general principle, where all our blessing is, what redemption has obtained for us. The God of all grace has called us to His eternal glory by Christ Jesus; wondrous love! but an integral part of Christ’s own glory, for what is a Redeemer without His redeemed? And once I believe that the blessed Son of God has died for me as man on the cross, nothing that a creature whose life He has become, can have is too great, as the effect of it.

The whole object of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to shew that our portion is heavenly, in contrast with the Judaism which was, and, when Israel is restored, will bea earthly. They had a high priest on earth, because God sat between the cherubim down here. Such a High Priest became us; holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher than the heavens: why? because our place and portion are with God there. Our place and calling are in the heavenlies. All had to be suited to this; the excellence of the sacrifice and the service of the priest. But how far does the word of God shew us our intermediate state, between the time of our being in this tabernacle, in which we groan, and having it glorified, when Christ comes, and shall change our vile body, and fashion it like His glorious body? Once we have understood the previous passage, and that our calling and portion are heavenly, all is simple and plain.

Our citizenship now and always is in heaven. How far we enjoy it when we die is the only question—more than here, or less? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto Him (Luke 20:38), though dead for this world, they are for Him as alive as ever, and so for faith. But it is alleged they sleep. There is no ground for this whatever. Stephen fell asleep, that is, died. It was not his soul fell asleep after death; those which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with Him (1 Thess. 4:14), but these (v. 16) are the dead in Christ. Some have fallen asleep, that is, had died (1 Cor. 15:6), the same word as sleep in Jesus, in 1 Thessalonians 4. This is contrasted with being alive, in Thessalonians, with remaining to this present, in Corinthians. It is just simply dying, and a beautiful expression to shew they had not at all ceased to exist, but would wake up again in resurrection, as a man out of sleep. This is clearly determined in the case of Lazarus; John 11. The Lord says, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go that I may awake him out of sleep. They thought it was taking of rest in sleep; then said He plainly, Lazarus has died. That is, sleep means plainly dying, and awaking is not awaking the soul, as if it slept apart, and so leaving it, but bringing back from the state of death by resurrection. A Christian's falling asleep is neither more nor less than dying; a soul's sleeping is a pure invention. People living upon this earth fell asleep; that is, they died. That is what it means in plain speech, and nothing else, and we do learn clearly in Scripture the state of those who die in the Lord. Paul knew that God had wrought him (and he speaks of it as to all Christians, as their common faith) for glory, and did not wish to die (be unclothed) as if weary, but that mortality should be swallowed up of life.

Christians have Christ as their life, as they have Him as their righteousness, and, this being so, as to death itself (2 Cor. 5:6), they are always confident, knowing that whilst they are at home in the body they are absent from the Lord. Life, eternal life, in Christ they have, but here it lives absent from the Lord, in the earthen vessel; when it leaves the poor earthen vessel, which makes it groan, being burdened, it will be present with the Lord. Is that better or worse, and where is He? Is it, though it has already the Holy Ghost as the power of life, the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, going to sleep, and knowing nothing? Is that the confidence he had, who saw such a power in this life in Christ, that he was not, as his object, looking to die, but mortality to be swallowed up by it; yet, when it lost the tabernacle which made it groan, it was not capable of anything else! And remember Christ is our life; because He lives, we live. Have we lost our connection with Him when we die? Does He sleep in us? Again (Phil. 1) Paul was in a strait betwixt two, to depart and be with Christ, which was far better, dying—mark what he was speaking of— gain, though living with Christ. That is, he, having the blessed joy of knowing Christ was his life, and living entirely for Him, so that it was worth his while to stay, yet found it far better, gain, to go to sleep and know nothing of Christ or anything else! not having a thought of Christ or possibility of serving Him, his desire, as to his own joy, was to go to sleep, and know nothing of Christ at all. Is it not perfectly evident, that when he speaks of being with Christ, and of its being far better than serving Him here, though that was worth while, he speaks of the joy of being there? Who would think, if I spoke of the satisfaction and gain of going to somebody, and being with him, I meant I was going to be fast asleep, and not

know I was there? But we have more: the Lord declares to the thief, who alone of all men, in that memorable hour, confessed Him, that he should be with Him that day in paradise. Was it not happiness He promised him, being with Christ and in paradise? Does that mean that he should be fast asleep, and know nothing? I ask if it be not supremely ridiculous, and flying in the face of the very point of Christ's words. The statement occurs in Luke, who, all through his Gospel, after the first two chapters, which are consecrated to the poor pious remnant who waited for Christ, and give a most lovely picture of them—God's hidden ones in the midst of rebellious and unbelieving Israel— after these chapters, I say, the Evangelist gives the testimony of divine grace in the Son of man, and the present state. He proceeds with the genealogy of Christ up to Adam, and then unfolds, all through his Gospel, the grace that in the Son of man blesses man, and blesses him now, and in a heavenly way. It is not dispensational, like Matthew, but grace and present grace, and heavenly grace, by the gospel, the present state of things. It answers, as far as it goes, to the testimony of Paul and the Acts. Now the poor thief, while a most bright and eminent instance of the power of grace and faith, confessing Christ as Lord, when everything contradicted it, naturally did not go in knowledge beyond his countrymen. He was sure that He who hung upon the cross would come in (not into) His kingdom, and prayed that Christ might remember him then, in blessed confidence in Him. The Lord's answer was, according to the whole tenor of the gospel, You shall not wait for that. I bring salvation by grace; to-day, this selfsame day, you shall be with Me in paradise, the fit companion of Christ in blessedness. This, then, is the portion of the departed saint, to be with Christ in

blessedness, absent from the body, and present with the Lord. I am aware of the miserable subterfuge, by which it is attempted to read it—verily, I say unto you this day, thou shalt be with Me in paradise. It not only destroys the whole characteristic point of the passage, according to the tenor of the Gospel it is found in, but it perverts the order of the passage, as it destroys its sense. "To-day" is at the beginning of the phrase, to give it emphasis in answer to when Thou comest. There is the solemn assertion, "Verily, I say unto thee." To add 'to-day' to this is simply puerile, destroying withal the allusion to the request of the thief, who only hopes to be remembered when Christ should come in His kingdom. No, says the Lord, with the solemn 'verily' which He used, you shall not wait till then, this day you shall be with Me. What is the sense of "Verily I say unto thee this day"? It destroys the solemnity of the assertion, but "Verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in paradise" more than fulfilled the hopes of the thief, and revealed to us other than earthly joys, when we leave this world to depart and to be with Christ. The wickedness of the Jews, as an instrument, fulfilled the promise in breaking his legs, as it did that in which the work of redemption was accomplished, which gave the poor thief a title to be there. Such, too, was the expectation of Stephen, when death arrested his course here. He saw Christ, and looked to Him to receive His spirit. Did He receive it? And was it only to put an end to his service and joy alike, and put him to sleep?

The intermediate state, then, is not glory (for that we must wait for the body. It is raised in glory, He shall change our vile bodies, and fashion them like His glorious body); but it is blessedness where no unholy

evil is. It is being with Christ Himself, the source of joy ineffable. The hopes and “always confident” of Paul, of Stephen, were not disappointed, nor did the assurance given by the Lord to the thief fail of fulfilment. I ask if the bright hopes spoken of in 2 Corinthians 5, Philippians 1, in Acts 7, and the Lord’s words to the thief, for any honest mind, can mean going fast asleep, and knowing nothing? When the Lord described the state of the rich man and Lazarus, did it mean that either the wicked or the just were asleep, and knowing nothing? I shall be told it is a figurative description. I admit it fully; but it is not a false one, and it is not a figure of men going to sleep and knowing nothing. But, further, if 2 Corinthians 5:6-8 means being happy with Christ, it means being happy with Him when we die. Death is the subject spoken of, for the apostle had despaired of life (2 Cor. 1); and absent from the body, and present with the Lord, is not resurrection, it means leaving the body, not taking it; departing and being with Christ is not His coming and raising or changing us to be in glory. The apostle is speaking there again of death, remaining here, or leaving the world. It was dying which was gain; Phil. 1:21. Life and death are in distinct contrast in verse 20, and then analuo is used for dying (v. 23), as is analusis; 2 Tim. 4:6. The attempt to apply analuo or analusis to Christ’s return, because it is used for breaking up from or leaving a festival, is a poor conceit, contradicting the express statements of the passage. The word means disuniting or destroying what is united, and so is used for death. Neither Philippians 1 nor 2 Timothy 4 leave a trace of doubt in the matter. The effort to pervert Luke 23:43 and Philippians 1:20-23 is only a proof that the force of the passage cannot be got

over, and the character of the effort to set them aside betrays itself.

How a spirit enjoys Christ we cannot tell as to the manner of it, but there is no difficulty whatever. My spirit enjoys Christ now, in spite of the hindrance of the poor earthen vessel it is in, and though now we see Him not, yet rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory. It is not my body which enjoys Him now, but my soul spiritually, with the hindrance of the earthen vessel, and absent from Him, then without the hindrance of the earthen vessel, and present with Him. The believer may rest perfectly assured that, departing from the body, he will be present with the Lord, and if His presence is joy to him, that joy will be his. No one would be more anxious to press the Lord's coming, and our waiting for Him, and the importance of the resurrection. I would urge it, as I have urged it, on the saints, and indeed upon all, in its due place; but not to weaken that all live to God, even if they are spirits in prison, nor the excellent joy and blessedness of being with Christ when we depart, that to die is gain. It has justly cheered and shed heavenly light on many a dying bed, and yet will, if the Lord tarry; and the scripture is as plain as to the happiness of the saint on his departure as to his being with Christ, far better, as to joy, than the most successful service here, as it is that Christ will come and take all His saints to be with Him for ever in glory, like Himself; though the latter is the full and final state of eternal blessedness, when the marriage of the Lamb withal shall have come, and when we shall be for ever with the Lord.

Christ In Colossians I

On the whole I should judge that pro panton is not merely before all things in point of time, nor the head of them when taken up in power. Christ is prototokos pases ktiseos. He has this headship in place, because He has created them all. He must therefore have existed before them; and to say merely that He was before creatures as they are does not say a great deal. I apprehend that it is His natural superiority, not taken place, to all things, as having a being independent of, superior and prior to, them all; more than prototokos, which is a consequence of His being their Creator, more than priority in time; but distinctness of being superior to all in nature, independent of any place He took, and existing without them, hence in a nature which was superior to them all, referred to them all, but naturally as wholly above them; a divine place, because it was of nature in Himself, not given but estin, what He is, not egeneto. Autos estin pro p. And what follows confirms this; for all things subsist and consist as a whole, and the parts have each their sustaining and ordering energy in Him. He was first alone, independent of them, and then, when they existed, is the constant sustainer of them in the co-ordination in which they subsist, as of their subsistence itself. Still He is viewed as the Christ, but it is what the Christ is. We have no en in Hebrews I, but elalesen en. All the rest is mediatorial in character, though the Mediator is fully recognised as being God—indeed it is the object of the chapter, but it is the Christ who is recognised as being so.

So in Colossians I you have His place, only founded on what He is, and His creative and sustaining power, the creation having been en auto, the pro ponton as said not being the place He takes in virtue of creation in the resulting order of God, but what He is in His personal place and glory, always in respect of the ponton naturally, in divine place, power, and priority.

As to the church estin arche prototokos ek ton nekron ina genetai en p. autos pr. It is only by resurrection; and here we have result, what He becomes genetai. And then we get the resulting effect, and how far it is fulfilled.

Thus we have of the Christ what He did, verse 16; what He is, verse 17 and half 18; then what He becomes, or will be. Verse 15 is His general place and title as manifested, but fully accomplished at the end; His relationship in His place toward God and toward the creature, His mediatorial glory according to counsels. Verse 19 is part of the egeneto, though here only the eidokia as to it. The fact is in chapter 2:9, only it is not here His personality as one. Then in verse 20 et seqq. comes the effect.

John is simpler, speaking but of His Person. He was God, and all was created by Him. The rest is egeneto, as particularly verse 14. Colossians is more complicated, because, while saying what involves it, it does not state His divinity, but gives the place rather than the nature, though that place be naturally, or rather supernaturally, above or before all and the Creator’s, while John and Hebrews state that He is God.

En has the force of what characterises by the power which operates in that governed by it, dia used in similar

connection is of course instrumental. Thus en auto ektisthe ta panta. This past act of creation was wrought in the power which was personally in Him. For this reason He is prototokos when He personally takes His place in creation. So continuously all things consist en auto. It is the same power which continuously holds all together in the unity of the kosmos. When He speaks of the instrumental action by which all have been and are created, it is dia and eis auton. In verse 19 en has the ordinary sense of “in,” or place, pan to pleroma being the nominative (compare chap. 2:9), and this will reconcile di autou: so verse 22, en to somati, and dia tou thanatou. So en in a lesser case, verse 29, en dunamei, and chapter 2:2, en agape: cf. 2:23; as often en sarki, en pneumati, ye are en pn; Rom. 8.

Thus the creation of all things was characterised and wrought by the inherent power which was in the Lord Jesus Christ, and all things subsist together as one ordered and law-governed whole by the same constant and inherent power. When the pleroma is spoken of, then His Person is distinguished as the One by whom and for whom, He being to take it personally as the prototokos. All the fulness was pleased to dwell in Him, and by Him to reconcile: prototokos is what He is in creation, the reason oti en auto ektisthe. It is what He is, not His divine nor His human nature. Cf. 2:9, 10, where we have the pleroma tes theotetos in Him on one side, and we are pepleromenoi in Him on the other. This is consequently the place He has taken before God, head of all principality and power. The pleroma of Godhead dwells in Him, but when He takes a place as man before God, a man, but personally and above all principalities as man. The way in which the Godhead and Person of

Christ are connected, or both, before the mind of the Spirit, is striking in what follows. Verse 13 is clearly God; verse 14 passes on to Christ. He has taken it out of the way, beginning a new sentence grammatically distinct really.

The prototokos clearly holds a special place in the revelation of God's counsels. He takes it as man; He takes it as Son; but He takes it as having created all, all things having been created en auto. As a fact it is His creation, but also dia, looked at as the actual instrument of God's counsels; the object also, all is eis auton. But then in sovereign grace He is also prototokos amongst many brethren. So the prototokos is introduced into the world, and the angels worship Him. But then all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him, and we are complete, pepleromenoi, in Him. And now continually all things subsist in Him. Hebrews 1, though the same general truth, presents more a personal Messiah, and so manifestation. God has spoken en uio. He is the express image of His substance. Indeed in Colossians we have the eikon of the invisible God in the prototokos, and all this is in a man! It is a wonderful thing, and the place among men holds the first place, as in Proverbs 8. The church, as His body, is another line of thought, though closely connected. In John it is more the Son in and with the Father, and we in Him, more personal and relationship though it is in. With the Father it is ex (1 Corinthians 8:6), so Romans 11:36, ex, dia, eis. In Hebrews 1 it is di on and di ou. But this is another thought.

Our Relationships To Christ

Revelation 1:4-7; 22:16-21

I have taken these two passages which precede and come after all the prophetic part of the book, as giving us the relationships in which the saints stand to Christ, to whom the book is confided.

In these opening verses we get an address, and the answer of heart in the saints to that address; and then, when the book closes, the address of the Lord to His people as the bride, and the answer. I desire to shew the place in which the Spirit of God sets the saints, and the connection of it with their character, affections, and duties.

One abstract remark may be made. Our affections and our duties flow from the relationship in which we are set. It is clear that if we are creatures of God, our duties as such flow from our knowledge of that. So with our earthly duties and affections—they flow from our relationship one with another, whether as husband and wife, or father and child. It is a very simple remark, but of all importance, with regard to the saints' position. But then I must be in this relationship to have these affections, and I must know what the relationship is to which those duties belong. If I had no consciousness of being a child, and happened to meet my father, I should have no sense of the duties and affections belonging to me as a child. In order to have right affections, I must be in the relationship to which the affections belong, and I must know that I am in it too. The relationship must be known as mine, in order to possess the affections belonging to it. I cannot love Christ as a Saviour, if I do

not know whether He is a Saviour or not to me; I cannot love God as a Father, if I am not sure whether or not I am a child. Now the importance of this is, that a full settled knowledge of salvation is the spring and foundation of our duties to God—not only the knowledge of the fact of salvation, but of what that salvation has brought me into. It has made me a child, and I am bound to walk and feel as a child. It is so if I take Christ as He presents Himself at the end of this book: immediately the Spirit and the bride say, Come. If I do not know that I belong to the bride of Christ, how can I, when He thus presents Himself to me, say to Him, Come? It is the relationship in which I am from which all must flow, and no duties and affections are rightly founded until we know ourselves to be in this relationship to God. There may be a craving after the thing, and there will be. If I am an orphan, I would give anything to have a father; but I cannot have the affections of a child, because I have not got a father to love me. Wherever the divine nature is, there is the spring of these thoughts and feelings of love to God, and of holiness; but I cannot have them in perfection for my soul, because I have not the constant enjoyment of my relationship. A law may be imposed upon a person, but it never produces any affection. There may be a law which claims certain feelings and affections from me, but that gives no consciousness of the relationship by which these affections are produced: consequently it gives me no power. This is the real character of the law. Instead of being founded on a relationship that is existing, it promises that by keeping it I shall get life. If I keep the law without having real life, I am to get life by keeping it.

I find that principle laid down in Scripture—duty called for in order to the obtaining of life; but never does it produce the thing. Law claims from man what he ought to be, but it does not and cannot place man in any relationship with God, in which he may enjoy the blessing that belongs to God. Now it is not so with Christ. He does bring us, by the salvation which He has wrought, into relationship with God; He gives us a known settled place before God; and then our affections and duties flow from the place we are in. They are not the means of obtaining the place, but that which belongs to the place we are in. If we are the bride of Christ, we ought to have the feelings and wishes of one that is so. Throughout, when you enter into these verses, that suggests itself to the heart. In whatever way Christ is spoken of, there is at once what calls forth a response from the hearts of the saints. Whatever may be said as to His titles or offices, or what He is, the effect of speaking of Him with whom we are in relationship, is to awaken feelings in our own hearts of what He is to us. For instance, if I were to speak to a child of its father, as one who had eminently distinguished himself as a hero, or a statesman, the child's feeling at once would be, That is my father. He would not say, That is a great conqueror. The child's feeling would be, That great man is my father. So it would be with a wife. If she were told that such a person had greatly distinguished himself in any place, and she knew it was her husband, she would say, That is my husband; because all this glory awoke, in the mind of the child or the wife, the consciousness of the relationship in which they stood to the one to whom they belonged. Now that is the case with the church of God. You cannot speak of any glory of Christ or of God, that does not awaken in the heart of the saint the

consciousness of what God and Christ are to itself. This is characteristic of the existence of such a relationship, and the affections that belong to it. You cannot speak of the person with whom others are in relationship, without awakening in their hearts the sense of what the person is to them.

The whole character of this book is one of judgment. It is not the Father communicating with the church by means of the Holy Ghost which dwells in it. And when Christ is described, it is as One whose eyes are like a flame of fire, judging in the midst of the churches, or as One coming out of heaven on a white horse, a sharp sword going out of His mouth, that with it He should smite the nations. When it is God, He is sitting on a throne from whence lightnings and thunderings proceed, and sending out preliminary or final judgments on the earth.

Now we shall find here, by the feelings that are expressed, the way in which the saint, the child of God, feels when Christ is brought forward. We shall find that, even when He is presented in judgment—that is, in an earthly character—the church has immediately awakened in her heart the place and relationship in which she stands to the one thus presented. Jesus, the Prince of the kings of the earth, is alluded to: at once the answer is, “Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” If the “Root and offspring of David” is named, the Spirit and the bride say, Come. It is the characteristic of the soul that lives in the conscious blessedness and enjoyment of an existing relationship with God. However Christ is presented, it is her own relationship with Him that is at once awakened in the bride. What I see in the word is not merely God visiting

us as sinners, as He has done, but that when He has visited us, He has brought us into blessed connection with Himself, and having brought us there, He calls us, as in that connection, to live in the delight and in the duties that belong to it.

We do not thoroughly understand how lost we are in our natural state, because we do not look simply to our place in Christ. It is in the measure that we understand that they who are in the flesh cannot please God, and that the flesh is not subject to God and cannot be remedied, that we are cast over by faith into our place in Christ. The moment I come to know that my relationship with God depends upon what He is for me, and what He has made me by grace in Himself, and not upon what I am to Him, it is all simple. It may astonish many to see that it does not depend upon what they are to Him. They will say, Are not men judged according to their works? To be sure they are. But who among you will stand this judgment? It is not merely a truth: but what is your condition if it is a truth? We are lost. We can only say, “Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.” There is an end of all flesh as such. If Christ came, He came to call sinners —to seek and save that which was lost. It was all a settled thing as to man in the flesh. You and I, looked at as moral responsible beings before God, have walked in such sort, that we could not stand in the judgment—no one, not even a Christian, could. I am not talking of grace saving; but of man judged as a responsible being to God. If God deals with us on this ground, we could not, as Job says, answer Him one in a thousand. That we know to be true. There is not a single person, if it were a question of the most careless person in the world, who

does not know that he cannot stand in the judgment. If he were brought to-day into the presence of God, he would do what Adam did—go and hide himself if he could; he would not dare to stand and be judged of God. The saint knows it, but the sinner knows it too. As a present thing, he has no desire to be with God. If it was offered to ever such a decent man of the world to go to heaven to-day, he would not—nor to-morrow either. When then is he to go? When he cannot help it. If he must die, he would rather go to heaven, but there is not a man of the world but would stay out of heaven as long as possible. If God reveals Himself in judgment, man will fly from Him; and when He revealed Himself in grace, what did man do? Spat upon Him, crucified Him. The story is told. Conscience tells us the one thing, and the facts of Christianity tell us the other: man would not have God. That is what we all are, and without any difference. Some may have produced more bad fruit than others, but we are all alike lost; and therefore God deals with us, consequent upon the death of Christ, on the ground that we are lost. It is of immense importance to see this fully, in order that we may fully enjoy God's love. "For a good man some would even dare to die." "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." That is, I learn this—that if I am bad, dreading judgment, and having no affections towards God, if God has loved me, it is according to the perfectness of His own nature. This is how grace meets a man's case. He is brought to this conviction, that he is a poor lost sinner with no desire after God—a lost sinner after having been tried in every possible way—tried without law, tried under law, and then tried by Christ, coming in grace to meet them in all their need. And what was the result? Man was lost,

hopelessly lost. “We will not have this man to reign over us.” We will have the world without being troubled with God.

Here I get God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; I find perfect love cognizant of what the sinner is, knowing how it would be treated, yet coming down to save. When I look at Christ’s coming to me, I get thus the knowledge, that God, in perfect love, and with the knowledge of what I am, has visited me. to save me. He did not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. Having found this, I have met with God, and I know Him. I find myself perfectly evil, my heart altogether evil, but I have seen Jesus, and He loves me perfectly: I have met Him in my sin, and I know Him. That is not relationship yet, but I know what He is. If I have gone to a person that I have considered my master, and have done everything against him, and if afterwards I have met him and he has assured me of his love, I have my every doubt and anxiety taken away. I shall not then wait for the day of judgment to know what God is to me, for I have met Him in Christ when I was in my sins. But then we could not go into heaven with our sins, and the next thing I find is, that Christ takes up this very place in which I was. Was I in death? He goes into it. Was I under condemnation? He goes under it. Was I in sin before God? He is made sin for me. I find in the cross the Lord Jesus coming and putting Himself in the very place where I was before a God of judgment. Thus, taking the sinner’s place, He goes down into death. He is forsaken of God, and being made sin, He bears their burden upon the cross, and now He is risen again. The question of the dealing of God with sin has been gone through on the cross. But, that blessed One having been

made sin for me, the holiness of God has been gone through, and man has been proved a lost sinner. But Christ having taken his place, the whole history of my sin is closed; it has received its reward in the Person of Christ. And He is risen, and there is another Adam, instead of the first Adam, in the presence of God. It is not merely God visiting the sinner in his sin, but One, who has taken the judgment of my sin upon Himself already, is in the presence of God in righteousness. There I get the whole dealing of God to settle the question of sin. “Christ has appeared once in the end of the world, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” In order to be enabled to enjoy the love of God, that is what my conscience wants. If I receive that by faith, I can stand in the presence of God, with the knowledge that God loves me perfectly, and that, as a righteous God, He receives me in Christ.

If you take these two passages, you will find in one what Christ has done for us, and the place in which He has put us, and in the next, the relationship which flows from it, and the conduct consequent upon it.

In Revelation 1:4, there is not a word about God in His character of Saviour, but in the character of Jehovah, as Almighty; and the seven Spirits that are before the throne shew that perfection of the divine Spirit in which God judges. Therefore Christ comes last, and when I come to Him, I get the statement that He is the faithful witness on the earth; then there is His resurrection—He is the first-begotten of the dead; and, lastly, He is the Prince of the kings of the earth. It passes over all that He is in heaven as the High Priest, and as my righteousness before God. But though Christ is only thus spoken of, in connection with the character of the whole

book, yet what is the answer of the saints when Christ is spoken of? “Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.” It is what He is to them. Though Christ is spoken of suitably to the whole character of the book, yet the church knows Him as He is for itself. Even if He is spoken of as the Prince of the kings of the earth, I say, This is the One that loves me, that has saved me; I know Him as the One that is in heaven, consequent upon the work that He has done for me. I know what He is for myself. He has loved me and washed me from my sins in His own blood. He is the faithful witness, and the Prince of the kings of the earth; but what I know is, that He has loved me, and washed me from my sins in His own blood, and if I think of the place in which He has set me, He has made me a king and a priest to God and His Father. It is the character of Christ’s love, that all which He takes from the Father in glory and blessing as man He gives to us. If I talk of Him even as a Prince on the throne He cannot do without me, He makes me a king too. A man of the world can be generous, but he does not bring another person into his own condition. This is what Christ does. “My peace,” He says, “I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you.” I will give you the very same peace that I have Myself. So too, “The glory which thou gavest me I have given them.” And not only that, but He gives them His Father’s love— “that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.” He puts us into His own place. This is perfect love. He Himself comes, and He has washed us from our sins in His own blood. If He is a king and priest, He has made us kings and priests along with Him. It is only

when I have the consciousness of being utterly lost, and look up to the love that God has shewn in the gift of His Son, that I can understand it all.

If I look at the day of judgment, I say, It is all over, it is a settled thing with me, and if God deals with me in judgment, I am ruined. It is too late to talk about being better—I am lost. But now through Christ I am saved. I have got God that has come in, dealing with this lost person and giving His Son for him. It is not merely quickening him; but besides that, when a soul is quickened and feels what sin is, and what righteousness is, and yet that he has not got it, God has given Christ as his salvation. You want deliverance out of a condition that you are in by nature, into another condition in Christ, and that is what God provides. The believer is not only born again, and sees that holiness must be, but he has found in Christ the very thing that he wants. The grace of God has brought salvation. This is another thing. I am not merely renewed, but I wanted an answer to the exercises of my soul, and that is what I have got in Christ. Would it be right for a child to be uncertain whether its father loves it or not? If it were so, I should say, That child has not right affections. We ought to be able to say, I know thoroughly well that the Father loves me—He has given His Son for me. It was a love which knew my case, and thought of it. Christ has loved me and washed me from my sins in His own blood. He has made me as clean as the value of His own blood can make a person. I am put thus before God, and then made a king and priest to God. By-and-by every one shall be blessed under his own vine and his own fig-tree; but the place that the heart of the believer finds itself in now is

in Christ's own place, consequent upon the love wherewith he has been loved.

"Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him." And what is the consequence? "And all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." I can testify that every eye shall see Him … and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him. But am I to be wailing because He comes who has washed me from my sins in His own blood? No, I am rejoicing. My portion is one thing, my testimony another.

If we look at the last chapter, after all the prophetical details have been gone through, I am not only washed and made a king and a priest to God, but I am of the bride. And here Christ sets Himself again before the church; He always does so. In the previous part of the chapter, as a warning, He said, "Behold, I come quickly." And now the Lord, having closed the testimony He had to give to the world, says in verse 16, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." And then He gives Himself these three characters:— "I am the root and offspring of David." He is the root of David, the spring of all the promises made to David: and He is the heir of all of them, because He was the promised seed of David. But then He gives Himself another character, and that is, "the bright and morning star." Nothing is said about the Bridegroom here. He is the bright and morning star. What is that? It is not the day. It is what no one sees the moment the sun is up. Those who are on earth in the day of the Lord will not see that star. It is what is seen by those who during the night are watching. Then, when the Lord comes, the star is seen no longer.

“The night is far spent, the day is at hand.” That brings home our present condition urgently to the church of God. From the moment that Adam fell, it was night, it was dark. It was still deeper night, as God went on dealing with man till Christ was rejected. And now the judgment comes. But it is just there the dawn begins. Man had departed from the light. The rulers of “the darkness of this world” is the expression. Before Christ came, it was night, because the sun had not risen; and when Christ was in this world, He was rejected. There was no connecting man with Christ but by His death. He came down to man, He visited him in grace; but “except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone.” He was merciful, He might come down to others in the meeting of all their need, but He was alone except He died; and when Christ died, there was the closing of the practical judgment of all that man was, looked at as in the flesh. It was proved that no dealing of God could make the fig-tree bear figs, and God said, “Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.” He had gone on digging and pruning, but no fruit was borne; the gardener was cast out, Christ was rejected. But “where sin abounded, grace did much more abound”; and God comes in grace and sets a man at His own right hand. And now the night is far spent, the day is at hand. The very rejection of Christ, which proved fully and completely the entire darkness in which man was lying, set a new man, another man, according to God’s counsels and heart, in glory at the right hand of God, displays this blessed One before our faith, and says, Look there and you will find life. “Because I live, ye shall live also.” You will find righteousness—everything—there.

I now know that God has come in, not merely trying man as He did for four thousand years, but doing His own work; and He has wrought that work completely, and Christ has gone up as “the second Man” that has taken His place in righteousness in the presence of God. I can say, That is my life. There is a victory over sin, there is a putting away of sin, there is an accomplishment of righteousness. There is one who has got His place there because of sin being put away, and because of accomplished righteousness; just as surely as the first Adam was turned out of paradise, the last Adam has come in. And now I can say that I can see the dawn. The Jew must wait till the High Priest comes out to know whether the offering is accepted or not. When Christ comes out again, they will look upon Him and mourn. But I do not wait for that, because the Holy Spirit has come out, and His presence gives me the blessed consciousness that Christ has been accepted before God, as my life and righteousness. My faith makes me know that I have it all in Christ. But when am I to get the fruit of this? I have got the Holy Ghost, but what is my relationship to Christ? The Holy Ghost come down gives me the knowledge of it. I have got the Spirit, and the knowledge of these two things—that Christ is my righteousness in the presence of God, and the Holy Spirit the seal of it. But, more than that, Christ is the Head, and we are the members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones. And what is their character when He talks about them? It is as the bride. It is never said of Christ that He was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh when He was down here. But now that He is at the right hand of God, we are bone of His bone and flesh of His flesh. Just as Eve was of Adam, we are of Christ—and more so—because the Spirit of Christ dwells in me

and unites me to Christ. When the Sun of righteousness arises with healing in His wings, there will be judgment, treading down of the wicked, etc. But meanwhile, while Christ is hidden from the world, faith sees Him; and faith, seeing Him, has trusted and leaned on Him as its righteousness before God, and the Holy Ghost is given as the seal of that righteousness. Therefore He says, “Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us is God, who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.” He is these two; the earnest of the glory, and the present certainty of the love. I do know the love now, the Holy Ghost giving me the consciousness of perfect love; but He is also the earnest of the inheritance.

That bright and morning star is before the day rises. We know Christ before we see Him. We have not seen Him and yet have believed. “At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.” We are associated with Him while He is not in the world. When the sun rises, I shall see Him in His glory, but we know Him behind the cloud. He is the Son that has revealed Himself to me—this One who is in the heavens, as He revealed Himself to Paul: therefore it is the gospel of the glory. I know Him as my righteousness, and as the Bridegroom to the bride. The morning star is that which will be accomplished, but which is the knowledge of Christ as known to the watching believer when He is not known to the world at all.

So, in Peter, “We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts.” The word of prophecy is a light shining in a dark place. The world is

all dark, and prophecy comes in and tells me the end of a dark world, and of all that passes in it. It is going on down a full stream to destruction. I cannot go on with that; my affections cannot be engaged in it. But the night is far spent, and the day is at hand. We know Christ in heaven, we know Him as the morning star when the world does not see Him. We know Him above, where the church first was put in relationship with Him. It is said to the church of Thyatira, “He that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron,” etc. “And,” He adds, “I will give him the morning star”; that is, he shall be a king and shall rule; but, besides that, I will give him Myself. We shall have an inheritance, and this with Christ. But do you think supposing a person were going to be married, and said to the bride, You will have a fine estate, would that be what would most occupy her mind? Certainly not. If her affections were true and right, it would be himself and not the inheritance that she would be occupied about.

So it should be with us. All God’s word will be accomplished. We shall have the inheritance, but we shall have Christ. We get the bright and morning star. It is in that character that Christ reveals Himself here. But what is awakened in the church’s heart is the thought of her own proper relationship to Christ. He does not say, Now I am coming; it is she who says it. “I am … the bright and morning star. And the Spirit and the bride say, Come.” It is the desire of her heart. When He is named in that character, she is longing for Him to come — not to be washed. The saints already had said, He has loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood. His first coming did that. He has done it all. And when,

through grace, I am brought to look up to God, and trust Him as a poor sinner, I am brought into this place by the Holy Ghost come down from heaven, because righteousness has gone up on high. The Holy Ghost comes down and seals me, because I am made the righteousness of God in Christ. And now it is not merely the thought and feeling, I wish I were the bride, but there is the consciousness of the relationship, and I say to the Bridegroom, Come. The Spirit says it because the Spirit is down upon the earth. I have got the living water and the Spirit, but I have not got the Bridegroom. The Holy Ghost, having come down, and dwelling in believers, produces the certainty of the value of what Christ did and was down here, and the longing desire to see Him. We shall reign with Christ, but to be with Himself is better. James and John said, Give us a good place in the kingdom. But what does Paul say? “That I may win Christ.” I have had Christ revealed in me, and I want Him. It is not the uncertainty of there being relationship, but the affections that belong to the relationship.

“The Spirit and the bride say, Come.” We get the whole circle of the church’s affections. When the Spirit of God is working in the saints, what will be the first affection? Christ. The Spirit and the bride turn to Him and say, Come. What is the next affection? It is the saints. Therefore it turns and bids him that heareth say, Come. If you have heard Christ, you come and join the cry. Even if you have not the consciousness of relationship, would you not be happier if you saw Him as He is? Therefore say, Come. The first affection is towards Christ Himself; but the bride would have every saint to join in these affections, and in the desire to have the

Bridegroom. But does it stop with those who have heard the voice of the Lord Jesus? No. The first effect of the Spirit's turning our eye to Christ is the desire that Christ should come; and, next, that the saint who hears His voice should have the same affection. And what next? We turn round to those who may be athirst, bidding them come, and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.

The saint who has the sense of the blessedness of having drunk of the living water which Christ gives, wants others to have it also. What is a thirsty man? It is a man that has got a want and no answer to it. "He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." I have an affection created in me by grace, but it is satisfied. I have got what my soul wants. I have got God in all His blessedness in love, and I have got Him nearer to me than human friend could be. I have known what it is to thirst, but now I am satisfied. I have got all that my soul longed after. But if there is a thirsty soul here, you will say, If I could only feel sure that I had got this living water! This shews that you have not drunk.

You cannot enjoy Christ without knowing it. If the Spirit of God quickens a soul, it will have wants that are not satisfied, but if it has gone and drunk of Christ, it will be satisfied. The church has not yet got the Bridegroom, but it has the water of life; and therefore it can say to the world, I have got what you want: you come and try. If you are thirsty, and only drink of that water, you will never thirst again. I have got Christ in my heart; and when you possess Him in your soul, it gives you the consciousness that you have got the very same happiness that there will be in heaven. You may know

Christ better, and love Him better when you get there: there will not be the hindrances of the vile body; but it is not another God, another Christ, another Holy Ghost that you will have. All the things that will make me blessed in heaven, I have now. I may be inconsistent with Christ, groaning in this wretched body, because I have so little faith to see my place. I say, What a hut I am in! The reason I do not like the hut is because I know I have got a palace. I judge my present position because of the glory that is before me. But if you want to know what makes a Christian happy in life and death, it is that the Christ he has got now is the Christ that he will have in heaven. He has got his home there, where the One he loves and knows best is already.

But more than that, if we have this living water, and people do not even thirst, still I can say, “Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” I can tell them I was just as vile as they, and God came and called me in His grace, when I was going far astray from Him. So that now I can say to others, “Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” We have got this water, we have not got to buy it. We have this relationship to Christ, and the affections that flow from it, so that we turn to those that are athirst, bidding them welcome, yea, “Whosoever will, let him take,” etc.

Thus it is that I get the whole circle of the church’s affections, from Christ Himself, down to the poor sinner far from God, because I have the consciousness of the affections that are suited to Christ. The Christian is in this world in virtue of his salvation in Christ, a witness of the love that has saved himself. And then we have to seek, remembering that the life we have is a dependent life, that this witness should be bright; “always bearing

about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body."

Only remark these two things—where we are brought in faith, with the Holy Ghost dwelling in us. I see that Christ has died to put away my sin: that is what I know, looking back. And, looking forward, I see that the same Holy Ghost, who gives to my soul to possess a certain knowledge of the value of Christ's first coming, tells me that He is coming again. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, etc… looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us." He puts us back and shews us Christ, and forward and says, That is your Bridegroom; He is gone to prepare a place for you, and will come again for you.

If I look back at Christ made sin for me, and if I look forward to His coming again to receive us unto Himself, shall I be afraid of judgment when He comes? He positively declares that He will come and receive me to Himself. Is that the way I shall stand before His judgment-seat? Yes; He will come and fetch me, and receive me to Himself. And why? Because at His first coming He had settled the whole question of my sins. The person before whom I appear in judgment is the One who died already to put away sin and who is my righteousness before God; and it is as made like to His glorified body that we appear before Him.

I would ask you, Are your souls standing in this relationship with God in Christ? Do you believe that God in mercy has thus visited you in perfect love, and that

now the place you are set in is that blessed relationship itself as the bride of Christ, who is waiting till He comes to receive her to Himself? Only remember that, if you desire the affections and the walk that belong to a Christian, you must have the consciousness of being in the relationship, or you cannot have the affections that belong to it. God has given us a salvation that brings us as saved persons into relationship with Christ. But in order to be consistent, I must know what I am to be consistent with. Do I expect you to be consistent with me as my servant, or as my child, if you are not standing in those relationships to me? If we are the bride of Christ, let us seek to be consistent therewith. But we must first be consciously in the place of relationship, and then seek, though it be amid suffering, to be consistent with it.

The Lord give us, by His living grace, to be brought into the consciousness of the place in which He has set us.

It is not the body and its privileges we have here, but the Head and its fulness; not the Spirit, but Christ as our life. But this is quite as momentous. So also we have the walk in view of the hope. We see where the apostle puts us as thus risen with Christ, and yet walking down here, and so a question of finishing our course. In Ephesians we come forth from God, and, being with Him there, shew out His character as Christ did. If I say I am risen, let me walk as risen; if justified from sin, yield myself unto God, dead to sin, and alive from the dead.

Verse 4. He had heard of their love to all saints. But one cannot get the knowledge of His will unless it is connected with all saints; for Christ's heart does take in all, and if we do not, we fail to embrace that of which His eye has taken in the circle; Eph. 3:18. The moment we get into a risen state, we are all one. We are Jews, Gentiles, all sorts of things, when looked at as men on the earth; but when risen, all that is done with.

There are two things—one may say three—which we have in the resurrection of Christ. First, the testimony of God is to the full acceptance of Christ's work—"God hath raised him from the dead"; and, secondly, the effect of that, which is a new place with God altogether where neither Jew nor Gentile, neither Adam innocent nor Adam guilty, ever were. It is an entrance into an entirely new condition; we belong to a new creation altogether. This, beloved friends, is of all moment to our hearts—the consciousness of our relationship with God. As to Christ, sins are past, judgment past, death past, Satan's power past, when He rose from the dead. His death had been a

terrible testimony to the state of the old man—it was a total breach with man in the flesh. “Let no fruit grow upon thee henceforth and for ever.” We never get fully into the consciousness of our proper blessing till we clearly and distinctly understand, not only that we are guilty, but that the tree is bad. God has set aside man, and in the flesh he cannot please God; he has no actual living connection with Him whatever—no life, no nature, in which He can please Him; Rom. 8. When we talk of being risen with Christ, we have left all that scene behind us which Christ has left behind; not of the world, as He is not of it, though we have to go through it, of course, and to keep ourselves unspotted from it. Christ got into life again— a totally new state past all these things; we are crucified with Him, dead to sin and the world, and in this new condition in which Christ is now. He was there dying under our sins—we, found dead in them, and now quickened along with Him, with all our trespasses forgiven. In Colossians it is only this change of position, not all that it involves.

The apostle desired for them that they should be walking here as risen men, filled with knowledge, that there might be the doing of His will. There is a path which the vulture’s eye has not seen, but which is unfolded in Christ, which He has tracked for us, and “he that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.” If you look at Christ, you never see one single thing done for Himself: perfect grace, a testimony to the will of God, which is known only spiritually, not legal righteousness. Is it such righteousness to be smitten on one cheek, and turn the other? That is the only thing we have now to look for,

which will not be found even in heaven—a perfect path in the midst of evil.

It is a trying path often: people will now and then trample upon you; but is my object to keep Christ, or my character? You will soon find in that way what the motive that governs you is. If the eye is single, you will get knowledge from God as the vulture, the most clear-seeing thing there is. The eye of Christ in us sees the thing that pleases Christ, and, of course, the world cannot understand that at all. They may admire it, for they see the unselfishness of it. The more we go on, and the more evil grows up, infidelity, corruption, and superstition, the more that faithfulness will tell. The world may not understand why a person gives up all he has, but it sees that he does so—that there are motives which govern the heart soberly and quietly. Bring the word of God to them: they do not think it is a good sword, but it is; for it reaches the conscience, and no man is an infidel in his conscience. In the midst of this poor selfish world, if there is a person who is living entirely for another, they cannot understand it. The fact that they cannot understand it makes them understand it in one sense: they see there is something they cannot understand.

Verse 10. “Walk worthy of the Lord”—the whole object of the Christian in his going out and coming in, in his whole path in life. What a wonderful privilege! A poor creature in myself, but called on to walk worthy of the Lord. Beloved brethren, think of it!

Verse u. “Strengthened with all might… unto all patience and long-suffering.” What was Christ’s life? All patience and long-suffering; everything was against

Him, and His path the path of unchanging goodness, of all patience and long-suffering, in passing along. Seek in this world patience and long-suffering. The world, being a world which will not have the principles of the Christian, will not have Christ; our path in it is patience — patience in service with souls. Souls are full of themselves, but always at bottom there is a want. “Redeeming the time,” not diligence, but seeking opportunities which are given, and being so full of Christ that I do not miss them when given. Patience may seem a little thing, but just try your own heart, and see if it does not test you. Saul waited six days and three quarters, and lost the kingdom because he could not wait the other quarter. He acted for himself. Nature could wait a long time, but could not go through with the thing. Patience acts for God: “Let patience have its perfect work.” Christ never did His own will; you are set to do His will, sanctified to His obedience.

Now the apostle lays the ground which I had on my heart at the beginning; but what I have been saying is of all practical importance. The light is my place. We never can give a right testimony, or be servants to others, till our own relationships with God are perfectly settled. You cannot carry the testimony of God with intelligence unless you know your own place. It is not that you talk about yourself, but can you say in God’s presence, “I am thanking Thee because Thou hast made me meet”? The walk is all founded upon this: I insist on it, for we all know how it is rejected, but it is the ground on which all Christians are set. You may go through the deepest exercises (the deeper the better), but when brought into your place as a Christian, you give thanks that He has made you meet. That perfect and infinite love has taken

me up, a poor sinner, and made me meet for the light. That is where I am—a blessed thought—it is the perfectness of love; God's thought, and He has carried it out. Supposing me to be actually risen, am I not fit for the inheritance of the saints in light? Self-righteousness (which is a very subtle thing) says, "I am not fit." Why, you do not know yet how bright that light is! But I do know that He, whose love has thought of me, must have that which is fit for His presence, for He is light as well as love, and He has wrought it in Christ. The prodigal was quite as sincere when he set out in his rags as afterwards, but he was not fit to go in till he had the best robe on.

Verse 13. "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness," etc. Here we are naturally in Satan's kingdom, the ruler of the darkness of this world. A man may not mean wickedness, but the glory of this world—its grandeur—has influence on the heart. Well, it is darkness, simple darkness, and all the time that is spent there is loss, for everything that is not Christ is loss—there is no life in it. The life of Christ in us cannot be looking after wealth, and power, and vanity—the one thing we have to do in the world is to overcome it. The blinding power of Satan is there, but we are delivered from it. It does not say, "brought into light," but it gives the experimental consciousness of what the light is—"the kingdom of the Son of his love." It is light: I get out of this darkness, which only ministers to my wretched selfishness, to nothing but self, the very opposite of what Christ was. There is one true, holy, blessed place—the presence of God. I have got into (not merely the light, but) the kingdom of the Son. The One who is the delight of the Father's heart, the sufficient and adequate object

of the Father's heart, who satisfies and draws out His love—we are brought into the kingdom of that Son. We have to go through the world, which has risen up because man was turned out of paradise; but I have passed out of it into the kingdom where God's perfect delight in His Son is. We have to judge ourselves, and watch, that it may be effectually wrought in us; but here the apostle is giving thanks that it is done—that we are brought, even while here, to know we are loved as Christ is loved. He has given us what is sufficient for His heart and our hearts to delight in, and, in the second place, we are loved as He is loved.

"All things were created by him and for him"; but He could not, in the counsels and love of God, take those things without having joint-heirs—His bride. He has come up, after having wrought redemption, not only Head over everything He has created as man, but also Head of the body, the church.

Verse 21. "And you hath he reconciled"; that is more than "made meet" for what God wants, according to His holy nature. We are not simply fitted, but God has reconciled our hearts now in that perfect love which has come out and wrought all in Christ's death, while the world is not reconciled. The reconciliation of Christians is a present effectual thing, through the knowledge of the perfect love of God, which did not spare His own Son. He has given Him for my sins, blotted them out, and left no uneasiness on my conscience. Not only are my sins forgiven, but I am reconciled to God. Take it up in your consciences, beloved friends: Christ my righteousness, sins all gone, myself loved as He is loved —that is my place. How far can your souls be looking up to God, without one thing to hinder your enjoyment? He

has brought us to Himself—brought us into His presence, in the full sense of the unclouded love of His heart.

Then we get the effect of this as regards the testimony. Paul was made a minister of two things; and so are we, whether in private dealing with souls, or in public ministry. I have learned this love which reconciles, and I will carry it out to every creature. I carry the love of Christ so in my soul, that, if a want comes, I have what will minister to it—so living in the love of God, with the sense of it in our souls, that it comes out naturally. If I meet souls, do I carry God to them? This is the Christian testimony; we carry this in our own souls, as made meet and reconciled. No matter what comes, difficult times, etc., if I can only carry it out, there is that which, if any one has ears to hear, is heard in the heart. I may be rejected of course, as Christ was, but that is the character of the testimony—the light too, as well as the love.

The second thing is the ministry of the church. This is not to sinners; but you cannot have a due sense of the thoughts and purposes of God in bringing us where He has, without carrying it all with you. The church supposes the fulness of love, and the perfectness of redemption, which breaks through our testimony. If we are conscious of this, that God has called us to be the body of Christ, the bride of Christ, which He is gathering to present to Himself, that love which has been known to us in its fulness will give a stamp and character to everything we say. It would be a gospel which carries its testimony to the ruin of man, but also to the love which is never satisfied till it sets us with the Son. A complete redemption cannot be hid—I cannot

preach the gospel without bringing it in. The current of love, which we know, lays the foundation in the heart of all that is built upon it, and it gives another character to the gospel. My being with God, according to that perfect reconciliation, enables me to go out and meet the want of every poor sinner. You may do it in difficulty and trial, but carry that with you; and neither infidehty, nor anything else, can answer it.

The Christian’s Life In Christ

Colossians 1

The character of Colossians is that the saint is looked at as risen: we hear nothing of the Holy Ghost except the expression, “your love in the Spirit.” But it brings out the other side, Christ as life in us, more fully here than anywhere. Christ is in us, “Christ in you, the hope of glory.” The way the saint is looked at is as risen; the consequence is that he is not, as in Ephesians, in heavenly places. In Ephesians you have the work of the Spirit of God, and the presence of the Spirit revealing things above, and associating us with them: here in Colossians the saint is dead and risen with Christ, a risen man walking through the midst of this world. In Romans you see a living man actually in this world, as we all are, Christ being his life, and rejoicing in the hope of the glory of God. We find, therefore, in Romans that a man is to yield himself to God; whereas in Ephesians we are looked at as coming from God to shew God’s character in this world. If you are able to do what is in Ephesians, you will be able to do what is in Romans. Christ had given Himself a dying sacrifice; you are to give yourself a living one. In Ephesians we have, “Be ye therefore imitators of God as dear children “(Eph. 5:1); this goes farther. What Colossians gives us is, not heavenly places, but that we are dead with Christ, and risen with Him, and this life is fully developed here.

We see the way the Christian is to live, and this founded on the place in which he has been put by grace. After that he speaks of all things as to be reconciled to God, while the church He has reconciled. First he takes the

great truth of what our life is and our walk, and what it is founded on. There is a path in this world, the spring and character of which is that God's will is in it, a path the vulture's eye has not seen, which was perfectly fulfilled in Christ. "He that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked," 1 John 2:6. The saint is given a path through this world which has nothing to do with the world, but which displays the character of Christ in it. "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also," Matt. 5:39. This would not be righteousness, but Christ displayed. You will see this immense privilege of walking down here like Christ, who could speak of Himself as "the Son of man who is in heaven," who lived a heavenly—more than this, a divine—life down here. There was not a single motive in Christ which governed the world, or a single motive in the world which governed Christ. "I will even make a way in the wilderness "(Isa. 43:19), that is the Christian's path.

Sometimes we get stopped on the road. "Well," I say to myself, "the eye was not single, or the whole body would have been full of light." It is a path of God. Christ come down to this world, and He treads a path like which there is nothing at all. We are sanctified. to the obedience of Christ; God's will was the motive of everything with Him, this was the very way in which He baffled Satan. He never did anything but because it was God's will, not merely that it was according to God's will, though this was true, of course. "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." He had been owned as Son, and the Spirit had descended on Him (there He makes our place), and then He was led

of the Spirit to be tempted in the wilderness. When Satan comes and says to Him, “Command that these stones be made bread,” there was no harm in eating when He was hungry, but He says, “I have got no orders to do it,” “It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” So He does nothing, and Satan does nothing—he could not, for that would have been an end to his wiles. The blessed Lord comes to do God’s will, and He was “obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.”

We see this in a striking instance when Martha and Mary sent unto Him saying, “Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.” We would have said, “He will be off directly,” but He had got no orders to go. “When he had heard therefore that he was sick, he abode two days still in the same place where he was,” John 11:3-5. We can explain and understand it now: the raising of Lazarus was to be a last testimony to Him. Such is the knowledge of God’s will, not merely doing die right thing. God tests the state of the soul thus. If there is wisdom and spiritual understanding, and one is going on rightly, looking back at something one had been doubtful about, one feels, “I wonder how I could have doubted about it at all.”

There is a path which the saint has to tread through this world, which is God’s path for him in it. God puts him to walk there to test the state of his soul, whether he has wisdom and spiritual understanding. “If thy whole body therefore be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light,” Luke 11:36. A candle not only is light itself, but it gives light to all around. “In thy

light we shall see light." "The spiritual man discerneth all things," there is progress in this surely; the measure of it we get in the next verse, "That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing." Suppose I did not know my Father, I should not know how to walk worthy of Him. But the babes do know Him.

A man's object is always what gives him character: if he loves money, he is avaricious; if he loves power, he is ambitious; if pleasure is his object, it is that which characterises him. The Christian's object is Christ.

We get walking worthy three or four times in Scripture. In Thessalonians we have, "That ye would walk worthy of God who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory," 1 Thess. 2:12. "Worthy of God!" think what this is, and that according to the place we are to have with Him in glory, when all is complete. We have another here, "That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing." The divine Man in this world is our example. Then in Ephesians we have, "I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called," Eph. 4:1. Walking "worthy of the gospel" in another passage (Phil. 1) is almost the same. In one sense we have the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost in these three passages.

If we talk of walking worthy of the Lord, we shall be fruitful; "being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God"; and our hearts, affections, object, mind and walk formed by that: that I get as the walk of the Christian. Then we have the power he walks in, "Strengthened with all might according to his glorious power"; that is the strength to walk right. Now mark how it works, "unto all patience."

We would think it was going to do something wonderful; but it is not energy or will, but patience that is the secret of it all. You want to hurry God sometimes, but you never can. We find this sometimes in the desire for restoring a soul—a right thing to wish; but God must go to the bottom. Take a lovely example of this in the Syrophenician woman. The Lord seemed painfully hard; the disciples say, “Send her away; for she crieth after us”; they said this to get rid of her, but He did not answer her one word. She had no title, no promises, nor anything else. At last he said, I cannot “take the children’s bread, and cast it unto dogs”: this brought her to the acknowledgment of what she was, and of what God was. She insisted that there was love enough in God to meet her as she was. “Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their masters’ table.” Then she got all she wanted: Christ could not say there was not. Seemingly the Lord was hard in this case, just as when they sent the message to Him, “Lord, behold he whom thou lovest is sick,” and yet, “He abode two days still in the same place where he was.”

Patience requires thorough confidence in God: God is working His own work meanwhile, but we must follow Him, not go before Him. If I am “strengthened … unto all patience,” there will be none of my own will, and I shall be long-suffering to others. Power works in patience, long-suffering and joyfulness. Christ was the “Man of sorrows,” yet He could say of His disciples, “That they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves,” “I do always those things that please him”; but He waited to know what the things were that pleased Him.

In Colossians 1:9-11 we have the state of the soul; then in the following verses the privileges on which it is based.

What was the first sign of an apostle? “Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds,” 2 Cor. 12:12. Patience was the first grand sign of an apostle. You never find the apostles healing a friend because it was pleasant to them. “Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick” (2 Tim. 4:20); and Epaphroditus who had been hunting up Paul somewhere, “was sick nigh unto death, but God had mercy on him; and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow,” Phil. 2:27. There is the path of the saint, he is not of this world at all; he is in it, and he has to walk through it in the spirit and character of Christ, with spiritual intelligence of God’s will, and having God’s strength, doing God’s will when it comes. “Let patience have her perfect work,” Jas. 1:4. As regards the grace that puts us into this path, you will find it is the fullest that possibly can be. “Giving thanks unto the Father which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” All the patience and long-suffering are founded on that. Not only has He justified me, and given me a title to glory, but He “hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” I can say God has made me—all Christians I mean—fit to be in the light.

We have seen the path and walk of the Christian; here we see the grace that puts us into it.

The thief could go straight to paradise; he was fit to be there through the work of Christ. We have no more

remarkable testimony to the work of grace in the soul than in his case. When the whole world was against Christ, he confesses Him: when He was hanging like himself on the cross, he says, “Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom”: he was certain of that, and when in agony of pain he never thinks about it. You see further the perfect work of confidence wrought in him. How should we like to be remembered, hanging, as he was, there? Yet he was fit to be with Christ in paradise. He was the one single person that was a comfort to Christ on the cross, the blessed work of His grace surely: He had none other comfort in this world.

“Which hath made us meet”; there we get the blessed consciousness which introduces us into this walk. “Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness.” We “were sometimes darkness, but are now light in the Lord.” Satan is “the ruler of the darkness of this world”: we have been entirely delivered from that, from the darkness of this world, and all that is in it—from Satan, its god and prince. When God was revealed in Christ, He could say, “This is your hour, and the power of darkness,” Luke 22:53. This world—we have ten thousand mercies in it to be thankful for; yet it is a world that has rejected the Son of God, and Satan is over it. “This is your hour.”

My beloved friends, I dread the influence of the world over saints more than anything. The world is so subtle that it will come in at the back door if you turn it out at the front. When one has more children, one wants a bigger house, and so it comes in often; it is not like gross sin which anyone can condemn. How began the world? It ended by turning Christ out of it, but it began with Cain. Cain went out from the presence of the Lord,

and in the land of Nod (Nod means a vagabond) he built a city, and called it by the name of his son. This is just what the world has done; it has settled itself out from God. Then you cannot have a stupid city; so you get wealth—cattle the wealth of those days—and artificers in brass and iron, and musical instruments, the harp and the organ. People say, What harm is there in all this? The harm is this, that, having been driven out from the presence of God, and now, what is worse still, having driven Christ out of the world, man must try to make the world as pleasant as he can, because he is away from God. There is no harm in brass and iron, but there is harm in using them away from God. If I knocked a man down in the street, there would be no harm in my strength, but there would be harm in the use I made of it.

“And hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love”; not only have we thus light but love, the two essential names of God. I have got both according to Christ. While I have been delivered from the power of darkness, I am brought (not simply into the light, but withal) into the kingdom where all God’s love displays itself in the Son of His love; there I am living. Then he adds the how of it all, so to speak: “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.” Light is a thing of perfect purity: if we have been washed white as snow, the more the light shines, the more it shews what we are. Now we have been delivered from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of die Son of His love. In Him I have this blessedness; my sins are all forgiven, and I have a perfect conscience, so that I am able to enjoy it. We have got walk founded on that.

We have another immense blessedness here. We have had the character and perfection of the walk of the Christian, and the fulness of the grace we have got in Christ; and now he comes and takes up what God's ways and plans are— "By him to reconcile all things unto himself." This is not come yet, but we get Christ in the place He holds, and where we are in the order of divine events. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature" —He reveals God, and when I see the created system, He is the head of it; the ground of this is that He is the creator of it. "And he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." There I get the blessed truth for us that, while the Son created all things ("By him and for him were all things created"), yet He would not take them into possession, till He had His joint-heirs. The time is coming when the created heavens shall be all in order, and Christ the Head of all as Adam was lord of the old creation. We find the same thing in Hebrews 1— "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." He did not take this place simply as God. "Now he that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." He went down into death, in one sense lower than the creature; He went through death, the grave, hades; and now He is far above all heavens, and He fills all, not simply as God, but in the power of redemption. He is head over all things to the church.

All things have not yet been brought into order; but meanwhile where Christ is sitting now is at the right hand of God, “expecting till his enemies be made his footstool”; He has not yet taken His great power, but He has perfected us. “By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified,” Heb. 10. “We see not yet all things put under him, but we see Jesus … crowned with glory and honour,” Heb. 2:8, 9. Part of Psalm 8 has been fulfilled, but not all. This is unfolded in 1 Corinthians 15 too. He is now sitting at the Father’s right hand, while He is gathering His joint-heirs. He is the Firstborn of every creature in title. He is waiting till it is fulfilled. “And he is the head of the body, the church “: this is special relationship. He will have the headship of creation, and He is head to the church, but herein He is the firstborn from the dead. There I find the scheme of God thus stated, that Christ, who created all things as Son, takes all as Man, but then He is not only head over everything, but head to the church. That is an immense truth, not only a fact but a truth. The Son of God met the whole case our wickedness had brought in; He has been under death, under Satan’s power, “made sin for us.”

The position of man in the Lord Jesus Christ is after judgment has been executed; he has entered a place that Adam innocent never had, after death, after Satan’s power. He is in this new place with a totally new life, Christ’s own life, in that place. “In him was life”; He becomes a man because God’s “delights were with the sons of men.” He takes on the cross our responsibility, and, God being perfectly glorified there, He goes into a new place, according to God’s glory, that is for us. “For all the fulness was pleased in him to dwell.” If you look at verse 9 of the next chapter, you will see the fact. “For

in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Here you get the purpose: that is all the difference. It was not merely a particular individual with a certain quantity of the Godhead—a thought very familiar in those days, but "All the fulness was pleased to dwell in him."

Then I come to the second thing: He will reconcile these things, but "You hath he reconciled" (we get it again in 2 Cor. 5). Here we have this blessed truth that this is our present condition of soul with God. I have learnt His love; I have learnt that my sins are gone; my heart is brought as a present thing into God's presence, and here I am with God, without a cloud or quiver, reconciled to God. "To present you holy and unblameable and unreprovable in his sight." This is our condition in the purpose of God: then we go on to our responsibility in connection with it.

We have got back to God with a sense of more love a great deal than if we had never sinned, for we see God not sparing the best thing in heaven for us. Now I can joy in God for myself. You will find warnings afterwards: still that is what we have here. You will soon find your conscience and responsibility exercised with what follows here. Not merely are we fit to go to heaven; but when I go to God by Christ, I believe in His perfect love, and I have a perfect conscience so that I can enjoy Him. That is the reason I find a very touching thing in John's epistle; 1 John 4:9-19. First he speaks of the way in which God's love has been manifested. He has given His Son, given His Spirit to dwell in us, made His love perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; then he goes on to say, "We love him because he first loved us," not we ought to love Him. The heart

has drunk in all that this love has brought, eternal life, as well as propitiation for our sins, the Spirit given, boldness in the day of judgment, because we shall be like the Judge; all this streams into the heart, so that we can say, “We love him because he first loved us.” The sense of this love is reconciliation. If you hear a child saying, “Oh, if you only know my mother, her love, her tenderness, and though I am so foolish, she is always the same”; that child loves his mother, though the mother’s love is always the superior. “We love him because he first loved us” supposes reconciliation.

Righteousness shall reign when Christ reigns; righteousness shall dwell in the new heavens and the new earth. The effect of our being reconciled in a state of things not yet reconciled is to put us on our responsibility to go on to the end.

The wilderness is no part of God’s purpose; but it is a part of His ways. You will see in Exodus 3, 6, and 15, that God’s purpose for the Israelites was to give them Canaan. So it is with us; and He takes the case of the thief to shew that the wilderness is not a necessary thing.

Here we are, going through the world, and with that are connected “ifs.” There is no “if” in the purpose of God, there is no “if” in the accomplishment of His salvation; but there are “ifs” in the way He leads us, humbling us and proving us. “If ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel.” If you give up Christ, you will never get there! He puts them through the wilderness, where they are tested and proved as to their obedience and dependence on God. There is no “if” as to my being in Christ: I know

I am in Christ— “At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:20); but the moment He takes me as an actual living man down here, He says, “So run that ye may obtain,” 1 Cor. 9:24. I am set to go through the desert, and if I do not go on to the end, I shall never reach Canaan. What is my confidence? “He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous.” I get Christ the blessed testimony of it; there promises come in. It is not a promise that Christ is my righteousness, but I have promises along the road.

In the ways of God He puts us through this world, where we are dependent on His faithfulness to keep us all the way. We “are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation,” 1 Pet. 1:5. We are in danger every moment, but it is as plain in Scripture as A B C, that God will keep us to the end; but do not you tumble, do not you get tripped. What is the good of saying, “Neither shall any pluck them out of my hand”? (John 10:28.) Because we are in danger of being plucked. “Catcheth” is the same word: “The wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep.” I have perfect security in the Lord’s faithfulness, not in my own; I get therein dependence on Him. “I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not,” He said to Peter, and his faith did not fail. I get a vast mass of what is most blessed connected with this, not merely the fact that eternal redemption has been accomplished, but that there is not a moment that God is not thinking of me! No outward violence can prevail against us, “Neither shall any pluck them out of my hand”; and no inward decay, “They shall never perish.”

There is a striking passage, though not nearly so blessed as that in 1 Corinthians 1. What makes it so gracious is

that the Corinthians were going on shockingly ill. “I thank my God always on your behalf for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ,” chap. 1:4. “Who shall also conform you unto the end, blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.” chap. 1:8. What does Paul do then? He begins to find fault with them, and he blames everything they were doing. We are put through this place of difficulty, exercise, and trial, but we have this word that we are “kept by the power of God”: therefore our responsibility is brought out to be leaning on His grace every moment. I may say to my child, If you tumble you will be killed, but I am not going to let him tumble. You are put through these exercises every day to prove whether you are faithful in leaning on His blessed strength, not on your own, to the end of the journey. God’s way is to put us through the wilderness, as He did the Israelites, but He never forgot them, never left them without manna. He puts us through this process in bringing us to glory, that we may know ourselves, but He interweaves His grace with all our trials and difficulties. Not only has God wrought eternal redemption for us, but “He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous.”

If I undertake like Israel, “All that the Lord hath spoken we will do,” I shall surely tumble; but if I say like Paul, “When I am weak then am I strong,” I shall be safe. Paul was in danger when he came down from the third heaven, and the Lord sent a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet him; then he learns that, when reduced to utter weakness, and when he felt his weakness, the strength of Christ was made perfect. We have to go through that—we all have. We are reconciled to God, and His purpose is to present us “holy and

unblameable and unreprovable in his sight”; but we are exercised all the way to see how far we “walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing.” In the desert there are “ifs” constantly. God knows whether we need much sifting like Job, who got a good deal, Satan being let loose upon him; but what was the effect of it all? “Wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes.”

There is no uncertainty as to the perfection of Christ’s work, and no uncertainty as to His receiving us to Himself in glory; but He wants our hearts to get practically into the sense of constant dependence on Him, with the blessed promise that in this path He will never fail but will keep us to the end. When there is wandering of heart, there is danger directly; therefore we get such expressions as “Keep yourselves in the love of God”; there daily responsibility comes in, and we gain immensely by it, having “our senses exercised to discern good and evil.” Paul does not say, “I believe,” but “I know whom I have believed”: the soul finds rest there.

We get something, in its measure, like this in the Old Testament in Psalm 23. The psalmist says, “The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.” He does not say, “Thou hast made my mountain to stand strong” —I have great blessings, but it is the Lord Himself who blesses me. What is the way he learns that? His soul is restored, the Lord spreads a table for him in the presence of his enemies. He had learnt Him through all this, and he is not afraid of the power of death, or of the enemy: “Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me”: and he knows that God will keep him to the end, “Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life, and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.”

We find in Colossians 1 these three things:—

1. That we are to walk worthy of the Lord, nothing short of it.

2. The blessed consciousness that, if it be a question of our place, all is settled.

3. God’s carrying us through a road where we are sifted and tried as to the motives of the heart, that we may know what is in our hearts, and know Him too.

It is a wonderful thing that God thinks of our dangers, our characters, and our circumstances. He never ceases to think of us along the road.

The Christian Not Of The World

Colossians 2

There is practically one subject in what I have read, but divided into two parts: one, Christ as contrasted with all the thoughts of the world; and the other, the true place of the Christian as in Him. It is a new place, even in Christ. He begins by pressing on them a warning against all the philosophy and Judaism abroad. They really ran into the same channel; and this is connected with the second point referred to, because they belong to this world. Christ is put, first, in opposition to all that; and, secondly, he unfolds that what is in Christ is in a risen Christ, outside of this world. There are the same things current now, for people are turning back to "the rudiments of the world." All this infidelity and ritualism have just the same root, though not the same shape; both belong to this world, and are what man's mind and imagination, as a child of Adam, can take up. The contrast is Christ risen—Christ out of this world.

This chapter brings out both. They are the workings of man's mind and imagination—what man can do; whereas the moment you get what God has revealed in Christ, and the place Christ is in, man has nothing to do with it. They are the rudiments of this world: the one is reasoning or mental flesh; and the other is imaginative flesh. This ritualism—Christ offered every Sunday, etc.—is as if there was not one offering for sin. But I find "By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Then it is not perfected! This makes all the difference. My imagination and fancy can take hold of

these things, or the mind rejects them; but they are the denial that Christ has finished the work of redemption.

We are very little aware (though they are quite different parts of human nature) how it all has to do with man—man not delivered from himself—and having Christ instead. The apostle first warns them, and then shews what the real thing is, that is, Christ in heavenly places. God had taken up human nature among the Jews to see if it could be brought into connection with Him; and it could not. It was tried in a certain sense; but God had to hide Himself behind a veil: if there were no veil, you must be able to stand in the light, as God is light. God never came out, but He set up a gorgeous worship, and He gave the law as a more perfect rule for human nature, for man as he is. The question is, has man kept it? No one has. Where a person is going on under Judaism, he will take all the gorgeous part of it, and, on the other hand, he talks of the law, without the consciousness that he has not kept it. Of course numbers fear the law when their conscience is awakened; and, where there is truth of conscience under such a system, they are always unhappy. Man's mind takes its own course, and ends necessarily without finding God. "Can man by searching find out God? "Instead of that, you get God fully revealed in Christ, and man brought to God in Christ. Christianity supplants the darkness of the natural mind (I do not say soul), which could have nothing to do with God, and which, take it in its fullest broadest sense, is necessarily atheism, as it never reaches to God, confining itself to what the mind can find out; and that is what they were all doing here.

The apostle was anxious about them, because they were constantly mixed up with these things—living in the midst of these Greek philosophers. Although he had never been there, yet his heart knew experimentally by the power of the Holy Ghost what the snares were, and he says, “I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you.” He felt the dangers that were there, and he looked on these saints as belonging to Christ, whom he so loved and laboured for, and he shewed interest in them.

Verse 2. Here I get the understanding of the mystery of God, and that is another thing altogether. It is not the way we are accustomed to understand the word “mystery,” as a thing not to be found out; but it is a thing only known by revelation— it is not known save to the initiated. It is that which by divine revelation and teaching we know, and it brings us into a totally new world.

You get, then, another important thing needed. Supposing I was the greatest scientist in the world, there is not a bit of love about it: it is connected with nobody, and there is not an atom of soul-work in it. Therefore God cannot be known, for God is love. Faith gives us an inlet into all the things that love has done. Science is as cold as ice—dead cold: you cannot let a bit of feeling in. There is no relationship with anything in the world or any One above it (v. 2). But revelation lets in “To the acknowledgment of the mystery of God” — God the source of their life, God the One who dwells there by the Holy Ghost among them, and gives the feeling that flows from the relationship into which they are brought. The mind may get developed, but there is no moral [motive?] in it—it is not in its nature. The

Christian acts by a motive. Science does not touch the ground that the soul is on. What has feeling to do with the discovery of how the physical nature works? In Christ I learn the blessed truth, that God dwells in me by the power of the Spirit in the divine nature, and I have communion with the Father and the Son. I get into a new world altogether.

Then I rise “unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding.” Understanding of what? Of how animals were born? No; of the hidden mystery. I get my heart opened to see all the scope of God’s plans and counsels in Christ. You get the “full assurance of faith “(Heb. 10:22) (that is not science!) that “he that hath received his testimony, hath set to his seal that God is true.” Science says, “I think this, and I think that” —such is all it has. I find adequate certainty about all common things, but if I have the testimony of God, I get the positive certainty of faith—the only certainty we have. I have set to my seal that God is true—He cannot but be true.

I get another “full assurance,” and that is “hope” (Heb. 6:11), for there you have the affections engaged, and the things realised. It gives much greater reality—the very acquaintance imparts great reality. I am going to be in the same glory with Christ, and that is the full assurance of hope. Am I going to be there? Yes, of course, if you are a believer, and you have the earnest of it in your hearts. “Earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven” —that is the full assurance of hope.

The third thing goes much higher— “Full assurance of understanding” —for it is part of God’s plan and counsel

in Christ; and if we are not there, Christ's glory is not complete, and it cannot be otherwise. "We have the mind of Christ." If I have the full assurance of hope, then I see these things as a part of God's plan and Christ's glory, and that is the full assurance of understanding.

"To the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, wherein are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." There is nothing so certain in the world as the revelation of God, known only by redemption. Now you belong to another world: these things (philosophy, Judaism, etc.) do not belong to the world I am in. Of course there is God's creation, but it is His first creation; it passes away, or we perish from it. It is a wonderful creation, but that is not being reconciled to God, and being in the new creation. In this mystery are all God's wisdom and knowledge—all summed up—all His counsels there, to which the natural mind has not even an entrance, and never can, for "they are spiritually discerned." It rests on the revelation of God. The soul rinds its affections in the new creation; it has a world it belongs to, and "they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country." You get the figure of it in Abram. He had not so much as to set his foot upon; he was not in the land, but he belonged to it, and that is just where we are, "As having nothing, and yet possessing all things." The world attracts Lot's heart in the character of its efforts at grandeur; but Abram was a stranger and pilgrim, and he says, "If thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." Lot goes down to the plain just ripening for judgment, and pitches his tent near Sodom; then he gets nearer and nearer, till he is snatched out of it. As soon as Lot had gone down and chosen this prosperous place, then God says to Abram, "Lift up now thine eyes," etc.

As soon as he had completely given up the world in heart, then the promised land rose up before him. He realised the thing that was promised to him. It was separation to God in faith. He got the full assurance of hope.

Now we go on to learn where the Christian is, not what he is yet. “Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.” It is Christ up in heaven in another world. “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” Here I find the actual starting-place, and this is, that in Christ all the fulness of the Godhead bodily is revealed. I have the perfect revelation of the fulness of the Godhead in Christ. I have nothing new to look after (save of course, to know it better), for I cannot go beyond the fulness of the Godhead, and it is revealed to me. In Christ, in that Man—more than man, for He was God too—has been the revelation of the fulness of the Godhead. It requires eyes to see it; but to faith, which saw through the veil of His humiliation when here, there was not a trait in His character, an act in His conduct, or an expression of the feeling of His heart going out to the misery around Him, that was not the revelation of the Godhead; the Father was revealed, as in John 14, all was revealed, and nothing else to seek after, except to know it better.

Then I get the other blessed side (v. 10), “In him dwelleth all the completeness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are complete in him” (just the same word in the original). Yes, and I say I am complete in Him before God—God is completely revealed to me in Christ; but what about you? can you stand before Him? I am before Him complete in Christ, with not a single thing wanting.

This makes it such a full statement of what the mystery is—the positive relation of all the fulness of the Godhead in One who has come close to me in love, that I may know He is love. When Christ was in this world, He did not seek anything great or grand for Himself. What did He seek? Sorrow, poverty, misery. That is what God has been doing in this world—perfect love (and power too) relieving distress—love that brought down perfect goodness to where I was; that is what God is to me. Perfect goodness in the midst of all the sorrow and misery of this world, and the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in Him bodily! Ah, poor science! it is a long way off from that. It can tell me about protoplasms, but about divine love never!

The mystery of Christ shews me this completeness without going to outside things—not up in the clouds to reach it if we can, but brought down to me here. I am complete in Christ, but as I find God perfectly revealed (none of us can measure it, of course, or even go through it—we have to search it out, and grow in it) then I find this on the other side: How can I stand before Him, and grasp all that? Are you fit to be in His presence? Yes; I say, “Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” That is the place you are brought into, just as the completeness of the Godhead was brought to us in Christ. Then I find that I am complete according to all God’s thoughts. Just as God stood in Christ before man, man stands in Christ before God. It is not merely philosophy spelling out what has been all around us since the creation, it is the One who created it all; and besides this, I find my personal blessedness in it. I am complete in Him, I have

everything I want, and that I want for eternity. “Both he that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one” —all one set. What life have I got? Christ. What righteousness? Christ. What glory? Christ. Just in one position and state. How can I tell how much God loves me? This I can tell you (or rather Christ has told us), that you are loved as Christ is loved. And we know it now. “I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it,” etc. He dwells in us, and the Holy Ghost brings down this love into our hearts; “the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us.”

Now the apostle turns to a special thing which was their difficulty then, that, while he gives the whole scope of God’s mind in the mystery, he goes down and deals with this fleshly religion. The Colossians were accustomed to be in the midst of these things. The Jewish system was bringing out for us whether man in the flesh could have to do with God. How many souls there are now under the law in their hearts (they are lawless if they are not)! You must get the knowledge of sin by the law, if rightly applied. It is man, as responsible man, getting a perfect rule of what he ought to be, and circumcision is merely the expression of that—death of the flesh. All that was shadowed forth in those things you have in Christ.

The apostle turns more to details to shew where we are as Christians (v. n). A totally new thing it is—the putting off the body of the flesh. They never had circumcision in the wilderness, not till they crossed the Jordan—a figure of our dying with Christ. Gilgal was the place where they rolled away the reproach of the world. I get the same here. Before it was a circumcision made with hands; now it is without: I have the true circumcision. Instead

of the mere outward ritual of the thing, I have the thing itself; I am complete in Christ. How so? Why I am dead and gone! I have put off the old man altogether; I am not speaking of carrying it out: this you get in 2 Corinthians 4:10. A risen Christ is my life, all connection with this world is gone. I am dead to sin, and alive to God. I have put off the body of the flesh, I have died with Christ. I reckon myself dead; I have got a risen Christ as my life; to faith then I have done with this flesh—done with it altogether. I have got this new thing; I am in it (of course I am in this poor earthly tabernacle still, but) I do not belong to this world; I have died through the death of Christ. It is not merely saying you must die—saying "you must" does not give a thing. If you have died with Christ, you are risen with Him—you have left it all behind. It is the very character and meaning of baptism. With Christ I died, I am baptised to Christ's death. Here am I, a living man, and I go through death with Christ (an outward sign, of course)—a person who has gone with Christ into His grave, and come up out of it again. He passed out of the condition He was in here as a man on the earth into a totally new place—God raised Him from the dead. You then get, "Wherein also ye are risen with him," etc. As a Christian you are risen. I have got into this new state; I say, That is myself, for I am a Christian.

And now we get much further light on our condition. "And you being dead in your sins" (v. 13). I was living in sins in the other, but the truth of "dead in sins" goes a good deal farther: alive as regards my sins, but dead as regards God. This goes farther, and takes up the nature that likes doing them. There is not one single thing in your heart with which God could link Himself. "They

that are in the flesh cannot please God." There is nothing in heaven your nature would like.

I get now, not merely "quickened," but "quickened together with him" (v. 13); because, supposing I am alive, I may be spiritually alive, or I may be in Romans 7. Any one there says, "I think Christ is precious to me, and I love His word and His people," but he is examining himself to find out if he is in the new creation. Like the prodigal, he has not met the father; but this is not quickened together with Christ— quickened, no doubt, and when I speak of being quickened in that way, it is the divine operation of a new life in my soul. But quickened together with Christ is different. Where do I see Christ Himself? Not as quickener, but as quickened. Christ as man has been raised from the dead. He died under our sins—for them; He went on unto death for us, and God has raised Him up, and, supposing I am a believer, I am raised up with Him. If I look at myself, it is as raised with Christ, as it says here, "Quickened together with him." It looks at Christ as a dead man, but that in coming down to death He put away my sins, and therefore I am raised with Him. It is not merely the fact that I have life; I have life in a new condition where Christ is. I have got into a new place before God—Christ's place—and all my sins are left on the other side of Christ's grave. I do not own the old man, it is the horrid thing that has been deceiving me.

There are two more things I would just mention. There are these ordinances—all "blotted out." All the things the flesh can do in order to gain acceptance are dead in the flesh that did them. Where do I find Christ now that we are risen? Where do I find Christ in the Lord's supper? It is His death. "Bringing Christ into the

elements," as people say; there is no such thing, for it is a dead Christ. The shed blood shews forth His death, and there is no such Christ now. After His resurrection He is alive, death can have no more dominion over Him. And so baptism, as to its signification; it is unto His death: I have gone down with Christ to death, and I am risen with Him.

Only one thing more. In order to bring us thus complete in Him, there were other things against us—these "principalities and powers" (v. 15). Christ has destroyed Satan's power in the cross; I was a living man in sin—that is gone. Then all those ordinances I was bound to—they are gone. Well, then, Satan's power (not that he has not power)—Christ has triumphed over him, "Through death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil"; so death has lost its power too. The cross of Christ has closed the history of the old man, and of all its associations. I was a slave of sin, "I am quickened together with him" —a slave to ordinances, they are "nailed to his cross" —a slave to Satan, his power is destroyed. I am risen with Christ beyond these things, and that is where the Christian is. I am going to have an everlasting holiday; I have it even now in spirit. I am going to God's rest in heaven. I do not keep days, for this is going back to heathenism. Do you think the sun going round will make them keep days in heaven? It is an everlasting holiday; it is only in our hearts now, for if we follow Christ, we learn its sorrows and griefs too, for He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." We are taken out of all the speculation of philosophy, for we are in a world into which it cannot get.

Now, beloved friends, are your hearts ready to accept such a Christianity? The flesh clings to what the flesh

likes— clings to the world, and that which Satan has power over us by, and therefore there is still the combating. But are you content with this? I do not talk about realisation; but are you content to take that path which Christ walked as your path?—to take up your cross daily and follow Him? It looks bitter to the flesh, for it is another world that the flesh can have nothing to say to, even in thought. We shall fail in many things; but are you content to have done with the world into which you were born—to be dead out of it? It is the character and essence of what Christianity really is. My place is as a Christian come up out of Christ's grave. Are you content to take such a Christianity as that? You will never escape the wiles of the devil—either philosophy or Ritualism—you have not got what takes you out of their sphere and dominion. It is the wiles of the devil we have to stand against, not his power— resist him. We have still that allowed in us, in our lives, which Satan can use and get a hold of. You say I must have done with this world that does not want Christ; but if I am risen with Christ, I say I have done with it. The more we go on, the more we shall see it is what is needed. If we are not using the power of Christ in that way, we shall not succeed. If we are risen with Christ, there is a world that the life belongs to, and a world that the flesh cannot touch. Is my heart living for the world where Christ is gone, or for this world?

The Lord give us to see Him so precious, that those things that were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. It is all very easy with a single eye, but "a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways." If Christ is up there, then, of course, our hearts will go after Him. It must be a thorough thing.

We see in this epistle that Christ is all: there is life in Him; then we see the object into which this life grows—the child grows up into that. We get, further, all the scene into which Christ has entered, as the child grows up into the scene around him. Christ is all, and He is in all too. Then another thing which we are all conscious of—the way in which He has met our need as poor sinners, the work of Christ which He has wrought for us all alone; all that meeting our consciences, and the effect of it too, which is that the Christian is looked at in two different ways—as a sinner saved, and as one who stands in the system and circle of God's purpose; they are two very distinct things, and the way of treating them is distinct too.

There are many thorough and devoted Christians who do not get beyond this first thing that God has done; but there is another thing—the thought and purpose God had in doing it, our portion looked at as connected with the second Adam.

He is our Saviour as regards the first man, looked at as responsible man, but behind all that, and beyond all that, there is the purpose of God, in which we are looked at, not as in the first man, but in the Second. You get the old man looked at (vv. 12, 13), One dying for our sins, standing in our place as guilty sinners, saving and justifying us; and then you get the second point, "quickened together with Christ." Whenever he speaks of quickening in these epistles, it is not merely the fact of having life; He looks at us as dead in our sins, not responsible people, but dead, and God not dealing with a responsible man, but a new creation, totally new; it is quite a different aspect, though they run into one another. I have died in Christ— "in which things ye

walked when ye lived in them," and death had to come in as to that life.

There are two things in connection with that, though he does not go much into the second in this epistle. First, we are a new creation, then there is the sphere in which this new creation has its life. Our conversation is in heaven. As to myself, I know that in me dwelleth no good thing, but I am placed, like Christ, before God. He has said, "My Father, and your Father"; "as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly" —this takes another scope altogether.

We come in as guilty sinners. If I merely get hold of the purpose of God, without conscience being reached as to sins, there is no truth in it; I must know what I am in myself before I can know what I am made in Christ. That is the point I had in my mind, which I desire to have your hearts turned to—the difference between saving a sinner, and one whom Christ is not ashamed to call a brother; that is not true about sinful Adam. Looked at as new creatures, we are new creatures in Christ Jesus (in Colossians he does not go much farther than that); new creatures which grow up as a child does in the sphere in which it lives, in which all its thoughts and affections are developed.

Verse 2. You do not want the wisdom of the world here; the life is of God. We are passed through this world, left here for exercises and trials, much to learn and much to unlearn, but still we get this sphere into which we are brought by grace, as well as the nature which is capable of enjoying it.

Verse 6. "So walk ye in Him." If Christ is our life, let us walk in Him, the heart not getting out of this sphere

which belongs to the new creation. You must all know, if you know anything of your own hearts, that double-mindedness is a great snare, even in the most sincere. We are constantly surrounded with that which belongs to the old man. I am not talking of sins. Take an unconverted man—his heart is like a highway for everything that comes before him in the world. That is an extreme case, but for us there is the danger of distraction, politics, all the things going on around us; and if the heart is not living in the sources of strength, it is double-minded—I do not mean in will, but that which determines the conduct of a Christian is not there; it is not the strait and narrow way for his heart, but that running through his mind and heart which saps the spiritual strength, and the manna is light food for him, not sweet as honey, but light food. Such is the danger of distraction, and so he says, “Beware.”

Verse 8. “Not after Christ.” This is the turning-point. The world has its principles, its rudiments; and all these things that distract us belong to the world’s estimate of things, and we do not suspect danger. People are talking of things around, and we are drawn into the ordinary conversation, and we come out with the consciousness that we have been unfaithful to Christ, and our spiritual strength is weakened. When the people were thinking of the leeks, the onions, and the cucumbers, they forgot they had been making bricks without straw in Egypt. A glorified Christ on high is the testimony that the world would not have Christ, and it goes on with its own rudiments and principles. Look at the prayer in Ephesians 3— what infinite blessedness! the poor world has nothing of that, and there you get the sphere of the life.

“In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” I get this wonderful central object, that where all the fulness of the Godhead is, it has all been in a Man: how little our hearts reach up to it! He says, “Strengthened with might,” that we may. But there it is for us, and in us too we can say in one sense; but that which He looks for is, that having got in a Man, the object of the Father’s delight, all the fulness of the Godhead, I should feed upon that with joy. If my soul has really felt and seen the fulness of the Godhead in Him in this world, if my eyes are open to see what He was there, I find this wonderful thing, a Man who is much meeker than I am, who thinks about my feelings much more than I do about His, and He is here close to me—a Man much more true, humble, gracious, affable than any other; and now we are united to Him where He is. You find what people do when they are settled in the truth of justification—they go back, and feed upon the Gospels. He becomes the food of the soul, and its object; and we find this unspeakable truth, that He who is sufficient for the Father’s delight is sufficient for mine—my thoughts poor enough, but His perfect. “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father”; that is what is before us in “in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily”; and this truth was the very first one that was attacked. And this is the reason of one of those cases of gracious thoughtfulness which we get at the well of Samaria: ‘If thou knewest Who it was that came down so low as to be dependent on a woman like you for a drink of water—’

He was utterly alone in a world of sinners, and then worked redemption; and now we are brought through the power of redemption and the Holy Ghost to see who He is.

He never gives up His Godhead place. It does not cease to be condescension when the thing is complete, and instead of waiting on our infirmities, it is bringing us into His blessedness. What are all the distractions of the world in the face of such a thing! It was His intention we should walk by faith; when He speaks of sight, it is the sight of heavenly things, but it is equally true we cannot live by sight here.

Verse 10. If the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him, we are complete in Him too—complete according to God's mind, in Christ before God. What is the measure of that completeness? Christ. And what is that "in Christ"? God looked down at Christ, looks at Him now, He is all the desire of His heart, and we are complete in Him. All that satisfies God's delight, His spiritual judgment (if I may use such an expression of God), He also brings us into (of course, He keeps His Godhead). All His thoughts as to righteousness, holiness, love are satisfied in Christ, and we are complete in Him. What a place, beloved brethren! And it was brought down to us in perfect grace where we were; and, on the other hand, there is all that God's heart and righteousness could delight in, and we are in that, Christ the measure. God had His measure for man, that was the law, what the first man ought to be; but here it is where all God's thoughts are satisfied, not in the first man, but, in His own wisdom, in the second Man.

He applies it now in detail. We see how God takes us up as poor sinners to redeem us: first, as regards His dealings with us where we were; and then, taking us in our lowest possible condition as dead in sins, we see what He has brought us into. Here I get the putting off, the circumcision; that is no part of the purpose of God. It

is not put off outwardly, it is the discovery, not of certain things we have done, but of this old stock, the flesh, which is enmity against God, a positive thing in me, to which death must be applied; it is in grace, for it is the death of Christ. I find the evil thing, the flesh, lusting against the Spirit, and the only remedy for that is death; to reckon ourselves dead, that is our place as Christians, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. I get the figure of that here in the putting off" of a thing always evil in its nature. If I try to keep it down, as not knowing it is dead in Christ, it will be a laborious effort, in which I can never succeed; but if I see it dead with Christ, I see it is a question between Christ and God. "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." Of forgiving it he does not talk; it was an evil nature, and God condemned it in death.

But in all this God is dealing still with the old thing. First, I need to get my sins blotted out as guilt, but when I want, in honesty of heart, to walk aright, I find this—I died there; I am not in the flesh, but in the Spirit; and I say, It is not I, it is only sin, and this was crucified in the cross. But then all that deals with the old man. It is the necessity of my condition, but not the purpose of God. Many, alas! have not even learned that. They see their sins are forgiven, but not that they have died out of that condition, so as to have done with it altogether. I am entitled to reckon myself dead, and then in Christ, who has redeemed me, I get by the Holy Ghost power against it; but still that is all about the old thing. I get this death to sin, and resurrection too, but still dealing with the old thing. But then, when I come to the new thing, I can look

at it in another aspect. It is stated in this epistle and in Ephesians. In Ephesians it is more as to its nature, “which after God is created in righteousness and holiness of truth.” God’s own nature reproduce, it was manifested in Christ, the pattern and fulness of it. In Colossians 3:10 it is expressed a little differently: “Renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.” I have got to know what love is; I know what righteousness in the divine sense is, and I know what holiness is. If I am chastened, it is that I may be a partaker of His holiness. “Renewed in knowledge” —I press this, for while Colossians does not put us so much into the new sphere, I am renewed in knowledge. He has brought into our souls the knowledge of what is pleasing to God, a new nature, associated with God in its very being and nature.

Supposing for a moment that I have known justification, have known the old man dead, I get another thing, “dead in your sins” (v. 13). When I come to know myself, I see that, spiritually speaking, I was dead, not a living sinner dealing with the old thing as bad, but I am dead in sins. My starting-point is total alienation from God; it is not the things I have done, nor the evil nature that did them, but no one thing in my heart that answered to God, and when the only thing that answered to God’s heart was here, we would have nothing to do with Him. I have got on to another ground now; I have found out that, in respect of God, I was dead in sins; but then, when I was lying, in a spiritual sense, dead in sins, Christ came down to the cross, and He died for my sins; and I get Christ, not as the quickening Son of God, but rather as quickened, and with that alone in Scripture the new creation begins. When speaking of the lusts and

sins of the old man, I say, You must die; but now on this ground I am totally dead, not a movement of my heart towards God, and nothing could stir any movement. It was tried—God, in His love, sending His Son; and what it woke was hatred.

I am quickened together with Him, an entirely new thing which I had not before, Christ now the only life I have. God's power has come in, and taken me spiritually out of that state, as He took Christ out of it, and has put me into Christ, not yet with Him. I am created in Christ Jesus, and so he says, If any man is in Christ, he is a new creation: our faith ought to realise it, for we are not there actually yet.

In this new creation we are sitting together in Christ, but it does not go so far as that in Colossians; He makes me a partaker of His own nature, and this is the only thing I own at all. What is the first man? What does he belong to? To the world, of course. This makes one of the difficulties of the Christian. I cannot expect the world to see what I see. But there is a path the vulture's eye hath not seen, and He does help us through these difficulties. We have to go through it; but this is not the world the new Man belongs to.

As dead in sins, we are totally away from God. Do not we know it, beloved friends? Take the most respectable, decent man in the world—the things of Christ have no interest for him—he is dead towards God; he may be intelligent, honest, etc., but you never get Christ in his heart. It was just the same with ourselves. It is not a question of reprobate criminals, but we were dead.

Supposing I get a dead man, is there any motion in his heart towards another? No. Can you produce any? No.

You may galvanise him for a moment, just as striking impressions may be produced, but he is dead. But I get this unspeakable grace, that Christ came down here actually to death. God quickened Him and us, and I am a partaker of the divine nature, a totally new thing—of the second Adam, not the first— a man that belongs to God's new creation, because he is a new creation. We never know thoroughly our blessing until we get hold of that; the thorough consciousness of what we were as dead in sins; the grace of Christ in coming down here; and therefore we are totally and actually raised out of it into another world. God has a new creation, of which Christ is the Head, He sitting now at God's right hand alone, and we strangers and pilgrims seeking a country, Christ the ensample, and we have to follow His steps, the path which none but the spiritual eye can see through this world. A new man, created of God, the life I have now got as created to satisfy Himself and all that He is. When we were these poor wretched sinners, guilty, away from God, it was in the purpose of His heart, ordained before the world unto our glory. I cannot enlarge upon this now —perhaps could not do it properly if I tried. But there is that sphere we belong to altogether, though left to go through this world.

Beloved brethren, as born of God you belong not to this world at all, but to the world where Christ has gone to prepare a place for you, and from whence He is preparing you for the place. When dead in sins, He has quickened us together with Christ—the divine grace of the Son of God, who became a man on purpose to die, and came into our death and sins, made sin for us, and He is gone to be the beginning and the Head of this new

creation. Our every-day trial, how far we are living in this new creation, our conversation in heaven.

There are these two things: the nature you have got, “created after God in righteousness and true holiness”; and then, where will that find what will satisfy its affections? It is revealed to us in Christ, and the Holy Ghost down here has brought these things out before us, “that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.”

We have to see, beloved brethren, how far we are not only keeping out the evil lusts of our hearts, but as new creatures are living in the new creation of God. I may be a babe in it, of course, but the affections of the babe are as true as those of the old man. How far is your conversation in heaven, where Christ is gone to prepare a place where you may be with Him and like Him? your hearts in love and thankfulness to Him who loved you, living in the things He died to bring you into.

What I desire your hearts to study in Scripture is this—that while there is this reckoning ourselves dead, there is the other aspect, that, dead in sins, we are created anew in Christ Jesus. You are a new creation as to state and condition, but how far are you living in the sphere it belongs to? It is a wonderful thing to think God has created us thus, Christ the attractive point there the power of it all; and what is this poor world to me?

The Lord give us, beloved friends, as quickened together with Christ, all trespasses forgiven, to see what it is to have our conversation in that which we belong to.

Christian Life

Colossians 3

We get here the great groundwork of Christian life, and the development of Christian life itself, both negatively and positively—what we put off, and what we put on.

It is of all moment for us, not only to understand it as stated in Scripture, but to have the statements of Scripture transferred to our hearts and consciences, that we are in an entirely new creation, “renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.” So the first man was made in the image of God, though now a lost ruined creature. In death and resurrection man gets a new place altogether, not only quickened, but quickened together with Christ. A man may be quickened as to the state of his mind, and yet think he is alive in the world, which is the very thing we are not. As to our condition before God, we do not belong to the life that is on this side of death. A new life may be given, and the man left down here; but Christ is looked at as a man who has died here, after having come into our place, taken the judgment—the cup, and gone away beyond it; and this is our place; not as to our bodies of course, for we have the treasure in earthen vessels, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies; but our place in faith and in life is Christ’s place, the Second man’s place, and not the first man’s. If our bodies, it is the first; if our souls, it is the Second. We are taken out of the old place by redemption. I repeat it, for it is very important for the apprehension of faith, that Christ the Son, a divine Person, communicated life, but Christ died, and now we are quickened together

with Him. The place we were in by sin and disobedience, He was in for us, and, He having perfected the work needed to redeem us, we are taken up into the place where He is, and when He comes to raise the dead, we shall be there actually. Now it is putting on the character of Christ; then it will be actually the thing in glory.

All through, the teaching here is not simply that we are born of God, but raised with Christ, who as Man is actually there; and it is the basis of Christianity to understand it, and the love that gave Him too. We have to watch and deny the ways of the old man, which seeks a place in the world, likes consideration, etc.; but Christ took the lowest place, and calls us to follow Him. As to our place with God, it is as near Him as Christ is. “If you died with Christ, how can you be alive spiritually in this world?” It is very strong as to a Christian’s place. The world is always soliciting the Christian back into it; it is an immense system which Satan has built up to act on the flesh and to hide God. This cannot satisfy conscience, and therefore, when a man’s conscience is awakened, he bows his head as a bulrush, saying, “Shall I give the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?” and gets under ordinances. He has not got out in spirit and state from this world—is not dead to it; it is the religion Paul had when he was Saul the Pharisee. An unconverted man can do these things better than a converted one, for the latter has too much thought to be satisfied, though he may be doing it. He may go on his knees, and be vexed and angry if you do not think well of him for it; he is making out his religion as a living man, not as a redeemed man.

Man is a religious animal: it is a necessity of man's heart. His reason may reason him out of the want of God, but there it remains at the bottom, and breaks out again, as it was after the French revolution. It is part of man's nature to have to say to God; it is the consciousness that he cannot supply his own needs in this world, and must turn to a God above him. It may be miserably corrupted, but man wants help, he wants to look up. The devil used this to let him make gods of his passions; but in man's nature is a craving after God; and man, when not set free by the work of redemption, will be religious; it is Pharisaism—there have always been Pharisees. It is just ritualism, alive in the world, and subject to ordinances, not dead with Christ; chap. 2:21, 22. I may fancy there are precious mysteries in these things, but they are all to perish with the using, and therefore the old nature makes its religion in them— "a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." They go back to the shadows, as if they were something real, and are subject to ordinances; man's will is in it, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. It is to the satisfying of the flesh. Who was satisfied when the Pharisee thanked God he was not as other men are? To whose credit did it go? To God or Christ?

Supposing I were to fast seven times a week. Well, I think myself better than the man who only does it six times; it is satisfying the flesh. Supposing it is prayer (I need not say prayer is the most blessed privilege a man has); but if he says so many prayers, the one who says five is better than the one who only says three: it is satisfying the flesh, though neglecting the body. That is, as regards being dead with Christ, I am clean out of it, I have left it all behind; what is it to me if I am dead? No

good thing in you at all, for the religious doings of the flesh are flesh still; it is merely saying, I am not dead with Christ. What are our greatest privileges, as Christians, may be used in this way.

Chapter 3:1. If risen with Christ, you are not in the world. If I have got this Christ-place, that I have died to the world, making Christ my life, I reckon myself dead, and alive to God, not in Adam, but in Jesus Christ our Lord. It is a great thing for the believer, it strikes at the root of a number of things in detail as we go on. Am I, a living man as born of Adam, to question my place with God as such? or am I dead with Christ, risen with Christ, and having my place with God as such?

“Where Christ sitteth”; there is one Man who has gone there, a blessed Man who loved me and gave Himself for me. I am with Him risen, knowing redemption or forgiveness, and my affections rest on Him up there. I see Christ on high. “Set your affections on things above,” etc. He is looking for the state of the moral mind here. Having the consciousness that Christ is my life up there, my heart follows Him. A dead man cannot have his affections or mind on things of earth.

Verse 3. Another thing which comes out most blessedly here is our complete thorough association with Christ. What is true of Him is true of me. “He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one.” Christ is dead, we are dead: Christ is hid in God, our life is hid in Him: when He appears, we appear. “Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.” There is this blessed identification with Christ, our sins put away; and as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall bear the image of the heavenly. “As he is, so are we in this

world”; not that we are actually in the glory, but it is our place before God. It gives wonderfully settled peace, beloved friends—all sins completely blotted out. But this is not all, there is another thing—in what kind of a way am I going to be received, supposing He had forgiven us, and left us here to go on as best we could? That is not what He has done. “Accepted in the Beloved”—that is what a Christian is. What the flesh has done is blotted out, and put away, but then we are in Christ, “as he is, so are we” —the positive side, in short, not only the negative; loved as Christ is loved, “the glory thou hast given me, I have given them.” “I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them,” that is now. The world will know we are thus loved when it sees us in the same glory with Himself.

Christ was totally alone with God when He was made sin for us, bearing our sins in His own body on the tree; and when this was done, sitting above in glory, He sent down the Holy Ghost to give us the consciousness that we are in the same place.

You find many such passages, as in 1 Corinthians 15, if Christ is not raised, we are not raised. He was really a dead man, and if I am not raised, Christ has not been. We get all in this blessed association with Christ. But where it pinches is, if that is true, “he that saith he abideth in him, ought himself also so to walk, even as He walked.” This will not do with the world. It pinches our poor wretched hearts if the flesh works; but when the heart is on Christ, it is freedom and blessed liberty; but it is a hard thing to the feeble heart that I am to be like Christ down here. I know I am going to be like Christ in glory, to bear the image of the heavenly; and so there is

one object on earth—to win Him, and to purify myself even as He is pure. Beholding the glory of the Lord, I am changed into the same image.

Here is the groundwork which is thus laid: dead with Christ, risen with Christ—not there yet, of course, but our affections set upon things above, not on things of earth; they cannot go together; “If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.” Our affections follow Christ where He is actually gone; our hearts have got into the place where He is risen in glory. How far have our hearts got there? We have actual acceptance, we know we are in Christ before God; but how far are our hearts content to follow Him, as He said, “Follow thou me”? A very strong word it is, as taking us right out of this world—a full and absolute object for the heart. There is a way the vulture’s eye hath not seen—the following Christ, the one thing God delights in.

In verse 5, etc., you find more fully than anywhere in Scripture what this life of the Christian really is. But it is “members which are on the earth only.” But-mark this: the moment I am here I have power, which in the flesh I have not. “When we were in the flesh, the motions of sin which were by the law did work in my members to bring forth fruit unto death.” The renewed man under law has no power; when dead and risen with Christ, we get power. “Mortifying” is putting to death. Scripture does not say “dying”; but we are called to reckon ourselves dead, because He has done it and has become our life, and then I say to the flesh, I do not know you, I have had enough of you; I am dead.

Colossians gives the fact, Romans 6 is faith’s estimate of it. 2 Corinthians 5 is practically carrying it out, “and so

death worketh in us, and life in you"; there is power, the power of Christ.

Verse 6. Unbelief is not the only ground of judgment. The world is condemned as such for having rejected Christ, but judgment is for works.

Verse 7. "In the which ye also walked some time when ye lived in them." They are not supposed to be in them now that they were in Christ; they had walked in them, like other Gentiles.

Gross things come first, what is plain and evident; but he does not stop there, for he will not have the flesh stir. How is it that you get angry? Is it not this, that the flesh is not subdued practically? Impatience—where does that come from? You say, "Oh, but it is so vexing, so provoking." Would Christ be impatient? And, you have Christ's life. "Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man and his deeds." I get three characters of sin—devil sins and brute sins; corruption and violence in anger arid malice; and then, added to that, "Lie not one to another," with the ground of this, "seeing ye have put off the old man."

And now we have the putting on. Mark the measure of this here, "renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." My standard of what is good is spiritual knowledge of God's nature. We are renewed in knowledge. I say that does not suit God.

If I take the character and image, I see that manifested in a man in Christ. In Ephesians it is, "Be ye followers of God as dear children." He takes the essential names of God, light and love, and in both cases he takes Christ as the pattern. A person says, An imitator of God! how can I be that, a poor worm like me? But what is your

pattern? Christ—that is the way we are to walk. It is not simply what is claimed from man under the law, but my walk is to be the expression of God; and I see this in Christ—love manifested in the midst of evil. It is not. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, but, the world being an evil world, you must go and shew out God in it as Christ did— “made partakers of the divine nature.”

Verse n. It is not said here, Christ is all in all, though that is very well in its way, but it is something more here, which is very important. “Christ is all”; no object but Christ. And what does that mean? The cross, perhaps; we may have to go through it. He is “in all,” the power of life, and the sole object of life. When it is affections, He is all, everything, to me; and He is in me the power of divine life too.

I have here also a most important principle: if I am to produce these fruits, and walk in this way, as He tells us, and there are a thousand different details in which it comes in every day, and all day—well, I go as the elect of God. If I send my child out, I say, Walk as my child, and he must recollect that he is my child; if he has lost the recollection of it, the whole nature and character of the walk is gone. Be imitators of God as dear children; do not forget this. So here, Put on as the elect of God, holy and beloved, etc. Just think, if I carried that with me all the day long! Here am I, the elect of God: God has chosen to delight in me. He will surely make us know our own nothingness; but there is the consciousness of this love, just as a child knows its father’s affection, not at all that he is worthy of it. Separate to God, and loved of God, I go through the world in the blessed sense that God, in His sovereign goodness, has taken me into His delight. We find all these things are said of Christ. Was

not He the elect of God, One chosen out of the people? Was not He the Holy One in the fullest sense? Was not He the beloved One, the beloved Son, all His life sanctified to the Father in an absolute sense? And He says, Walk as such. You cannot do it unless you have got the motive, that which moves the affections, though there may be duty. We are to walk through this world, not to attain anything, though I shall get joy and blessing; but having got this place, there is the putting off the old man, and the putting on the new. Being in that place, and having that life, I put on the things that become it— “meekness, long-suffering, humbleness of mind, lowliness.” He always took the last place; when rejected, He said, “Let us go to another village.”

“Forbearing one another, forgiving one another.” Did not Christ forgive us when He was insulted, spit upon? Yes, and you go and do that too. If you look at 1 Corinthians 13, you will find there is not one atom of activity spoken of there as to charity, but it is all self-denying, meekness, patience. If you know what self is, you know that is where we are tested. I must bring not merely kindness into the path, but the divine element which checks anything that is contrary to holiness, while humble, lowly, etc. It has with it the divine thing which cannot acquiesce in an evil to itself; love, the bond of perfectness, will put it all in its place. The moment I bring God in, I bring in what has a claim upon the heart, in thorough consistency with the One who says, “Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.” If your heart were always perfectly peaceful, quiet, and gentle, how many things which provoke would not be there! It gives, too, calmness of judgment so that we know what to do. Christ’s peace was never disturbed. You never find Him

in a position where He was not Himself; even in Gethsemane, when in an agony, He turned round to His disciples, just as if nothing had happened, and said, “Could ye not watch with me one hour? “He goes from one to the other, just what He ought to be with His Father about this dreadful cup, and just what He ought to be with His poor disciples in love to them. Of course we fail, but that is the principle.

Verse 10 is not merely negative, nor the putting on the character of Christ, but the unsearchable riches of Christ, the soul opening out on all that belongs to the Christian; “teaching and admonishing one another … singing with grace,” etc Not merely knowledge, but the affections expressed as human beings do express them, and as they will be expressed in heaven— “singing,” the word giving the knowledge of all things, and then melody in the heart.

“Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” How can I bring Christ into the common things of this world? Whatever word comes out of your mouth, or whatever you do, do it in the name of the Lord Jesus. You say, Is there any harm in that? Can you do it in the name of Jesus? If not, do not leave Christ to go and do it without Him. Are you going to see that exhibition? Why not? I cannot go in the name of the Lord. I take the common things of life purposely to make it simple. Do you smoke? No, I cannot smoke in the name of Jesus. I do not mind what it is—everything in word or deed—the gross things of evil all cast off, and then what would be called by man indifferent things. It is an indifferent thing if I put the book this way or that way; but supposing my Father held very much to my putting it this way, and I do not, you may say, Well, I do not know about the book, but

I know where your heart is. “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.” If you make a law, it will be very hard, but if Christ is everything to me, it will be easy. If I love my father very much, I shall take great care to put the book as he likes.

Then another thing that marks where the heart is—“giving thanks.” These wretched things, which distract the heart, and force the Holy Ghost to be judging, are not there, and He becomes the Spirit of joy and thankfulness to God, the love of God shed abroad in the heart, which constantly goes up for everything in thankfulness to God in the sense that He is the Author of everything. Even sorrow is blessing: it is more profitable to be in sorrow than in joy. We can give thanks, if really the love of God is in our hearts, walking as to everything in the name of the Lord Jesus, no distraction in the heart; where there is this, the Holy Ghost necessarily becomes a rebuking Spirit, instead of a Spirit of joy and thankfulness.

Are we in His favour which is better than life? Our lips shall praise Him. The Lord only give us, beloved brethren, to walk in that way, confiding in divine love, and seeing the proof of it in the love that gave Himself for us, kept privily in His presence from the provoking of all men, to go through a world of confusion and restlessness with the peace of Christ in our souls.

Christ In Heaven, And The Holy Spirit Sent Down

Acts 2:22-36

This passage brings very definitely before us (Christ having been exalted as man by, and to, the right hand of God) how consequently the disciples received the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. This runs through all the instruction given here. The place of Christ, having finished redemption, is to sit now at the right hand of God, “expecting till his enemies be made his footstool,” Heb. 10:13. He has not yet taken His own throne at all; He is seated on the Father’s throne. “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne,” Rev. 3:21. Thence He will “come again,” as He says in John 14, and receive us unto Himself.

Christianity is not the accomplishment of promise. Of the earthly part the Jews were the centre. But God meanwhile “hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ”; and then, till Christ comes again, He is sitting on the throne of the Father, and has sent the Holy Ghost down.

The Christian is one in whom the Holy Ghost dwells between the accomplishment of redemption and His coming again. The thought and purpose of God about us is that we should “be conformed to the image of his Son.” The Holy Ghost is given to dwell in us meanwhile, to dwell in us individually— collectively too, but I speak now individually. That is what the Christian is: Christ is his life, his righteousness: it is a ministration of

righteousness and of the Spirit. “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his” (Rom. 8:9); it does not say, “If he is not converted,” though that would be true, of course. You see so many saints everywhere who are not settled in their relationship with God; the present power for this is the Holy Ghost come down.

The coming of the Lord Jesus is not simply a little bit of knowledge which we may add to the rest, but it is the hope of the Christian. If we die we go to Him, but what is held out to us is that the Christian is waiting for Christ. “So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation,” Heb. 9:28. If we die we go up to Him, and blessed truth it is too; but that Christ shall come, this is the hope of the Christian, the only full hope. “To depart and to be with Christ which is far better,” true this is not the purpose of God for us; the purpose of God is that we shall be like Christ. I do not want to be like Christ with my body in the grave, and my spirit in paradise: the expectation of the Lord’s coming makes the person of Christ to be so much before the soul. I am going to see Him and to be like Him. Scripture does not talk of going to heaven; “Absent from the body, present with the Lord,” 2 Cor. 5:8. “To depart and be with Christ which is far better” (Phil. 1:23), always the thought is going to Christ. That is what we all want personally, that Christ should have a larger place in the heart: “Rooted and built up in him”; “To know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.” “Christ is all,” and He is “in all “as the power of life; having become our life, He is before our souls to fill them.

Christ is the motive for the Christian for whatever he does, whether he eats or drinks; and his desires are never satisfied, and never can be, till he be with and like Christ. Therefore he is always waiting for Him. The Thessalonians were converted “to wait for his Son from heaven,” 1 Thess. 1:10. The coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, instead of being a little bit of prophetic knowledge, is interwoven with all the thoughts and condition of the Christian. Grace has appeared teaching us (Titus 2:11, 12), and the grace that has appeared is the grace that saves. When the Lord went up on high the Holy Ghost came down, and through the Holy Ghost we have not only the knowledge but the fruits of the place He has given us. The seal of the Holy Ghost is put upon us: the presence of the Holy Ghost is that which gives the full knowledge of our place and blessedness. Redemption, which brings us to God, is finished; we are exercised afterwards—all that goes on, but our relationship is never in question. I believe the government of God is most important when we are children; “He with-draweth not his eyes from the righteous,” Job 36:7. This is most important and blessed in its place; but the great thing is first of all to get into the place where God has put us.

The very names of God go along with this. To the patriarchs He was “God Almighty,” when they were strangers and pilgrims; to Abraham He said, “I am thy shield, and thine exceeding great reward” (Gen. 15); to Israel He had given promises, and He takes the name of Jehovah, the name of One who, having given promises, never rests until they are fulfilled. Then in the Revelation He speaks of Himself as the One “who is, and who was, and who is to come,” Rev. 1:8. All that was

concerned in a certain sense with this world; but it is not so with us. We are called to suffer with Christ, because Christ has been rejected, and this with the full knowledge of redemption. “And I have declared unto them thy name and will declare it, that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them,” John 17:26. God has another name, “Most High.” You never find the name “Father” from Psalm 1 to 150. “And this is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,” John 17:3. “Life and incorruptibility” have been brought “to light through the gospel,” 2 Tim. 1:10. The name “Almighty” does not carry eternal life. “Jehovah” fulfils promises, but does not give eternal life, but the Father sent the Son, “that we might live through him,” 1 John 4:9. “For the life was manifested and we have it, and bear witness and shew unto you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us,” 1 John 1:2. “And this is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in the Son,” 1 John 5:11. When we receive the Son, we get into the place of children; it is the force of the expression in John’s Gospel. “But as many as received him to them gave he right to be called children of God,” John 1:12. The Son is there, and we are associated with Him completely and fully. In Matthew 3 the Holy Ghost comes down upon Him, and the Father’s voice says, “This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.” There the full revelation of the Trinity is Christianity: we have the Son as man, the Holy Ghost coming down in bodily shape like a dove, and the Father’s voice, in that wondrous scene of Christ taking His place publicly as man. “I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God,” John 1:34. The Old Testament saints were quickened surely; but if

you take Galatians 4, you find they were not in the condition of sons. “The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all,” chap. 4:1. “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father” (v. 6). That had not been the case before; they were ordered to do this and that under the law.

“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,” John 12:24. He was totally alone, a true man in His relationship with God; even when He declared His Father’s name to His disciples, they did not understand a bit of it. Then you see redemption brings us into this place.

Let me turn back to the basis of all this. Here am I a child of Adam, with an evil nature and sins; Christ bore my sins, and that is all perfectly settled for ever—if it is not, it never can be; but it is “once for all, for ever”; there is no other application as regards the putting away of my sins in God’s sight. He does not impute them for the simple blessed reason that Christ has borne them, and He is sitting at the right hand of God, because it is done. Many a true honest soul sees only past sins put away, but what about sinning afterwards? Go to Calvin, and he will send you back to your baptism, while the evangelicals go back to the blood. “For the law, having a shadow of good things to come… can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect,” Heb. 10:1. “In which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience,” Heb. 9:9. If I go into God’s presence, I have not the most distant thought that He imputes

anything to me as guilt: that is what is wanting to so many souls. “Because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins,” Heb. 10:2. He does not say sin: the old stock is there. “But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year,” Heb. 10:3. I go into the presence of God now, and I see Christ sitting, because by one offering He has settled everything. “And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices which can never take away sins; but this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool,” Heb. 10:11-13. He sits at God’s right hand, because He has finished that work perfectly. “For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified” (v. 14). He has set them apart to God, and He has perfected for ever their consciences.

“The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing,” Heb. 9:8. Now we have “boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.” The thing is done; it was prophesied of before, but now it is done. “For ever” here means never interrupted. If I come to God, Christ is always there, and my conscience is always perfect. I may go and humble myself in the dust if I have dishonoured Christ: it is in the holiest that I learn how bad sin is. I could not be before God in the light until the veil was rent, but “by one offering “Christ has perfected my conscience. When I go to God I find Christ, who bore my sins, sitting at the right hand of God because He has done it. This will make me see sin a great deal more than anything else. I

have got a new nature, and I am in the light as God is m the light.

This turns the question from righteousness to holiness. So long as I am connecting it with a question of acceptance, it is righteousness that I want: suppose righteousness is settled, then I abhor the sin because it is sin, for itself. “Well but,” you say, “without holiness, no man shall see the Lord.” That is quite true, but you are looking for righteousness, not holiness. The clearance in that way is absolute; but there is another thing which gives my soul its place before God. Not only Christ died for my sins, but I died with Christ; the tree is bad, not only the fruit: then I reckon myself dead. In the first part of Romans we get nothing about experience. Suppose I owed £100 and that it was paid for me, no experience would be in question; but suppose I say to you, “You are dead to sin,” perhaps you would say, “Indeed I am not, it was working in me this morning.” Till you are clear about that, you are not settled in your place. The old tree has been cut down, and grafted with Christ. In Romans 6 I reckon myself dead: “Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin” (chap. 6:11); in Colossians 3:3 we get, “For ye are dead”; and in 2 Corinthians 4:10, “Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus.” We find God’s estimate and faith’s estimate; and in Galatians 2:19 we have the summary of the whole thing, “For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.” When I find a nature working in me contrary to Christ, I say it has been crucified with Christ, and I do not own it. “What the law could not do … God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh,” Rom. 8. He has forgiven the sins and

condemned the tree that produced them, but the tree that was condemned has died in Christ.

I have to learn thus, by the power of the Spirit of God, not merely that what the old tree produced has been blotted out, but that Christ is my life; " I am crucified with Christ," and sin in the flesh has been condemned. Where? Where you died with Christ: when Christ was there for sin, sin in the flesh was condemned, not forgiven; it died, for faith, where it was condemned. "O wretched. man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. 7:24, 25. Looked at as in that old man, I died in Christ. The moment we believe in the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, then we get the sealing of God. Because the blood of Christ is upon me, then the Holy Ghost comes and dwells in me. They received the Holy Ghost on believing the forgiveness of their sins. In Acts 10 we find the same thing: faith received the forgiveness of their sins in the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and then the Holy Ghost came on them. As in the figure in the Old Testament, we are washed, sprinkled with blood, and then anointed with oil. The Holy Ghost comes, then I know where I am, that my standing is in Christ: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," Rom. 8:1. "In Christ" is my standing before God; the Holy Ghost is the present power of it all; the work is Christ's.

I get the other point, knowledge of salvation, and knowledge that I am not a child of Adam but a child of God. "To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins," Luke 1:77. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. The same is he which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost,"

John 1:29, 33. He could not baptise with the Holy Ghost till He had died, and was risen and glorified. I know the place I have got into: the treasure is in an earthen vessel, but I have got the knowledge of salvation. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," 2 Cor. 3:17. It is that which enables me to say with truth, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live." There I get first the accomplishment of redemption; and Christ sitting on His right hand; and the purpose of God, as the blood on the lintel and door-posts made the Israelites free, and they were brought from Egypt to the Red Sea, out of an old place into a new, so that Moses could sing, "Thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation," Exod. 15:18. "Thou shalt bring them in" (v. 17). I get these two things, complete redemption is one; the other I have not got yet; Christ has entered as our Forerunner, I have not entered yet, but the Holy Ghost is "the earnest of the inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Christ "endured the cross, and despised the shame," and He is set down as man at the right hand of God. We rejoice in hope of the glory of God. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand," Rom. 5:1, 2. I know by the Holy Ghost that I am in divine favour. We have these three things.

1. We are justified, and have peace with God.

2. We stand in present grace, in divine favour.

3. When Christ comes again, we shall be in glory with Him. "That the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them as thou hast loved me," John 17:23. It is "That the world may know" not believe: this ought

to be now, but it is very far from it. When it sees us in glory, it cannot help knowing; when we appear in the same glory with Christ, people will think, “Why these people that we trampled under foot are in the same glory with Christ!” We do not wait for that: the world will know when we are in the same glory with Christ, but now we know by the Holy Ghost, “That the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them and I in them,” John 17:24. Beloved friends, just think of that: your hearts ought to have the consciousness that He loved you as He loved Jesus! A child might say, “I am a foolish child, I think little about my mother”; but he has no uncertainty about his mother’s love to him. We never apprehend all God’s love to us; still we know we are children and sons. It is no uncertain place: I know I am loved as Christ is loved; we have poor wretched hearts, that is quite true. A true child does not measure its mother’s love; I am sure it could not, but it knows and is in it.

We have got “the adoption of sons.” “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba Father.” I have got the consciousness of it; I know my place. We know God as our Father. The soul that has the Spirit of God dwelling in him knows not only the clearing of the sins of the old man, but that he is in the second Man, and knowing it, he cries, “Abba, Father.” “For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified, are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,” Heb. 2:11. They are “all of one,” one set, as it were. What is my life? Christ. What is my righteousness? Christ. He is not one with the unconverted world; there is no union in incarnation. He stood for us in the cross, but He has

united us with Him in glory. If I take the Father's relationship with Christ as man, He is not ashamed to call us brethren. In Psalm 22 He says, "Thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns. I will declare thy name unto my brethren." His work was finished: as soon as that was done, He comes out in resurrection, past the power of death and of Satan, and He sends this message to His disciples: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father: and to my God and your God," John 20:17. He had never said that before, though He called them "sister" and "mother" and "brother" in a general way. Beloved brethren, what we want is to see how Christ has united us to Himself, to see the way God has brought us into the place of the second Man, as sin brought us into the place of the first man. One point more, our connection with Christ: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter." "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." Ah, it is a terrible thing that saints are so far from scriptural ground as to say we cannot know! We are in Christ, "accepted in the Beloved," and we have the Spirit of adoption. One thing more, besides the point I am on: Christ is in us. You cannot live on in sin, you are dead; that is where the Christian's responsibility is, not in connection with his acceptance ("By one man's obedience many shall be made righteous"). I know He is in me, having bought me at all cost, and there I see responsibility. I get the two things in Romans 8. "No condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," and "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." You have been delivered, you have redemption in Christ, and you have been sealed with the Holy Ghost. I own nothing as life in the Christian but Christ: the whole of our lives should be the expression of Christ and

nothing else, our “speech always with grace, seasoned with salt.” Only one other thing, beloved friends; God is love, and the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts: therefore we get in the Epistle of John, “He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.” We have the Person of the Holy Ghost dwelling in us, so our bodies are temples: God is there in the perfection of His own nature; we have to watch not to grieve such a guest. It is through the Holy Ghost that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts; that is the key to everything. “And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also” (Rom. 5:3); it is the key to everything; I want it, and He sent it. Christ is sitting at the right hand of God, and the Holy Ghost comes down giving us the consciousness of the present relationship in which we are to walk.

“Be ye therefore imitators of God as dear children,” Eph. 5:17. How are we to imitate God? Was not Christ God? I earnestly desire that all our hearts may get hold, through the power of the Spirit of God, of the place we are brought into, that we may have the consciousness of this, the knowledge of it through the Holy Ghost until we go to be with Him. The Lord give you to have this consciousness. Why, beloved, to think of the Father’s love at work, and the Son of God having gone down to death for you, it is not much to expect!

The Lord give us to feel what we owe Him, that our whole desire may be to glorify Him.

On Sealing With The Holy Ghost

Our being sealed with the Spirit is too important a point to allow it to settle down into the ambiguity and mist into which it is fallen in many souls. The Scripture is plain and positive on the subject, and it constitutes, not the foundation, but what is specifically characteristic, of the Christian state. Details and experiences as to it may require detailed inquiry, and sound and enlarged spiritual experience. But the presence, and as to the individual the indwelling, of the Holy Ghost, constitute Christianity, and the Christian state of the individual.

When John the Baptist proclaimed Christ to his disciples, he announced Him under two characters: “The Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world,” and “He it is that baptiseth with the Holy Ghost,” the last being evidenced by the Holy Ghost descending and abiding upon Christ Himself. All the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Him bodily, but He as man, and He alone until redemption was accomplished, was sealed and anointed with the Holy Ghost—in His case a testimony to His own perfectness; “and John saw and bare record that he was the Son of God,” John 1:29-34; Acts 10:19; John 6:27. So He was led of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. By the Spirit of God He cast out demons. By the eternal Spirit He offered Himself without spot to God. He spoke the words of God, for the Spirit was not given to Him by measure. If it was by resurrection He was declared Son of God with power, it was according to the Spirit of holiness.

I refer to these passages, and many more connected with the point might be quoted, to shew the immense

importance of this fact. His being sealed was the testimony to His own perfectness; in us it is the fruit and seal of redemption. But if it sealed the Person and character of Christ, and that it was by this power He wrought as man, and we are made partakers of it consequent on redemption, its importance, though not the foundation, can hardly be overrated, and the connection of our position with Him is brought into a wonderful light: he alone possessing it while He was alive here below, but competent to confer it on us when gone on high, and redemption had qualified us for receiving it. The coming or baptism of the Holy Ghost was consequent on the exaltation of Christ. Christianity, which as I have said is characterised by His presence, could not exist until Christ was glorified (John 7:39); and Christ when exalted received the Holy Ghost as to the exalted man anew in order to its being sent down; Acts 2:33. This is confirmed as to its being sent by the words of the Lord Himself. “It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go away, I will send him unto you,” John 16:7.

Whither He went we know; John 14:4. The Comforter is sent by the Father in Christ’s name (John 14:26), and by Christ from the Father; chap. 15:26. But these are details. And this presence of the Holy Ghost was so real and distinctive a thing, His personal presence definitely characterising Christianity as such, that it is said in John 7, “The Holy Ghost was not yet, for Jesus was not yet glorified.” “Given” is added in italics, which is all very well for the general sense; but I give what is literally said, that the full distinct force of the words, the words of that Spirit, may be before us. Of course it is not that

the Holy Ghost did not exist: no Christian would think of such a thing. And the Old Testament bears witness from creation on of the existence and operation of the Spirit in all that God did upon the earth. But as the Son of God created all things, still, as He Himself tells, did not come personally down here to dwell among us till the incarnation, so, though the Spirit of God wrought from the garnishing of the heavens, and the brooding on chaotic waters, He did not come to dwell personally down here until there was a glorified Man sitting at the right hand of God. As to the Son it could be said, “I came forth from the Father and came into the world, again I leave the world and go to the Father”; so it could be said by Christ of the Spirit, “If I go away, I will send him unto you, and when he is come,” etc. He was promised in the Old Testament. The promise was accomplished on the day of Pentecost, and Christianity exists.51 The texts we have briefly referred to have brought before us some very weighty points. The Lord Himself was anointed and sealed, and this given as a sign that He was the baptiser with the Holy Ghost, and giving occasion to John the Baptist to bear record that Christ was the Son of God.

Further, we have seen that until redemption was accomplished, and there was the man that did God’s will, sitting at God’s right hand in consequence of it, the Holy Ghost (spoken of as constituting and characterising Christianity by His presence) was not yet. So the disciples of John at Ephesus, “We have not so much as heard whether the Holy Ghost is” He was sent down the witness of Christ, as man, being at the right hand of God.

This is of all importance. The point of departure of Christianity was man’s taking a new place in

righteousness on high, consequent on redemption being accomplished where sin and death and Satan's power and God's judgment were; that Man being Son of God withal. Accordingly Christ received as man the Holy Ghost on being exalted on high, not then for Himself as when perfect on earth, but to confer on those who believed, putting them in relation with Himself and what was heavenly on high.

Scripture is clear.as to its being only for believers. John 7, already quoted, states the fact: "the Spirit which they that believed on him should receive."

But it is stated more strongly in John 14:16, 17, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth [abideth] with you, and shall be in you." We have there the Spirit as the constant portion of the saints, sent consequent on Christ as man being exalted to the right hand of God, whom He received anew on high to confer on His own, and who could not be thus present down here until Christ was so exalted. The Son had been here, and was here to be received by all who knew of Him. Men would not have Him, but that is another thing; but the Spirit is not for the world. He may by God's chosen instruments announce the gospel to it. He was known by being with us ever, and dwelling in us. Men were and are born of the Spirit, but the Holy Ghost Himself coming down is another thing. This happened on the day of Pentecost. They were not to go forth till then, but to tarry at Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high, to wait for the promise of the Father which they had heard of Christ; Acts 1:4, 5; chap.

2. Clean through Christ's word, who had withal already breathed on them that they might be partakers of His new risen life, as God breathed on Adam, their understanding already opened to understand the Scriptures, they were to wait for the Holy Ghost coming down upon them.

The world knew nothing of it, but in its effects. It was for those only who already believed on Him, putting them consciously in the place in which He was with God. That other Comforter, which in a certain sense took the place of Christ, though only to reveal Him more fully, and as a heavenly Christ who had accomplished their redemption, and through the efficacy of that, was the object of their hope in glory, of which He was Himself the earnest and the revealer. This was for those only who took part with a rejected Saviour, for believers. There were those who believing had received life through His name, who lived, through hearing, through grace, the voice of the Son of God. They must have been, to see and enter the kingdom; the Jews must, to enjoy hereafter the earthly promises as the Lord shewed to Nicodemus. But the Spirit was to come new when redemption had been accomplished, and Christ exalted as man to the right hand of God, to take the things of Christ and shew them to the disciples; and all that the Father had was His, and to make them know that all He had as the exalted man was theirs.

All this is something quite different from my being born again, or even that special quickening in the power of Christ in resurrection, with being born of God by His word of truth (John 20:22), save as this was necessary to a person's receiving it, and that the same Holy Ghost operates in and by this life when He dwells in us. Of the

former I shall speak. The connection of the given Holy Ghost with this life, when dwelling in our bodies, is manifest in Romans 8. That life is not separated from its divine source, when He dwells in us, though His personally dwelling in us as a divine Person is another thing, also spoken of in Romans 8 as the Spirit itself. If He was our life in Person, He would be an incarnation of the Holy Ghost in us, which is futile on the face of it. We are born of the Spirit, but what is born of the Spirit is not the Spirit, though it be spirit, that is, characterised morally by the same nature; John 3. In this sense we are made partakers of the divine nature. The Colossians treats of life and does not speak of the Holy Ghost; Ephesians does repeatedly, and we get contrast with flesh characterising the epistle, and union with Christ and sonship developed. Our bodies are temples of the Holy Ghost which we have of God, and are bought with a price, hence to glorify God in our bodies. We have thus the gift of the Holy Ghost before us, characterising by His presence Christianity and the Christian. The difficulty which arises in people's minds has for its origin, that the effects of His presence necessarily connect themselves with our experience. It could not be otherwise; the Holy Ghost could not dwell in us without producing certain effects on our minds. It is a present power when a believer is sealed working in us, and we are apt to judge of it by looking at it in our minds, and confusion comes in. Seeing whether we are walking up to the privilege is all right, but that is quite a different thing. It is not a finished work like Christ's outside of us, and having absolute divine value in God's sight, but a living power working in us, whose presence is the seal, with which we are sealed.

It is of moment to distinguish between the sealing and the operation of Him who is the seal when dwelling in us. God sets His seal on those who believe on the ground of the perfect work of Christ, and His being glorified in consequence. Of this John 7, Acts 2, and the day of Pentecost are witness. They were believers, and for a good while, and they were to wait at Jerusalem to be endued with power from on high. They believed on Christ as one dead, risen and glorified, and that faith was sealed; but the work was fully accomplished and Christ fully glorified, or the Holy Ghost would not have been there. The effect was to follow. They belonged to God according to the perfect work of Christ, and were sealed as such. So the redemption of Israel to God as a people was absolute, independently of the exercises of the wilderness and Canaan. The presence of the Holy Ghost was the immediate consequence of the perfectness of Christ's work and glory, where faith in it was, without any question of experience or a work within, save that they believed. It was the seal of faith. As a seal it had nothing to do with experience.

Here it may be well to notice the Epistle to the Romans, confusion as to which produces confusion in the minds of saints.

As is generally acknowledged now, and certainly is the case, there are two distinct treatises in the doctrinal part of Romans. That which speaks of guilt, and grace blessedly meeting it through Christ's death and bloodshedding, ends in chapter 5:11. In this part our actual sins are the ground of God's dealings. All have sinned. In the second part, chapter 5:12, to the end of chapter 8, this is not the case. Our state as in the flesh is spoken of, and then as in Christ or the Spirit. "By the

disobedience of one many were made sinners." The question there is not the forgiveness of sins, but death to sin, as having died with Him. All the development of this part is experience connected with self, and practical. The first part is not, but the effect of a work done for us and outside us, and God's love now known as the source of it. Christ was delivered for our sins, and raised again for our justification: therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God. In chapter 5 we have the conscious happiness of the believer connected with that work for us, and God known in love through it, but nothing connected with our state of experience. Here, first, the Holy Ghost is mentioned, God's love being shed abroad in our hearts by it. The presence of the Holy Ghost in the Christian is assumed. But it is the love of God known by it, not, as in the second part, how and what it works in us, though it does surely work in us when given; but to connect the second part of Romans with the first as a continuous process is a mistake.

Guilt by our acts is a different thing from our state as children of Adam. In one we are guilty, and (unless justified) come into judgment; in the other we are lost. The effect of the work of Christ is to clear for ever all our sins away. By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified (eis to dienekes). So that, once purged, we have no more conscience of sins. Blessed is the man to whom God imputeth no sin. They are remembered no more, and as, when He had by Himself purged our sins, He sat down on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, we are, besides being purged, risen in Him in the new standing which is the effect of His redemption for man.

Now the sealing of the Holy Ghost, based on forgiveness, gives the intelligence and consciousness of this new position. The idea of God's imputing guilt to us is impossible (unless, perhaps, in some extreme case when delivered to Satan as a chastisement). But that is not all. By the Spirit, by the gift of which we are sealed, we know we are sons, crying, Abba, Father; Gal. 4. We know we are in Christ, and Christ in us (John 14), and the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts; Rom. 5; compare 1 John 4. And He is the earnest of our coming likeness to Christ in glory; 2 Cor. 5.

The Spirit may rebuke and humble us as to consistency with the place we are in. Thank God He does. But He never can give a testimony in our souls contrary to, or other than, the place where perfect redemption has placed us, that redemption which has brought Him down to dwell in us. Such a thought would be making Him give a false testimony. But the Spirit is truth.

"We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." It is not merely the fact of a new life communicated, but the consciousness of the position in which redemption has placed those who have that life. "I go to my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God." It is not only that the Son has quickened us, but that Christ has finished the work given Him to do—is entered as man into a wholly new place (where Adam, innocent, was not), and, being glorified, the Spirit gives us the consciousness of the relationships into which He has brought us. And this place is the fruit of a work done outside us, though those who partake in it must also be born again, and is known through the Holy Ghost given as the seal of our faith in that work, but of nothing else.

But the question of experience does come in in the word, and that connects itself with the difference of flesh and Spirit. It behoves us to consider what flesh is. What it is in its evil nature, I need not dwell on here; it is the evil nature in which we are, as born of sinful Adam; but as regards our relationship another consideration comes in.

In this sense, What is it to be in the flesh? It is to be in relationship with God on the ground of our natural responsibility as men, as children of fallen Adam. It is, as to our moral state—which in itself is true—making the disposition of God towards us to depend on what we are towards Him. Of this the law is the perfect rule. It says, if conscience is awakened, I am such and such: God will be so and so towards me. Grace is on the opposite ground: God has been, and is, through Christ such and such, and I shall be so and so, as the fruit of it. But this changes everything.

Take the parable of the prodigal son. When he came to himself, you hear much about him; he owns his sin, that he is perishing, and sets out to his father, for confidence (not peace) always accompanies divine awakening, but he says as a consequence, Make me as one of thy hired servants. Arrived, with his' father all this disappears, and he with it, and his place is wholly what his father is to him and does for him. When converted and in the right road, he had not yet the best robe, nor his father on his neck, to make him in his own consciousness and actual place what the father's thoughts were towards him.

Now his whole condition was changed; it was what his father was for him, and had done for him. The mind may get bewildered by false teaching, putting back under

law, where its true effect is not discovered. This was the case of the Galatians; but they were therein fallen from grace, Christ became of none effect to them. It was not a state of soul. They did not, in adding circumcision, think of anything but adding, but the apostle saw plainly enough. It was not an experience, a state of soul; it was Christianity given up altogether in its very principle. They were, as to their minds, if not as to God's, fallen from grace.

Hence, in Galatians, no kind words to begin with, no salutations at the end. It was for the apostle, not a state of their souls, but Christianity given up; he wished the doers of it cut off. If this system were true, Christ was dead in vain, they who taught it were accursed. All that has nothing to do with experiences and states of soul. It was making "Christ the minister of sin." Through the redemption that was in Christ, the blessing of Abraham came on the Gentiles, that believers might receive the promise of the Spirit. He then goes on to shew how believers received the Spirit (they were sons by faith in Christ, and because they were sons God gave the spirit of sonship), and specially insists on the presence of the Spirit, and how they got it. There was the liberty wherewith Christ has set us free. He was, as he expresses it, travailing again in birth for them. They had got, not into a bad spiritual state as Christians, they had in their minds given up Christianity. The question was then the flesh and the law, man as he was and God's rule for him, or Christ glorified and the Spirit putting us consciously in His place and acceptance before God and the Father by redemption. That this last was gone was not a bad state of soul, as I have said, but Christianity given up, doubtless not in will there, but in the thing

itself; and this is our point now. The Holy Ghost was given, not in respect of any particular state of soul, not even of being born again, true as this was as to those to whom it was given; but simply in virtue of faith in a Saviour who had died, and was risen and glorified, as indeed there was no other; and if Paul had known Him otherwise—and as a Jew he had—he knew such no more.

The presence of the Holy Ghost was specifically and distinctively the consequence of the glorifying of Jesus, who had accomplished the work that saves us, in dying, shedding His blood for us as man, and rising again. Thus there is evidently a double part as to Christ Himself, His suffering in obedience unto death, drinking for us that dreadful cup, the thought of which made Him shed, as it were, great drops of blood, and, as a consequence of that, His being glorified. The former was the accomplishment of redemption demonstrated by His resurrection, or our faith would be vain; if He were not risen, we should be yet in our sins. He would be lying in death as another. Subjectively, man was in his new state in Christ risen. Hence we read, “He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.” He has loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood. The latter, His being glorified, is what He is entered into and has obtained for us, but which, though happy meanwhile if we depart, we shall not possess till He comes again to receive us to Himself. It is evident from Scripture that the Holy Ghost came down when Jesus was glorified, His work being accomplished; but when we by faith have part in the accomplished salvation, but have not yet attained the glory, He is the seal of faith in the one, and the earnest of the other. For in Christ all is accomplished, and He is entered as our

Forerunner; and the Holy Ghost sent down and dwelling and ministering in us gives the full consciousness of the fruit of the one in forgiveness, and of our place in Christ. He gives withal the consciousness of being sons, and if sons, then heirs. Born again we must be to have the smallest part in these things, but it is faith in Christ's work which is sealed by the gift of the Holy Ghost.

We have redemption through Christ's blood, the forgiveness of sins; the Holy Ghost is the earnest of our inheritance till the redemption of the purchased possession. The great general truth is that believers, and believers only, receive it. If we look into details, and build on Scripture statements, we find there must be faith in the work of Christ, as well as in His Person, in order to a person's being sealed. Thus, when the terrible conviction was produced in the minds of the Jews that Jesus was the Christ, and that they had rejected Him, but God exalted Him, they say, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter says, "Repent, and be baptised, every one of you, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." They are to believe in the exaltation of Christ, of which the gifts were the present proof, but they were to partake in the effects of His work in order to receive the Holy Ghost. So, in Acts 10:43, it is the testimony to the remission of sins that is sealed by the Holy Ghost coming. So Ephesians 1:13, it was the "gospel of their salvation" in which they believed, so that, believing in Christ, they were sealed with the Holy Spirit as earnest of their inheritance. That a person may be born again, and not have received the Holy Ghost, is perfectly certain according to Scripture, for "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," and this the disciples did while Christ was on

earth, but could not have the Holy Ghost, which did not come until the day of Pentecost; though they had life, and were clean through the word.

It is alleged the case was different—He was not come. Quite true, but they were born of God. I refer to the fact that we may distinguish between the two. And in Samaria, after the Holy Ghost was come, they believed and were baptised; but the Holy Ghost was fallen upon none of them, which happened afterwards by the laying on of the apostles' hands. In the same way Paul, then called Saul, was converted by the appearing of Christ to him on the way, and three days afterwards Ananias was sent, that he might receive his sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost.

A Christian, then, is one in whose body the Holy Ghost dwells as in a temple, giving him consciously the place in which accomplished redemption places him; but God, having wrought him for glory with and like Christ, while the knowledge of his place in Christ is clear to his soul, this last, glory with and like Him, remains a hope laid up for him in heaven. The Jews must be born again to get the millennial blessings; John 3; Ezek. 36. But those who believe in Christ, not having seen Him, associated with Him while He is not seen, sealed with the Holy Ghost, have their part with Him where He is not seen. "He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren."

There are three great privileges which result from the presence of the Holy Ghost, though all in us should flow from it. First, we cry, "Abba, Father," Gal. 4. We know we are children; Rom. 8. Next, we know we are in Christ,

and Christ in us; John 14. Thirdly, the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts; Rom. 5. His presence is the power of the blessing with God, with Christ, with the Father. Compare 1 John 4:12, 13.

But it is not promises, or accomplished millennial peace, blessed as that will be in its place, but, God having wrought us for an eternal weight of glory, the revelation of which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive, but which God hath revealed to them that love Him. Subjectively the new man is fitted to enjoy God Himself, but the sphere in which his affections are developed is that which is done for him, and is revealed to him, and here the work and sufferings of Christ, and the glories, and for us the heavenly glories, which shall be revealed. Between the accomplishment of the work, and our having part in the glory, the Holy Ghost has come down to seal us as redeemed and justified, and to be the earnest of the part we have not, only that “as Christ is so are we in this world,” and conscious of it in living faith.

Forgiveness, the Father’s love, our portion and place in Christ, with joy in hope of the glory of God, such is the place and portion of those whose life Christ is. Of this the Holy Ghost is the present power and revealer to the soul, when faith in Christ and in His work has been sealed for the day of redemption; or (more accurately) they, on the ground of that faith.

The new man is capable of enjoying divine and heavenly things, but cannot reveal them. If it be said, They are in the word j agreed, but they are, when there, spiritually discerned. The sealing of the believer with the Holy

Ghost (on the ground of his faith in the Person and work of Christ, who has accomplished the work of redemption, and sits on the right hand of God, so that he knows the efficacy of that work, and his place before God, as a son and in Christ) is a truth as clearly stated in Scripture as can possibly be, and constitutes Christianity and the Christian as a present state of things: certainty as to guilt removed, present sonship in divine favour, and joy in hope of the glory of God. But here it is also founded on Christ's work as delivered for our sins.

Another point now comes in, the connection of this with the state or experience of the soul. I do not now mean of guilt and imputation of sins: of that I have spoken. Our conscience is purged through the blood of Christ; but what passes in the soul? There is that which is never forgiven— sin, the principle in the nature—which God must abhor, and the new nature abhors, and which we find in us. I have already referred to the now well-know division in Romans 5:11, up to which our whole state as to guilt, and the grace that meets it, is fully gone into: propitiation, Christ delivered for our sins and raised, and peace with God, present favour, hope of glory, His love shed abroad in our hearts for the way by the Holy Ghost given to us, so that we joy in God Himself through Christ, by whom we have received this reconciliation, we are reconciled to God, and joy in Him. We have then another subject: one man, the head as to sin, One as to obedience; the many connected with him constituted sinners by the offence of one, and the many connected with the Other constituted righteous.

This was evidently a new ground and subject; personal guilt and judgment rested on what each sinner had

done. Here it was a race in a state of ruin by the offence of its head. The law came in by the by so as to aggravate the sins by making them transgressions, and to detect sin, the root principle, by its requirements when the conscience was awakened.

It was not now the forgiveness of the sins of the old man, and cleansing from them by grace, and so being brought into present favour on God's part towards us, but our being brought into a new state and standing before God in the second Man— our being in Christ Jesus. In chapter 6 we get the doctrine; in chapter 8 we get our state as the result, we are in Christ, and Christ in us, heirs of glory, and sufferers with Christ here. In chapter 7 we get the legal process by which we acquire self-knowledge, in order to our morally consenting to having Christ instead of ourselves. In this second part of the epistle it is not Christ dying for our sins, but our dying with Christ. Remark here the difference between chapters 5 and 8. In chapter 5 (where guilt had been displayed as universal, and the grace that met it in propitiation, and Christ delivered for our sins, and raised again for justification) all is divine favour and goodness, peace with God, such as He is, as regards our sins, present grace or favour, hope of glory; it is love shed abroad in the heart, and joying in Him. In chapter 8 it is our state, dead with Christ, alive in Him, we in Him before God, so that there is no condemnation, the law of the Spirit of life setting us free, the mind of the Spirit, life and peace. In chapter 5 it was God's love shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost; in chapter 8 He bears witness with our spirit that we are children, He intercedes in us. It is our state towards God as in Christ, not what God is towards us.

I have said that chapter 6 gives us the basis of this in doctrine. We are baptised, our profession of Christianity is to Christ's death, our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin, as a whole in its concrete form, might be destroyed. There is an end of our old Adam state by the cross. Christ died (not here for our sins, but) to sin, and we are baptized to His death, are to reckon ourselves dead to sin and alive to God, not in Adam, but in Christ Jesus our Lord. All that is in the Father's glory, what He is as displayed and surrounds Himself with according to what He is, was engaged in the resurrection of Christ; holiness, righteousness, majesty, love to the Son, recognition of what He had done, supremacy above all evil in light and love, and Christ as man rises by and into it, and that as having perfectly glorified God, where all was exactly contrary to it. And we are alive in Him, have Him risen as the life suited to it. We may have it in an earthen vessel, but it is our place with God. In this the flesh has no possible part. As man, Christ entered into it through death, closing (Himself ever sinless and apart) all connection with man as born of Adam; a true real man and Son of man, but Head, as risen of a new race and state. It is right to remark that He never united Himself to men—a common and ruinous doctrine. "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone." He alone, as we have seen, was anointed of the Holy Ghost, and sealed of God the Father, still a true man come of a woman, come under law, and in the likeness of sinful flesh, and going with the godly remnant as associating Himself with them. He was there a man amongst men, but that association was closed by death, save as Lord over them. We are united to Him in His new and glorious

state as Head; Eph. 1, 2. But this is kaine ktisis3a new creation. But to return to our direct subject.

“We are crucified with him.” Here it is our “old man.” We are still in the body, but we are not on the old standing-ground with God, we have died out of it in Christ, we are crucified with Him, we reckon ourselves as dead to sin here (to the world in Colossians), and alive in Him to God; our old Adam standing before God is gone by death, and we are in Christ, alive to God in Him, to give ourselves up to God as those that are in Him alive from the dead, and free to do so in this new life. We are not looked at as risen with Christ in Romans, but justified, and Christ our life, as men living in natural life down here, only Christ our life in it, in Him before God, not in the flesh.

Now the first part of the epistle brings us from conscious guilt into divine favour and knowledge of divine love, as justified by Christ’s work; the second, into the knowledge of ourselves as having died with Christ to our old state, and being in Him before God. Our profession is not merely believing in Christ, but being brought into His death, baptised to it as our portion. But the first is complete and absolute. The doctrine of sealing is not found here; but the person is sealed, a guilty person restored to God’s favour, and enjoying His love, reconciled to Him, and delighting in Him. I repeat, the first part is complete in itself; the man is a pardoned, justified man, enjoying God’s favour, His love in his heart by the Holy Ghost given to him, and rejoicing in the hope of glory. It is judicial. Eternal life is not a present existence, but given to those who continue patiently in well-doing (indeed it is always a future thing

in Romans, where not merely a general fact of grace); only God commends His love toward us.

Our state and standing out of Christ and in Christ is another and distinct point, but when in Christ the sealing of the Holy Ghost is here also assumed and developed. It is specifically taught in Ephesians and 2 Corinthians, but always as that of believers, that is, of those who have life already, and are washed in the blood of the Lamb. Christianity is not known in its real character where this is not. The starting-point of this, as to our standing, is—we have been baptised to Christ's death, our old man is crucified with Christ, so that we should not serve sin. It is done with for faith, we are set free. But is there no remedy, no ameliorating the old man, no power in the new to walk out of and independent of it? There is no amelioration nor power in the new to go right by itself, even when one wills it. If righteousness is to be had in our fallen Adam state (in the flesh), then the law is the measure. But the flesh is not subject to the law of God, nor can be—law, no doubt, in its spiritual character, for law forbids lust, and the flesh lusts. To stand before God on this ground is therefore a hopeless matter, but the question is, in this part of Romans, our standing before Him.

But we have the two points: we are born again; but this is not enough, for the flesh is there, and what characterises the law is our obtaining righteousness by what we are. But sin is there. But if not enough, it is not all: our old man is crucified with Christ, we have died to sin in Him. Thus for faith the flesh is gone in death, and Christ is come in life. Sin in the flesh has been condemned in the cross, but death came to the old condition of man; not that Christ, of course, had any sin,

but He was made it for us. He was on the cross “for sin.” So that condemnation of sin in the flesh is passed, and death, the power of Christ’s death, is come. I am now connected with a Christ risen from the dead. My first husband, the law, ruled over me as long as I lived; but I have died with Christ; by His death God condemned sin in the flesh. That condemnation Christ took, and ended in dying; so by my death I have ceased to be under law, have died out of the condition to which law applied, and am not only alive in Christ, but connected with Christ risen in this new place where sin and condemnation are entirely over and passed. My being quickened left the flesh there, though I hated its fruits and workings, and as the principle of law, and our mind under it, is that which God will feel as to us, is the effect of what we are; the holier my desires, the more miserable I was; but having part in His death, I reckon myself dead.

The deliverance, then, is by the death of Christ, that is, my being crucified with Him, and connected with Him as risen. But how can I know this? By the Holy Ghost. In Romans 8 we are in Christ, and Christ is in us (vv. 1, 10). Now the knowledge of this is by the Holy Ghost; John 14:20. We are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. No condemnation, because we are in Christ; and if Christ be in us, the body dead because of sin, its only product if alive; yet we are alive, because the Spirit is life because of righteousness.

And now mark that in the parenthetical chapter 7, which treats of the bearing of law on the question, we have two states of the soul, both when quickened, not of progress or degree, but absolutely incompatible—so incompatible, that one cannot exist if the other does, a relative position in one of which the soul is connected with law

as with a husband, in the other with Christ risen from the dead. The soul has died in the first, so as to have done with it, died away out of it, only as crucified with Christ, or it would have been condemnation as well as death; 2 Cor. 3; Gal. 4. We are dead to the law by the body of Christ, that we might be married to another; we could not have two husbands at once. Then we get the experimental effect of the law, as seen and estimated by the light of Christianity. It awoke, and as an occasion provoked sin.

The experience of chapter 7 is not the cry of a man in it not knowing what it is, but the estimate of it by one who can judge of it with spiritual knowledge. We, we Christians as such, so the expression is ever used, we know that the law is spiritual. As to the fact, no one was ever in such a state, the will always perfectly right, and the doing always wrong. It is the working of the law when the will is renewed, but the man is under law, and as to the thoughts of his relationship with God he is in the flesh, loving obedience and God’s law, but judging of God’s thoughts of him from what he is himself, which is the opposite of grace.

The law is seen to be spiritual in its requirements, his conscience consents to it as- good, his heart delights in it after the inner man, but he does not succeed in keeping it. He is captive to the law of sin which is in his members. To will is present with him, but how to perform the good he finds not. Now this is experience looked at by a delivered person, but of a person clearly undelivered, a person under law, a man when he was in the flesh. He learns, thus looking at it, not guilt, but that there is no good in him, that is, in his flesh; next, that it is not himself, since he hates it; thirdly, that it is too

strong for.him—he cannot succeed in his will to do right. It is a lesson of two things—that there is no good in the flesh when estimated spiritually, and next, that we have no power. To distinguish the sin from oneself is often a relief, but not deliverance. Now it is of all importance that he should know, and experimentally know, what flesh is, and so what it is to be under law; but God has no pleasure in keeping him there when he has learned it. But it is not the Christian state. There is conflict to the end when we are delivered, but then that is in the Christian: the flesh lusts against the Spirit. Here there is no question of the Spirit, nor of Christ, save in contrast, another husband, which you cannot have at the same time. As to this the chapter is positive. We cannot have two husbands at the same time. If I have learned the love of God in the gift of His Son, and my standing is there, divine acceptance does not rest on what I am for God—under law it does.

The chapter is the estimate of the working of the law by one who has the Spirit, and can say, “We know.” He does not say, therefore, we are carnal, Christians could not. If I am asked, Has he the Spirit?—Is he sealed? I answer, Decidedly not, he is captive to the law of sin, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; and in chapter 8 he is made free, and not in the flesh. And if one is led of the Spirit, he is not under law, but that is exactly what is described in Romans 7, but described by one who, being out of it, can describe it by the Spirit. Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace. Though I have spoken of chapter 7 as parenthetic, and justly (for it comes in between the doctrine of chapter 6 and the practical state of chapter 8), yet, in a certain sense, chapter 6 closes the doctrine

of the epistle. Sin has not dominion over them, for they are not under law, but under grace; so, yielded to God in obedience, they have their fruit unto holiness here, and the end everlasting life. The wages of sin is death; the gift of God eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Thus the two experimental states are gone into, under law, and in the power of the Spirit in Christ. The complete contrast of the two is evident, not degrees of progress, but contrast of state. The incompatibility of the two I have spoken of, implied in the two husbands, the change being introduced by nothing short of death, as an absolute cessation of the bond. But I now speak of the contrast in the state itself. In chapter 7 he is in the flesh; in chapter 8 he is not in the flesh because the Spirit of God dwells in him. The experience of chapter 7 contemplates the law only; in chapter 8 he is dead to the law by the body of Christ, and it is a question between the flesh and the Spirit. Christ is in us, and the body dead, and the Spirit life in the delivered soul. We have, then, first, in chapter 7, the two husbands contrasted—a renewed man connected with law, and the same with Christ raised from the dead, the first bond being absolutely severed by the death of the person in it. Then you have the experience of the former, the renewed man under law, estimated by the Christian intelligence of one out of it, and the flesh is judged, and the incompetency of the renewed soul to overcome it under law. It needs a deliverer, that is, God through Christ. We are alive in Him, and He in us, and have died to sin, been crucified with Him. There is therefore now no condemnation for them in Christ, for though flesh is in me, I am freed from its law through the law of the Spirit of life in Christ, and I, as to my standing before God, have nothing else than

Christ as life in the power of the Spirit. What the law could not do, nor I succeed in under it, because the flesh was not subject to it, God has done; for it has judicially disappeared in the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, and there it and I to sin died with Him. The old man is crucified and gone in the cross: God has condemned sin in the flesh there.

But here the power of the Holy Ghost comes which dwells in us. It is a sum of our state in, already in, verse 2. But the things of the Spirit and walking after the Spirit refer directly to a divine Person and to a new nature; and to this, though not yet separating Him from life as its power, the change from the old position of Adam standing is distinctly referred. “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” It is not subjecting flesh, which cannot be subject to law; but “if Christ be in you, the body is dead,” according to chapter 6, for alive in itself, it only produces sin; yet I am alive, “the Spirit is life” as the power and producer of righteousness. And further to complete the deliverance: “if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ [the head of his people] from the dead will quicken your mortal bodies, by reason of his Spirit which dwells in you.” It is the Spirit of God, as contrasted with flesh—of Christ, as that which we are as now livingly formed after Christ—of Him that raised up Jesus (Christ’s personal name) from the dead, as accomplishing our final deliverance. From this on the Holy Spirit is spoken of, not merely as a divine Person dwelling in us, and so working on life, but as acting distinct from us. By the Spirit we mortify the deeds of the body, we are led by the Spirit; He is the Spirit of

adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself, it is said, bears witness with our spirit that we are God's children, with the inheritance in hope, and helps our infirmities in our patient passage till we are there; the Spirit itself, when we do not know what to pray for as we ought, making intercession for us, but in us, and that according to God: so real is this presence with us.

There is, then, a deliverance52—not being born again, not forgiveness—though both be true—but deliverance, in that we have died with Christ, our old man crucified with Him, and He our life, in the power of the Spirit of God; and, while His work is the basis, it is possessed and known, and our place in Him, by the Spirit dwelling in us, which Spirit we receive on believing in the efficacy of Christ's work for the forgiveness of our sins. We are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in us. Scripture is as clear as possible on the point. It is equally clear that one in Romans 7 has not this deliverance; the proof of it is very simple—he is seeking to be delivered. It is not a repeated thing, but a state into which we enter: the whole of chapter 8 is a proof of it; we are in Christ, have the Spirit of adoption, the Comforter, which is not taken from us.

It is not being born again—that is a "must be"; not the revelation of grace and salvation—this is by the cross. The visitation, as prophesied of by Zechariah, was to give knowledge of salvation to the people by the forgiveness of their sins.

It was the gospel of their salvation which led to the sealing of the Gentiles. I have no doubt that He who began the good work will perfect it unto the day of Jesus Christ. But the testimony of Scripture is constant. The

prodigal came to himself, was repentant, confessed his sin, and that he was perishing, and set out on the road which, in fact, led him to his father; but he had not reached his father, nor knew his mind, could not cry Abba Father, nor had he on the best robe, which made him fit to enter into the house. It is in vain to say he was not conscious of it; he had not got it. Christ was delivered for our offences; but though He has made peace by the blood of His cross, we have it not till we are justified by faith. It is alike important to see that it is completely made, and that we have it not till we believe. Indeed, to say that we have peace with God, and are not conscious of it, is nonsense. It dislocates, too, the connection of the Spirit's presence and Christ's work. To be free, and at liberty, liberty with God, crying, Abba, Father, and freedom from the law of sin and death, and not be conscious of it, has no sense, though we may not be able to explain how it is; but we have the joy, and know it. I attach no importance to the word 'Christian'—probably given by the world; but his body who is such is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which he has of God.

The comparison of some passages in Romans and Galatians shews distinctly how this is a distinct state, and not a mere progress in the condition of the soul, the liberty of sons, the fruit of redemption, in contrast with bondage under law, even if born of God. In Galatians 3:23: "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under law." Before faith came we were under the law, a schoolmaster unto Christ, but after faith came we were so no longer. We are all sons (not children, two things not confounded by Paul) of God by faith in Christ Jesus. But the heir, so long as he is a child, differs nothing from a slave, though lord of all. But when the fulness of time

was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because ye are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

Chapter 5 exhorts them to stand fast in this liberty; the flesh lusted against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; but if led of the Spirit, they were not under law. Flesh was there, but their state and standing was wholly changed; they were sons, free, led of the Spirit, not under law, because Christ had redeemed them out of that state, and so the Holy Ghost was given to them, if faith had come in. The state was the consequence of God's Son being come to redeem, and faith in that. Now look at Romans, in the delivered state— Romans 8, As many as are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God. We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear. And how is this? We are not under law, but under grace, reckon ourselves dead. (Compare Gal. 2:19, 20.) Christ having died, we are delivered from the law, dead with Christ to sin and the law too, married to another, Christ risen. We are in Christ: the law of the Spirit of life in Him has set us free; for what the law could not do, God has done, sending His own Son for sin. The consequence is not a law imposing human righteousness, but the things of the Spirit our portion.

Though the flesh is in us, we are not in it, not in that standing before God, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in us, not if born of God; that they were when undelivered. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit life; and then he goes to conscious sonship by the Spirit, and so, not to one being born, but to the witness by the Spirit of being born of

God (children, not sons): we are heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. The principles of the state in chapter 7 are the law, the flesh, sin, captivity to the law of sin, undelivered, the will right, but no power to carry it out. The first six verses give the two relationships to law, and Christ risen, death wholly closing one, being the only deliverance from it. The principles of chapter 8 are, in Christ (not merely forgiven, but in a new state), made free by the law of the Spirit of life in Him, sin in the flesh condemned in His having died a sacrifice for sin, not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, the Spirit of God dwelling in us, the body dead, the Spirit life; sons, knowing we are such, suffering with Christ, to be glorified with Him; Christ and the Spirit, not mentioned in the first; the whole subject is the second husband, in the power of the Spirit in the second. It is impossible that two standings and relationships can be more distinct. Having believed in forgiveness by Christ's blood, the believer has received the Spirit, and knows by it where he is, as having died with Christ, and being now in Him.

Bad teaching, which puts being born again (a vital and necessary truth, and examining whether we be in the faith, a very natural thing then, but a mere and entire misinterpretation of Scripture), instead of an accomplished and known redemption by the work of Christ, having led many true hearts away from plain Scripture truth, I add here what Scripture plainly states. If a soul can in truth before God say, Abba, Father, that soul is sealed. If a person really knows that he is in Christ, and Christ in him, he is sealed. If the love of God is shed abroad in the heart, the man is sealed. (Rom. 8; Gal. 4; Rom. 13; John 14; Rom. 10.) Other proofs may be

given of if, for the whole life of a man is, save particular failures, the evidence of the Spirit of God dwelling in him; but I take the simplest and most immediate evidence in a man's soul purposely and such as are in terms stated in Scripture. Now what hinders the simple acceptance of this truth is, that the full doctrine of redemption is not believed. Forgiveness is looked at as forgiveness of so much past sins,53 of sins up to our conversion, what was really Jewish forgiveness, which is contrasted in Scripture with Christian; Heb. 9, 10. What Scripture calls eternal redemption is not believed in. As to Christians in general, what it is to have no more conscience of sins, they cannot tell you, or even of the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputes no sin. No, all their past sins were forgiven when they believed, but sins since? well, they must be sprinkled again, or the present priesthood of Christ on high applies to it, neither of which is in Scripture.

Ask them what it means, when it says that by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified; they cannot tell you: each sin, after its commission, has to find its forgiveness as and when it may; and people are taught that it is a very dangerous doctrine to think otherwise. Now there is an interruption of communion; there is a gracious washing of the feet with water; but when I have believed in Christ's work there is no more imputation of sin, I am perfected as to conscience. We have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. He who bore our sins, and put them away long ago, is there. We must not confound the work of the Spirit, which makes me own my faults, and the work of Christ, finished and effectual once and for ever. He bore my sins when I had not committed one of

them, and if forgiveness, in the sense of non-imputation, has to be gained now, it would be impossible; for Christ would have to suffer for them as the apostle says, “For then he must often have suffered from the foundation of the world.” Hence he who has not the sense of redemption in his soul by faith, and he who really has, are by current teaching put on the same footing, though one has the Spirit of adoption, and the other has not—one looks for mercy, not yet obtained by faith, and the other, with God, cries Abba, Father; but both are taught to suppose sin imputable alike, and to search if they are children, and the delivered man is thrown back by false teaching under law in Romans 7. If you can really cry, Abba, Father, you are surely sealed; but then no sin can be imputed to you, or Christ is dead in vain. Judaism was, as to that, better than this half Christianity. There, if a man sinned, was a sacrifice, and his sin was forgiven. Here, once, perhaps, pardoned for what was gone before, he has nothing but uncertainty for all that follows. But Christ has obtained eternal redemption, and blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no sin. And the work being complete, and he who is sanctified perfected for ever, the worshipper once purged has no more conscience of sins, and Christ is sitting down on the Father’s throne because all is finished. Of this the Holy Ghost is the witness; being born of God is not.

There is one text as to which it may be well to add a supplementary word: “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his,” Rom. 8:9. “None of his” alarms people; it is simply that he is not yet His, any more than the prodigal was in a son’s place till he reached his father.

Verse 1 puts us in Christ, this verse Christ in us, which is the Christian state, according to the promise in John 14. It is not the state of soul which is a question here, but the fact of Christ being in us, as the next verse proves, connecting it withal with chapter 6. He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. This cannot be till we have that Spirit. We are not till then in the Christian state as belonging to Christ in fact, even if on the way, like the prodigal. The Christian is always looked at as born again, forgiven, and sealed. That is the Christian state—till then he is not in it. The indwelling of the Spirit is part of the Christian state, as Galatians, Romans, 2 Corinthians 5, 2 Corinthians 1, and a multitude of other passages, shew.

There is one other passage I would refer to, as sometimes cited, “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God.” Now, first, the sealing of the Spirit is not the subject here, nor is being born again. It is assumed and referred to in chapter 3:24: only there the Spirit’s testimony to dwelling in Him, and He in us, is only applied to His dwelling in us, as even gifts of all kinds might shew. But obedience marks the Christian, keeping His commandments, and this involves dwelling in God, and God in us, the consciousness of it being by the Spirit given to us. So verse 4. So in our verse 13, but the terms varied, He hath given us of His Spirit: the terms, indeed, of the prophecy, but here of moment, as connecting us with God in His nature. John is not occupied with the administrative acts, such as sealing, by which our relationships are known. He dwells in the nature of God, and communion with it. He is light, so are we. He is love, and he who dwells in love, dwells in God, and God

in him. Our koinonia is with God, and we walk in the light, as God is in the light, in love, as Christ loved us. I do not doubt it is through the Spirit, but what John is full of is our being in God, and God in us, as a present thing, not our being sealed for the day of redemption—a day not come yet; and it is of His Spirit, so that we should dwell in and have communion with Himself. This is not sealing, though it be through means of it, that is, of the gift of the Holy Ghost. Romans 5 is nearer to it, and there it is by the gift of the Holy Ghost, but an effect of it, not the thing itself. When a man is quickened, and trusts in the blood of Christ, and is sealed with the Holy Ghost, then he enters into the fulness of God, of all that is in Him, his new nature innately enjoys, is innately capable of enjoying all that He is; the Holy Ghost is the revealer of, and spiritual power to realise, what is revealed, and thus we enter into that fulness, our conscience being perfect through the blood of Christ.

Thus entering into what the Holy Ghost brings us into, we dwell in God, and God in us. And this is the position of every Christian, of whoever believes that Jesus is the Son of God. But these are looked on as sealed, as this passage itself shews. With a parenthesis to detect evil spirits, the view of the Christian state begins, 1 John 3:23 externally, verse 24 internally, chapter 4:7, and following. It is not the habit of John to treat the divine administrative process of God’s ways, but the nature of God, and the fulness that is in Him, and our connection with it in its character and power. This process the reader will find in Ephesians 3:14-19. It is the full blessing into which we are brought by the Holy Ghost with which we are sealed. Ephesians is the realisation of it. There is another point important in this passage, the

force of “Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God.” Here a man is openly in the place of a Christian; but it is in no way the fact of His Person, in contrast with His work. In the passage itself, the whole of what He was, has done, is now in glory, is brought into view: nor in what follows is it simply that we are quickened, but that he that hath the Son hath life. The whole mystery of godliness, as regards us, viewing Christ as a Man in glory, who once came down, and finished the work, and is gone back to the Father. Verses 9, 10 we have the Son sent to be life to us, and propitiation for us; in verse 12, God’s love is perfected in us now; in verse 17 He is viewed as the glorified Man, and as He is, so are we. It is evident that this takes in the whole history of Christ in saying Son of God. But the way in which John speaks of Christ goes further: He is truly a man “come in the flesh,” but God in His Person. We know Him that is true, and are in Him that is true, that is, in His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, He, outos “is the true God, and eternal life.”

Read the verses from chapter 2:28; chap. 3:3: is He spoken of as God, or as man? As both in one half-verse He appears; we are born of Him, so sons of God, but the world does not know us, as it did not know Him. It is one Person who is God and who is Man, according to the aspect in which He is looked at, and believing in His Person is the secret and foundation of it all; but a divine Person who came down, is God, finished the work, and is gone up, a true man who has died, but Son of God. So we enter into all the fulness of God, dwelling in Him (being in Christ), but according to all that He has displayed Himself to be in His ways with us in Christ, and blessed it is. But this is different from the

administration of those ways, even the sealing with the Holy Ghost, by which we are capable indwellers.

Paul gives us this administrative and judicial dealing of God. There is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, by faith in Christ the Son, who has wrought redemption. We are sons, not merely children, and so the Spirit of His Son is sent forth into our hearts. John goes on to what this brings us into, in its fulness in God, as revealed in the Son. All belongs in God's mind, the nous of Christ, to every believer, as the best robe, and tie shoes, and the ring to the prodigal; but we enter into them by being sealed with the Holy Ghost, and are able to do so, being strengthened by Him according to Ephesians 3. And now the matter stands thus: dispensation-ally it was when the Son of God had come, been crucified, accomplishing redemption and gone on high; then, and then only, the Holy Ghost came down, the public seal and testimony that He was the Son of God, the glorified Man on high. So with the individual, when he believes that the work is accomplished, in the efficacy of that work, he is sealed with the Holy Ghost, giving the assurance of our place by what Christ has done, and the earnest of what He has obtained for us, having put away our sins, and done away the whole of our old standing with God, flesh and law, and entered as our Forerunner into glory as man, in virtue of redemption.

Now when Christ is at all truly preached, even where the efficacy of His work is not clearly applied, still what has that efficacy is placed before the soul as a truth. According to ordinary evangelical ministry, people are told they must be born again—quite true—and to examine themselves if they are; and if the value of

Christ's blood is spoken of, they are carefully warned and guarded, lest they should have any false confidence, not to deceive themselves, etc. The effect is, that the mass (where the word reaches the soul) remain in the spirit of bondage, and searching their own state to see if God can accept them; the ground may be laid, but are they fit for heaven? the efficacy of the blood being a resource at the end of their career, many truths for living by, as men say, one to die by. A few, in whom the Spirit of God made it a felt need, do realise forgiveness as a present thing, and even that of attainment; consequently, being sealed, they cry to God, Abba, Father, but remain in the spirit of bondage after all, thrown back on their self-examination, and the judgment, they can form of themselves, not here fully seeking to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ our Lord, in true holiness and divine life, but turn even this into a question of fitness, that is, of righteousness, and true holiness is lost, as is divine righteousness. Acceptance, save as a thing in the air, is not known. And such is the state of the Christian world. Let watchfulness, diligence of heart, the fear of God, working out our own salvation with fear and trembling, be pressed on the redeemed and saved with all diligence, but on such as such, and when they are such. For though we have the assurance of being kept and confirmed to the end by divine power, yet if we are redeemed, and because we are, we have the wilderness to pass, where all is sifted and tried in us (John 10; 1 Cor. 1), but where the true believer relies on the faithfulness of the living God, who withdraws not His eyes from the righteous, as he does on the perfect work which redeemed and saved him (so that he is not in the flesh) and brought him into this place of testing.

In result, then, the pattern and the model of the Christian's place is Matthew 3:16, 17. The heavens are opened to him; He is sealed and anointed with the Holy Ghost; and the Father owns Him as His beloved Son. Only Christ was in this place as man in His own excellency. For us redemption was needed; for except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abides alone: but if it die, it brings forth much fruit. Hence, our faith must rest, not only on His Person, but on His work, to find ourselves in that place. And this is what the truth of the matter is as to delay. It is not delay in sealing, when faith in Christ's work is there—I see no ground for that—but delay in the heart's believing in its efficacy, appropriating faith in Christ's work.

* * * * *

I allow myself to add a line on another subject, as misrepresentation has gone forth. I insist that when Christ's presence is spoken of, with two or three gathered in His name, it is Christ—not the Holy Ghost. The difference is very real: the Holy Ghost was not incarnate, was not made flesh for us, did not die for us, and in this respect cannot be the object of the same affections. On this I have constantly and uniformly insisted. What gave occasion to the contrary representation was, as far as I can ascertain, a bad translation of a French tract; where evidently it was said Christ was present en esprit, spiritually (not corporeally), and this has been translated by "the Spirit."

51 I do not doubt the Holy Ghost will be given specially in the beginning of the millennium, but that is not our

subject here; as now given, it connects us with an absent, heavenly, and glorified Christ.

52 We have it here, and based on Christ's death, and enjoyed by the Spirit. So in Galatians 5:1," the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." So 2 Corinthians 3, "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

53 Past sins in Romans 3 are the sins of Old Testament saints. It is clear that at the moment I am forgiven, I can only apply it to sins already committed; I have no other. But this does not touch the question of the extent and bearing of Christ's death, which was before I had committed any. It is confounding the Spirit's work and Christ's.

Church And Privileges

Things, truths, not words, are my objects. I had supposed that kuriake was the source of kirche in German, kirk and church. “Kyroike” I never heard of; it may be all right. Some philologists now say that this is all wrong, and that kirk, or church, comes from the Saxon. I can only say I really do not know, nor have at this moment the means of ascertaining, if indeed it be ascertainable with any certainty. But the truth is I have a pious horror of the word “church,” because no one knows what it means.

What does it mean? Mr. G.’s congregation might build him a new church; then it means a building. Or Mr. S. may be a member of Mr. G.’s church; then it means an assembly under the presidency of Mr. G. In England, he is going into the church means he is going to become a clergyman; he is gone to church, is the public service or worship—gone to the church is the building again.

The Roman Catholic church and the Greek church are large bodies of persons professing Christianity, associated under these designations. So of Presbyterians, and Covenanters, Lutherans, etc. If you press the matter, the church is the teaching, the authoritative part of it. This is so even among Protestants. The thirty-nine Articles of England tell us the church can decree rites and ceremonies, and has authority in matters of faith. So that we have to know what a person means by “the church “before we can reply to a question as to it.

But I will just mention a little bit of history which refers to this, and why it is so current a word. When James I

(or, as we should say with Scottish Covenanters, James VI) had the Bible translated, the translation in popular use was the Geneva one, made by the refugees in Queen Mary's time. This always used the word "congregation." Now James had a long experience, or knowledge at least, of his mother's conflicts with John Knox, and was not very fond of Scottish principles embodied afterwards in the covenant, and used to say, "No bishop, no king." He therefore gave strict orders to have the word "church" everywhere, and not "congregation." Hence the prevalence of a word which has really no meaning.

Say "assembly," which is the meaning of the Greek ekklesia, and all ambiguity disappears. "Ecclesia" was the assembly of those who in the small Grecian states were citizens, and so had right to vote, etc., and then was applied to analogous bodies or meetings. We all know what an assembly means. Only now we have to do with God's assembly. For example, "Take with thee one or two more, etc., if not, tell it to the church." To whom is it to be told? Well, the minister, or perhaps the presbytery. With the Roman Catholic, "if he will not hear the church" wins awful proportions. Now say (as it really is) "the assembly," how simple all is! If wronged, go yourself first alone; if in vain, take one or two others; if still in vain, matters being ascertained, then tell it to the assembly. For the present mixed state of things this may seem very inconvenient, but the sense of the words is plain enough.

Now apply this to Acts 7. "This is he that was with the assembly in the wilderness." Can anything be simpler? Israel was a vast assembly in the wilderness, and assembled themselves at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. For though a different word in

Hebrew, the tabernacle got its name from its being the place of meeting. But then all possible reference to the church in the Christian sense disappears. Who denies that the six hundred thousand men who came constantly to the entrance of the court were an assembly? There were three words used for it, Kahal (as is stated by Mr. G.), from Kahal, the verb to call together; Moeed, and Heeda, or Gneedah, the two last from Yaad, to appoint a place or time of meeting. Hence the tabernacle was called Ohel Moeed, the tent or tabernacle of the congregation.

Israel was a great assembly or congregation, as none can dispute, but which proves simply nothing as to its being what God's assembly is, according to the word, now. It is "Ecclesia," an assembly, in Acts 7, and the word, being simply an assembled multitude, says just no more than that. The identical word is used when it is said (Acts 19), "Having so said, he (the town clerk) dismissed the assembly." Put "the church" there, and what nice sense you will have!

I quite understand it will be said, "Yes, but they were God's assembly in the wilderness." Admitted, but the whole question remains; that is, were God's assembly then, and God's assembly now, constituted on the same principles, on the same basis? There was no question then of conversion, or faith, or anything of the kind, or even profession. They were, as Scripture expresses it, of the fountain of Jacob, descendants of Israel according to the flesh, and under condition of being circumcised the eighth day, which, by the by, none of those born in the wilderness were at that time. That assembly was a nation; God's assembly now is not. The fact of being an assembly, or the word, proves nothing; the whole

question remains—Are the Israelitish nation, and God's assembly called by grace, the same thing, or assembled on the same principles?

Mr. G. makes some enormous statements: First, "The church of Pentecost was Israel." Why, the Jews had openly rejected the Lord, and Peter in his sermon says to those who had ears to hear, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation," and the Lord Himself, "Henceforth your house is left unto you desolate, for I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth until ye say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." They were a judicially rejected people, though not for ever, and are so to this day. They were men of Israel; but the assertion, inconceivable as it is, only shews how far a false principle can carry any one. God did not say in Joel, "He would give the great outpouring of His Spirit to Israel." He said He would pour out His Spirit on all flesh. In patience with Israel He dealt with them, and began at Jerusalem; but it was the Holy Ghost being given to Cornelius that opened fully Peter's and the Jewish Christians' eyes.

But let us enter a little more into the heart of the matter. Mr. G. says, "To them were committed the oracles of God; to them pertained the adoption, glory, covenant, giving of the law, service, and the promises; Rom. 9:4. Nothing more can be said of the church now." Now here is the nucleus, the heart, of the question: not the introduction of Old Testament saints into church privileges, unscriptural as that is, but reducing God's assembly now to the measure of Jewish privileges. The former might alone be treated as a mistake, the latter deprives God's assembly of its true divine standing, and

this is what makes it of moment. The law was given by Moses, grace and truth came (egeneto) by Jesus Christ.

Let us see what Scripture says on the matter. In the tabernacle there was a veil, behind which God sat between the cherubim; the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest was not yet made manifest, while as yet the first tabernacle had its standing.. Now by Christ's death the veil is rent from top to bottom, and we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh. We can, and are, to walk in the light as God is in the light. Is this "nothing more" to Mr. G.?

I will not insist on God's righteousness being declared now, the righteousness of God being revealed, not prophesied of, because I desire to take what is most positive and on the very surface of Scripture. See Galatians 4. "Now I say the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a slave, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father; even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the rudiments of the world. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons; and because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father; wherefore thou art no more a slave, but a son." Is it "nothing more" to be brought to be sons of God by known and accomplished redemption, and know it, to live in the relationship, instead even of an heir differing nothing from a slave?

Will Mr. G. allow me to ask him, were the Jews under the first covenant, or the second, in their relationship with God? Are we under that first covenant? But more, we have the difference clearly brought out in Hebrews 10:9: “He taketh away the first that he may establish the second.” It will be said that these were ceremonies; but what ceremonies? The priesthood is changed; is that merely a ceremony, a better hope by which we draw nigh to God? And see the difference: the sacrifices could not make the comers thereunto perfect as pertaining to the conscience; there was a remembrance of sins every year. Now we are perfected for ever who are sanctified; so that Christ, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. He is seated there, because all is done, till His enemies are made His footstool; and our sins and iniquities are remembered no more. The worshippers once purged are so in such sort that they should have no more conscience of sins, instead of a remembrance of them every year. We have eternal redemption, a purged conscience, because the sins are purged once and for all, and boldness to enter into the holiest, “giving thanks to the Father who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light” (Col. 1:12), having the knowledge of salvation given to His people by the remission of their sins. Is all this “nothing more”?

Take what is said by the Lord; and this will lead us to the question of the Holy Ghost. Than John Baptist no greater prophet had ever arisen, and of those born of woman none greater; but the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. Many kings, prophets, righteous men, had desired to see the things which the disciples saw, and had not seen them; but “blessed,” says the Lord,

“are your eyes, for they see.” They were more blessed than their kings and prophets—they had Messiah with them. But so great was the privilege and advantage of having the Holy Ghost, that it was expedient that Christ should leave them; for if He did not, the Comforter would not come; but if He went away, He would send Him. What a thing to lose, Christ’s personal presence in grace! Yet so great was to be the effect of the coming of the Holy Spirit, that it was better He should go. But they would persuade us that He had been there all the time of the Old Testament! (See 1 Pet. 1.) They searched their own prophecies, and found they did not minister to themselves, but to us, the things now reported by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Was the promise to pour out the Spirit “nothing”? Clearly it was not anything if He was there all the time as when poured out.

And now mark the foundation of this immense truth. God never dwelt with Adam innocent, nor with Abraham or others; but as soon as a redemption, external even, was accomplished, we read, “They shall know (Exod. 29) that I, Jehovah their God, have brought them up out of the land of Egypt, that I might dwell among them “; and the Shechinah of glory came down and sat between the cherubim, and led them in the wilderness. So it was, when an eternal and full redemption had been accomplished, and man (though much more than a man) sat down in virtue of it at the right hand of God, that the Holy Ghost came down to dwell in God’s people individually and collectively.

We must not confound between the divine action of the Holy Ghost and His coming. I think it will be found in Scripture that all direct action of God from creation is by

the Holy Ghost. Even Christ could say, “If I by the Holy Ghost cast out demons.” At any rate He moved on the face of the waters; by His Spirit God garnished the heavens; He inspired the prophets, and wrought all through the divine history; but this was not His personal coming. So the Son created all things, but He did not come until the incarnation. “I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world and go to the Father,” John 16:28. So speaks Christ of the Holy Ghost: “If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go away, I will send him unto you, and when he is come,” etc. (John 16:7, 8.) And this was so distinct a thing, that it is called “The Holy Ghost” without saying came, or given, or anything else. Thus John 7:39, “For the Holy Ghost was not yet”—given is added— “for Jesus was not yet glorified.” So the disciples, baptised by John in Acts 19:2, said, “We have not so much as heard whether the Holy Ghost is.”

All Jews knew the being of the Holy Ghost; but this was His promised presence, and this is easily understood as to John’s disciples, because he had spoken of Christ’s work as twofold:—He was “the Lamb of God,” and “he it is that baptiseth with the Holy Ghost”; which was the second great part of His work—baptising with the Holy Ghost—and could not be done till He was glorified. So He tells His disciples after His resurrection, “Ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” He Himself was anointed and sealed with the Holy Ghost when He stood, the first man fully, perfectly, acceptable to God, who had ever existed since evil entered, perfect in Himself. God “anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power.”

And what is the effect of the Holy Ghost's dwelling in us? The love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost given to us; Rom. 5. We know that we are in Christ, and Christ is in us; John 14. We know that we are sons, and cry, Abba Father, the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit. He takes the things of Christ, the glorified man on high, and shews them to us. Our bodies are temples of the Holy Ghost, which we have of God; so that God dwells in us, and we in Him, and we know it by the Holy Ghost given to us. What eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath entered into the heart of man to conceive, God hath revealed unto us by His Spirit. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty; and, Christ living thus in us, the body is dead because of sin, the Spirit life because of righteousness. Man at the right hand of God, in righteousness, and the Holy Ghost dwelling in the believer as the consequence of it, characterise Christianity.

All this is lost by this system. What made it expedient for Christ to leave His disciples, we are told, is all the same as what they had before He came! The anointing of the Holy Ghost is "nothing"! Besides, he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit, and this leads to the corporate difference.

Till Christ ascended up on high there was no man at the right hand of God, no one to whom the believer could, as a present fact, be united, and consequently, as we have seen, no Holy Ghost either to unite him to Him. But Christ ascended up on high, a man, in righteousness, and the Holy Ghost consequently came down, not to the world, but to believers. Let us hold fast this great truth —the essence of Christianity, as the cross and God's love are the foundation of it. The Head being on high, we are

quickened together with Him, according to the power with which God wrought in raising Him from the dead, and setting Him there, and raised us up Jews or Gentiles together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ, not with Him yet; Eph. 1:19-23; chap. 2:1-7. Neither part of this was true before Christ was glorified. There was no such glorified man, no Holy Ghost come down from heaven. On this Scripture is clear as possibly can be. There was a Son of God who could quicken; no raised glorified man, whose going to the Father was the testimony of God's righteousness, nor Holy Ghost come down, the divine witness of it. We are members of His body; He has given Him, as so exalted, to be Head over all things to the church which is His body. Thus by one Spirit we are all baptised into one body, Jews or Greeks. Israel had lost his place as such. There was no difference now. By the cross the middle wall of partition was broken down, and of twain one new man to be made, and both reconciled to God in one body by the cross.

Now the duty and essence of Judaism was the keeping of the wall up; Christianity as a system on earth is founded on its being broken down. Were the Gentiles in the church brought into the Jewish state as is alleged? No; He makes of twain one new man, and reconciles both, and came and preached peace to those afar off, and those nigh, for neither had it. The apostles and prophets (the prophets are the prophets of the New Testament, see Eph. 3:5) were the foundation of a new edifice, a habitation of God through the Spirit. This had never been promised, never revealed at all and could not have been. To say there was no difference between Jew and Gentile would have destroyed Judaism at one stroke. It

was not revealed at all; Eph. 3:4-11; Col. 1:26; Rom. 16:25, 26. In verse 26 it is not “the scriptures of the prophets,” but now by prophetic scriptures, graphon prophetikon.

But the grand point is the coming of the Holy Ghost consequent on the exaltation of a man in righteousness to the right hand of God. So when Christ says, “I will build my church “on the revelation made by the Father to Peter, what was the meaning of that, if He had been building it all the time? The church then, the body of Christ, is formed by the baptism of the Holy Ghost consequent on the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God; the Holy Ghost, as so come, was not yet, when Christ was not glorified; and this baptism as is declared in Acts 1, took place a few days after, that is, on the day of Pentecost.

Romans 11 has nothing to do with the church, the body of Christ. It is the olive-tree of promise (and the church was never promised even), and it is accompanied with a revelation that, when the Jews are grafted in again, the Gentile branches would be broken off. There were promises and prophecies at any rate, which apply to Gentiles, as, “Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people”; but if Israel be God’s people, the church cannot exist with it; for there is no difference of Jew and Gentile, and blindness in part is happened unto Israel, till the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. They are enemies as touching the gospel. It is “the casting them away” in “the reconciling of the world.” The church is the body of Christ formed by the Holy Ghost on earth, while Christ sits on the right hand of God.

I should have many things to note if I merely took up the article. “House of the Lord,” or any application of it to the place where the people meet, is wholly without foundation in Scripture. “The church of the wilderness “is also unscriptural. “The kingdom of heaven” is not the church at all. It is really too bad to say, “the apostles do not say a word about a new organisation.” There is a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. Did not Paul organise the church? Were the priests and Levites priests and Levites of the Christian church?

There would be another difficulty which Mr. G. has not noticed at all; that before the Exodus there was no assembly of any kind at all; individual saints, Enochs, and Noahs, and Abrahams, but no assembly; but I do not go beyond what is on the surface of the article.

What I press is this—that the Holy Ghost is come, and that, when He came, the baptism, by which the saints were made one body, took place. The assembly is the body of Christ, the dwelling-place of the Holy Ghost on earth, and never existed before that baptism, and could not, for the Head did not exist, nor was the Holy Ghost in consequence descended to unite men to Him so as to form that body. He gave Himself not for that nation only, but to gather together in one the children of God which were scattered abroad.

Power In The Church;

Or Not Imitation, But Obedience In The Sense Of Present Ruin I feel a little difficulty, my dear friends, in taking up a subject in which my mind is exercised with you all. There is exceeding grace of expression in that word in Nehemiah, “The joy of Jehovah is your strength.” The mere principle of imitation, as regards power, is very mischievous. When the church has become awakened to the discovery of what she has lost, the very probable tendency will be to seek to imitate that power. Such is never the condition of faith. What the church has to do is to know its actual condition, and to turn to God in the condition that it is in. Many have gone astray in trying to be like the state of the early church. The place of faith is to be cast on God, and not to assume what we have not. This dispensation is one in which the kingdom of God is not in word only but in power, and this must be had from God. All imitation of it is worthless. This leads us to a point of great comfort. While we are guilty as to what is lost, yet God is in no sense hindered by the resources which He had given; He has yet all fulness to bestow on us. The church is cast on God’s own resources. I believe, as our brother has said, the church may find a blessed excellency of grace which they had not at first. This was the case in the days of Nehemiah with regard to Israel; the joy of Jehovah was to be their strength, and therefore he stopped the weeping. Though they were in great distress, and in subjection to evil, yet we read, “Since the days of Joshua, the son of Nun, unto that day had not the children of Israel kept such a feast, and there was very great gladness.”

We find that this was one of their gladdest feasts; they had never had it till the day of their sorrow. Being cast, then, on the resources of God, “the joy of Jehovah was their strength,” not the joy of Moses in bringing them out of the land of Egypt. I feel very strongly that this principle is of great practical importance. Though there is the discovery of sin, in comparing the state of the church with what it once was, yet we have the fulness of God in giving blessing suited to our own present condition brought out. The children of Israel did anything but pretend that they were not in sorrow. The next chapter shews this; they were in great distress, they had no glory, but they had the joy of Jehovah, and they kept the feast. The secret of this confidence is direct reference to the Lord. I am as much entitled to have confidence in God as anybody since the foundation of the world. I can never qualify the resources of God, being limited by nothing but His own holy grace, which does all that we want now. Imitation of the early church is not faith, but reference to the word of God, as applying itself to my condition, is. You cannot imitate power, it is folly—you must have power.

As regards the first part of the question—the source of power is the same in the church now as it was in the days of the apostles, but its exercise manifestly is not the same. “Our word,” says the apostle, “was in demonstration of the Spirit, and with power.” I believe that the demonstration was the external witness of the power, the exhibition of the deposit that was in the church to the world. As it regards the question of the power in the church being the same as in the days of the apostles, it does not exist; there can be no question as to that. If we come to discipline in the church, there is no

limit to its power but the extent of its existence. We have not, in fact, the same power in exercise as the apostles had. I see two distinct divisions in the apostolic office: the one antecedent altogether to the church as gathered by testimony; the other did not exist till the Holy Ghost was poured out on the day of Pentecost.

Then we have apostolic power for the church in the inspiration of the Scriptures. This is evidently closed, for Peter says, “Moreover I will endeavour that ye may be able, after my decease, to have these things always in remembrance,” 2 Pet. 1:15. This would have been most monstrous presumption in Peter if any other apostles were to have followed him. Paul, in like manner, commends the believers at Ephesus to God, and to the word of His grace, which was able to build them up, etc.; Acts 20:32. Why did he do this? Knowing that after his departure grievous wolves would enter in among them, not sparing the flock, therefore he commended them to the word of God’s grace, and not to the apostles who should follow him. In 2 Timothy 3 we read that in the last days perilous times shall come (not wonderfully blessed times, but perilous ones); but, says the apostle, continue thou in the things which thou hast learned. The Holy Scriptures were what the apostle referred Timothy to when the perilous times should come.

We read in 1 John 2, “Ye have an unction from the holy one, and ye know all things; I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it.” When the apostle was present even, he did not teach the saints without reference to their competency to prove all things. On that I see the church of God is cast. Then, as regards anything that is called for now, we have not apostolic power to meet it, but we have God’s resources,

and there is no limit to them but the faithfulness of God, which cannot fail. I feel bound to exercise all the power with which God has entrusted me, not minding anything in the wide world: there is no limit to our responsibility of using what God has given us. God deals invariably on this principle. He gives to man a deposit, with the responsibility of using it aright. I believe the responsibility of the apostles was to give the deposit, and that of the church to keep it, but it has failed, as man always fails. Moses gave the people of Israel the law; they had the responsibility of keeping it, and failed. In the different characters of deposits man failed in each. God could never propose man's sin, though He might give prophecies, and shew what He would do when they did fail; so that the apostle could say, "All seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's." Even before the apostle died, he saw the departure from their high privileges of those who were not their own, but bought with a price.

"God is faithful" in whatever state we are to minister the supply that is needed. Our proper place is to present ourselves before God as we are, and this will always humble us. In reference to the passage which has been quoted in Mark 16:17, if the question be asked wherefore is the power in the church now not the same as in the days of the apostles? Clearly because of man's unfaithfulness. The promise in Mark is not made to the apostles, but to those who believed in the apostles' ministry. It did follow those who believed, and that promise was accomplished; it is left in a vague manner, because it was to be the proof of the faithfulness of the church in the deposit that was given to it, and it failed. Paul and Jude describe the very persons who crept in

unawares as the object of Christ's coming with ten thousand of His saints to judge… In the word of God I get the positive testimony that the church has apostatised, and thus, as to wherefore there is a difference between its state now and in the days of the apostles, there is no difficulty in deciding it (though the cause of the difference should deeply humble us). We have failed in our responsibility as to that which they deposited with us, and that is reason enough.

John's falling down at the feet of the angel to worship him was the very thing which Paul speaks of as the sign of apostasy, though of course in him it was only a momentary error; but it shews the tendency of the flesh, even in the holiest man. The spiritual discovery of the condition in which we are, and the casting ourselves on the resources of God as those who have failed is perfectly humbling and sorrowful, but then "the joy of Jehovah will be our strength." What was the lesson God was teaching His church when He suffered Paul to be cast into prison? Satan thus appeared to have gained a great advantage, but God's meaning in depriving the church of the presence of the apostle was, that we might get His judgment as to the duty and state of the church without an apostle. The first great duty of the saints now is to humble themselves. (See Phil. 2.) The first Adam exalted himself, and soon got humbled; the second Adam humbled Himself, wherefore God hath highly exalted Him. We read too, "Humble yourselves, therefore, under the mighty hand of God," etc. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you," etc. In the distinct consciousness that it was God, and not Paul, who wrought in them, He shews

them where they are cast in the absence of an apostle—on God.

I do see a distinct difference between what we find in Luke and the Acts, and that which is opened out to us in John 20. The first was testimony to the Jews respecting Christ, as the anointed Man led of the Spirit, having been rejected by the Jews in that character. He is presented by Peter as the exalted Man, and it is clear to me that He was presented as such to the nation, not to a remnant, as we read in Acts 3:26: “Unto you first God, having raised up his Son, Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.” But the rejection of the message delivered to them by Stephen, and his death, close this ministry.

Saul was converted by a testimony to the union of the saints with Christ, who appears to him from the glory, saying, “Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? “There was in this the direct discovery that, in touching the saints, he was touching the Lord Himself. I do not find anywhere the union of the church with Christ, and of the Jew and Gentile being “fellow-heirs of the same body,” etc., except in Paul’s epistles. Saul was the willing, active, apostle of Israel’s rejection of the Holy Ghost’s testimony to Jesus; he is met on this very errand by the Lord in glory, and made the witness of Christ and His saints being one, and he was the instrument of communicating this mystery to the Gentiles.

John 14, 15, and 16, I believe, treat of the Spirit quite differently, though they have been all classed together. In chapter 14 the Lord was putting His disciples on the ground of privilege on what had been given them, and not on what they had apprehended, and the condition in

the latter part of the chapter I would say has been fulfilled, although I deny not that it should have a practical effect over us; but in the Comforter the church has its own peculiar blessing. And then comes another thing, “Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit.” The old vine had been proved to be degenerate, it was one dependent on ordinances. Christ, the true vine, was the power of fruit-bearing, and therefore this is the necessary character of the Christian vine; if it were not to bear fruit, it must be cut off. Remark that immediately consequent on this we have the promise,” I will send the Comforter,” and now it is as the Spirit of testimony to the world sent by Christ from the Father, and not merely the Spirit of communion sent by the Father in Christ’s name.

One part of this Paul was incapable of: “Ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning”; whereas Paul says, “Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.” He does not call himself a witness of the things which happened to Jesus in Jerusalem. I see the same thing in the Hebrews, “which was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.” As a Jew he was the object of testimony, not himself a witness.

I find in 1 Corinthians 12, where the various gifts are spoken of, the Lord is spoken of as sending the Spirit, to make us servants of the Lord, and that He is not given as the promise of the Father to children—this was for the perfecting of the saints. Ephesians 4 speaks of the same thing. The apostle, having developed the fulness that is in Christ, unfolds the operations of that fulness in those gifts which are for the maturing of the body. The gifts spoken of here are to continue, because the body

can never cease to be the object of the care and love of Christ, let it fail ever so much in witness to the world. The question may be asked, had not the church at Corinth failed, and yet the gifts remained amongst them? No; not in the sense in which the church has now failed. Apostolic power could restore them, as it said, "Ye have perfectly cleared yourselves in this matter." We there see the exercise of apostolic ministry, not in judging the church' when it had failed, but in sustaining the church when it was failing. People sometimes speak of gifts as though they were the instruments of restoring the church. But this is a most mistaken idea. For the Corinthian church came behind in no gift, when it was in a most disorderly state, but still this church was not then put out of its place of testimony to the world through these gifts. The Lord had not then said, "I will remove thy candlestick out of its place."

In the Epistle to the Ephesians we see the blessed source of the church's own fulness, and that it is the habitation of God, where He dwells; and what we want to comprehend is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know that love which ministers to the church, to make it grow up into the fulness of its Head. If God were to exhibit His power now in the church by giving it the gifts it once had, He would be acting inconsistently with His own righteousness in identifying Himself with that which has lost its moral character; for surely it is not now the exhibition of what Christ was in the world. But, on the other hand, if the Lord did not now minister the gifts mentioned in the Ephesians, He would fail in maintaining the blessedness of His character, and the stedfastness of His love to the church.

As to there being positive gifts for ministry in the church now, no doubt there are pastors, teachers, evangelists, as distinctly as possible. One great cause of the confusion and disorder, in which the church is now, is the want of wisdom in recognising these gifts; so that we often find evangelists teaching old saints, and pastors going out to preach to sinners. This shews the confusion which man has produced by his own arrangements.

I could not exactly say that gifts necessarily accompany the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. It is not merely that God has set in the body all these things. If I were asked in what state God made man, I should say, “upright”; but this would not be true of him now. Has every man necessarily a gift now? No; there are many services now that cannot be called gifts: the giving a cup of cold water in the name of Christ is a service to Christ and to a saint, but it is not the exercise of a gift, though of more importance than a gift, because it is the proof of love. Whilst the gift is God’s and supreme, yet He forms the vessel, and suits it for the distinct gift which He gives to it.

Paul was a highly educated man; Peter was a poor fisherman. God glorified Himself in them both. He chooses the vessel as well as gives the gift. God will be supreme—He uses what vessel He pleases. Paul never went to the feet of Gamaliel for wisdom after he was a saint; he was a prepared vessel in providence, filled in grace.

How may any gift be ascertained, etc.? There is not a more important principle than that every gift ascertains itself in its exercise, as says the apostle Paul, “the seal of my apostleship are ye in the Lord.” In the exercise of

any gift, nothing can remove us from individual responsibility to the Lord. The Lord gave the gift, and the Lord requires the service. Do not mind the whole church (they are but “chaff”) when they interfere with our responsibility to the Lord. Exercise the gift in subjection to God’s word, and those who will judge, let them judge. I could not give up my personal responsibility to Christ (miserably as I may fail in it) for all the church ten times told over. The mark of the wicked and unfaithful servant was, that he was waiting for some other warrant than grace to use the talent which had been committed to him. People may say, but many false prophets may go forth thus. Yes, surely they may; and what control can you have over an evil spirit? In John’s epistle to the elect lady, we find him saying, even to a woman, “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not,” etc. She even was made a judge of the truth. The remedy he had to secure the little ones against the snares of the devil was the truth.

The first thing we want is faithfulness, and real humbleness of mind; each one will then find his proper niche.

As regards the prayers of the saints for the Spirit, I could not pray for the Holy Ghost, though I could pray to be filled with it, that He might so take possession of my soul, that the power of outward things might be taken away, and that thus He might be able to work in me with imhindered power. While recognising the Holy Ghost as having been given to the church, and that therefore He cannot be given again, it is very important to remember that the Holy Ghost is God; and therefore the church has to look for fulness which is infinite, and I could most

earnestly pray that the Holy Ghost would put forth His energy (I know not how) in the church of God; and this is not stirring up the gift that is in us individually.

On the other hand as to God's dealing with His children in discipline, I do not believe that there is such a thing as God's hiding His face from a Christian: his standing is in God's faithfulness, and God looks on His people in Christ; but I do know that His people get out of communion themselves. I believe that, as to fact, communion may exist, and people think, because of it, that they have none. The feeling of finding out that you have been far from God is because you have found out His presence, which discovers to you the evil of the state you have been in, which was the lesson you wanted to learn. If a child had been slighting his father's commands, when he was in his father's presence, it would make him feel very uncomfortable, because it would bring to his mind his disobedience.

When chastening comes to the soul, it is out of communion with God as the Father, and consequently it is as from the Lord; but when I find out the meaning of the discipline, there is distinct apprehension that it is the Father's doing—the Father purging the branch; when the soul is restored to communion, there is the discernment of the parental feeling. It is "the Lord" who judges the church. If as an individual child I look to the Father, when the church is concerned I look to the Lord.

The use of dispensations is to nurture our minds into the knowledge of what God is, from whence all dispensations flow, and to lead them to look on to that time when "God will be all in all."

A Short Reply To “Landmarks,” No. 6, Of The S.P.C.K.

First, I do not admit that the celebration of the Lord’s supper is a matter of obedience to a precept, nor of obedience at all, save as every right thing is obedience to God. And the difference is great, though I only note it without dwelling upon it.

Secondly, the tract confounds ministry and apostolic order. Apostolic order is lost, ministry is not. It is a common idea, but only an error. Ephesians 4 proves that ministry was to continue to the end. But gifts from Christ on high, labouring according to God’s calling in the unity of the body, are not elders appointed by apostolic authority in every city. Teachers, as Apohos, taught wherever they were, were elders nowhere; evangelists exercised their gifts in the world, were as such elders nowhere. Pastors were pastors in the unity of the whole body. The pastor of a church is a thing unknown to Scripture. Elders might have any of these gifts, but these did not make them elders. It was desirable, in addition to various moral and social qualifications, that they should be didaktikoi, not didaskaloi. Such as were are especially distinguished in 1 Timothy 5:17. Brethren admit that the apostles chose elders for the brethren in every city. But since the corruption of the church, already begun in the apostles’ days (see Jude, who shews that this was to continue to the end), we have not elders. Bishops and elders in Scripture are the same thing (Acts 20:17-28), the word overseer in the last being bishop (Titus 1:5, 7); but a bishop, priest, and deacon, is a form unknown to

Scripture. Where are the elders in the Establishment? They might be also gifted ministers, but in Scripture ministry is a gift from on high, and woe be to him who has his talent and does not use it! And the word of Scripture is, “As everyone has received the gift, let him so minister the same, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God.” Nor is there a trace of consecration by man for it in Scripture: unless it be the apostolic conferring of gifts which the prelates of the Establishment pretend to imitate. It is never said that hands were laid on elders; but it is probable they were, as it was the usual sign of blessing, and it is said, “Lay hands suddenly on no man.”

The apostle declares that, after his decease, evil would come in, but he makes no provision for the continuance of order and elders; he tells Timothy to communicate doctrines to faithful men, without the smallest hint of consecration. As to ministry, we have the positive promise of its continuance in Ephesians 4. But men have substituted for elders (or bishops) and deacons, the Pope, cardinals, archbishops, diocesan bishops, archdeacons, priests, and deacons. The apostolic order has disappeared, the ministry has not. The professing church has invented a disordered system not found in Scripture; and the Brethren, in the midst of the ruin, accepting a ministry given of God, do not pretend to be apostles to restore scriptural order. They admit a visible society, but fallen into corruption and disorder. The inventing, not a ministry, nor order, but disorder, is on the part of those whom the writer approves. But the Brethren do believe in the presence of the Holy Ghost, of which not a word is said in the tract; and in the

authority of Christ over His church, and His fidelity to it to the end.

But this confusion of ministry given from on high and regulated order, leads to another false point. It is said, “If the christian ministry has thus failed, the visible church of Christ must have failed with it.” The reason given is purely human; but the word of God declares that this visible church would fail, that in the last days perilous times would come, and there would be the form of piety, denying the power; it gives a description of it which answers, save two or three words, to what the apostle gives of Paganism in its worst corruption. He says too, expressly, that there would be a falling away before the man of sin was revealed. But he does more; he says that the mystery of iniquity was already at work, only there was a check upon it. Jude, as we have seen, says that the evil had entered, and John (1 John 2) that apostasy had already shewn itself, so that they knew it was the last time. Brethren believe then that there is a ministry of evangelists, pastors, and teachers, and that, according to Ephesians 4, they will continue to the end. Apostles and prophets (though the words, particularly the latter, are used more vaguely) are expressly stated in chapter 2 to be the foundation, which is not now to be laid. What is now called apostolic order is not only not found in Scripture, but is quite contrary to it, and the earliest tradition even does not recognise it. In the Epistle of Qement no trace is found of what is now called a bishop, either at Rome or Corinth, whereas elders are distinctly spoken of. That there was soon presiding elders is true, but Tertullian and Jerome give different accounts of their origin, the former attributing them to the apostle John, the latter to the common consent of

the church to put an end to the party-spirit of the elders, each seeking to have the disciples under himself. Diocesan episcopacy, metropolitans, and the modern hierarchy date from Constantine's time only, and followed the civil divisions of the empire. If the author has ever read others of the apostolic Fathers, as the Shepherd of Hermas, or even Barnabas, it will be impossible for him to deny the utter degradation, moral and doctrinal, into which "the church" had fallen a century after Christ. In two centuries its corruption was alike notorious and infamous. We have only to read Cyprian to know it.

As regards the separation from Mr. Newton, I have no wish, but quite the contrary, at this distance of time to bring up the name of one for whom I only desire every blessing; but as it is brought up, I must refer to it. Mr. Newton taught, printed and published, that Christ was further from God than Israel when they made the golden calf, and had to find His way to a point where God could meet Him, and that was in death. He taught, printed, and published, that in the final state the saints would be omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent as God. We did break with this, though the evangelical world receives him, as far as I know, still. Who was right in this case, godly people will decide. The breach with what, from the name of a chapel, is called Bethesda (a Baptist cause) was because they received those who came from, and in some cases were imbued with, the teaching of Mr. Newton. There was no secession with Captain Hall; he went out, but had no followers. The rest of the vague accusations I leave as such. It seems to me that a gift for preaching, I add, or teaching, is better than preaching or teaching without a gift, or pretending, as the prelates

do, to confer the Holy Ghost for a priest's office. The system of clergy is geography, not grace. There are so many parishes, and they must have clergy for them. The crying evil of the Establishment is that the clergy, to maintain their position, continue, in contrast with Brethren, associated with the grossest false doctrine, the denial of inspiration, and infidelity. Popish errors are held by a vast mass of the clergy, and tolerated, because they cannot help it, by those who have a horror of these things, because if they did not tolerate them, they would break up the whole system which has become the nursery-cradle for Popery and infidelity. A humanly-composed creed these Christians called Brethren have not, but they hold fast to the faith once dehvered to the saints, as stated in the inspired word of God, and exercise the just discipline of God's house, as there taught, on those who depart from it. I do not doubt they have failed in many things; I speak of the principles on which they walk.

The writer of the "Landmarks" then comes to the doctrines they teach. The writer does not attempt to charge them with any departure from foundation truths. Silence as to this is striking. The use of the Lord's prayer, the state of soul as to repentance, or certainty of salvation, are all that the writer refers to. Without a human creed, unity of doctrine in fundamental truths is by God's grace maintained. With three, the earliest of which (the Nicene) was three centuries after Christ, with thirty-nine articles to boot, fundamental doctrines are given up, and Popish doctrines and superstitions are wasting fiie vitals of the Establishment. As to the rule of life, the divine rule of life for a Christian is Christ. He that saith He abideth in Him, ought so to walk as He

walked. Was Christ's walk only the Old Testament rule, or was He not God manifest in the flesh? Grace was manifested in Him which we have to follow. "Be ye followers of God as dear children, and walk in love as Christ has loved us and given himself for us." "Hereby know we love that he laid down his life for us, and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." I need hardly say it is not in expiation: but as a pattern of love it binds us. We are to grow up to Him, who is the Head, in all things. He that knows that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him seeing Him as He is, purifies himself as He is pure. And, beholding with open face the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord. He who can see nothing in Christ but the rule of the Old Testament has himself a very poor idea of Christ and of His spotless life of grace, full of divine instruction as the Old Testament is, and lovely as the expressions of obedience and faith which are found there, are. But there is a great principle which marks the difference. Christ's life was divine grace, God Himself in grace as a man, and that the Old Testament could not give. It is to be found in One only. A path which the vulture's eye hath not seen, but which has been traced for us by the footsteps of that blessed One—divine love and holiness in the midst of evil in a patience which went on, till it ceased to be exercised in the silence of death, and the blood and water told of a salvation accomplished for those who were His enemies. The example of Christ is the true rule of life for a Christian, which as presenting God in love went beyond the Old Testament, "Which thing is true in him and in you," 1 John 2.

As regards the Lord's prayer: its perfection no one denies, but as perfect it was suited to the time in which it was given; it was not in the name of Christ. "The Holy Ghost was not yet given." Nor do we find a trace of its use afterwards. The superstition attached to its use is shewn by an effort in the received text to assimilate the words in Matthew and Luke, which no one acquainted with the fact denies. Each form is perfect in its place; but the fact of there being two bars its being an inspired form of words for us. For which form are we to use? When the disciples had not the Holy Ghost, the Lord graciously taught them how to ask and what to ask for. The contents are not only of course perfect, but as a summary full of instruction as to what we should desire. But I suspect were I to ask the author's parishioners who repeat it by rote, what the Father's kingdom is, they would find it hard to tell. The use of it may shew superstition, but I know no rule against its use, though it would certainly shew ignorance of divine order in Scripture, the Holy Ghost not being then given, and Christ's name not being given as that in which the prayer is offered. He who would add it says the prayer is imperfect, which I do not.

I must say the charge as to repentance is not fairly put. There was, at the time that revivalism became common, looseness among some as to the meaning of repentance, not only among some called Plymouth Brethren, but others who were not among them. They met with the false Methodist doctrine of 'first repentance,' and then faith founded on the abuse of the passage, "repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ"; forgetting it was to be preached in Christ's name, and that it was absurd to talk of repentance if what was

preached was not believed, that the truth by which men were called to repentance must be believed to produce the repentance. Two Plymouth Brethren, I judge, overstepped the mark in their statements, as did others more strongly; so that I myself wrote to rectify from Scripture, and the true force of the word, some statements put forth. This (though it was nothing peculiar to Brethren, but belonged to a movement in which some of them took part, and took place as to them as it did as to others in resisting a most mischievous doctrine) overstepped the truth on the other side, as poor human nature is apt to do. I notice this because the maintenance of sound apprehension as to repentance is of importance to all, and I judge that there is a tendency in all the revival movement, and much modern preaching, to superficiality in this respect, large as the blessing may have been which has accompanied it; and one or two of our brethren did not escape the snare, but I must add, when noticed, recognised and avoided it. But the passage of the tract quoted by the author of the "Landmarks," and indeed the tract itself, if not carefully worded, affords no ground for the attack made. It is, on the contrary, a discussion on repentance, which is divided into two kinds, a division made by evangelicals before any of us were born, a division into legal and evangelical repentance. The tract is written to distinguish legal and gospel repentance; the way it is quoted conceals this, the word gospel losing its emphatic form by omitting the context. It is not my object to justify the expressions in the tract. This statement assumes and supposes repentance, and states that the things spoken of do not enter into gospel repentance. Godly sorrow works repentance, and therefore is not repentance itself. It is stated in the tract

impugned, that sorrow for sin and the works that God works in us accompany salvation. The author says they are not parts of gospel repentance itself. I may like or dislike the way it is put; but the statement is not at all that repentance is not called for, but that gospel repentance is not of works, but of grace.

Two of the passages, quoted by the “Landmarks,” prove what they are cited to deny. The doctrine of the tract is that God meets us in our sins by setting forth Christ and His cross, and that thus His goodness leads us to repentance, but insists that all pretension to righteousness must be given up in coming. I do not think this to be logically exact, but it is ten thousand times more evangelical than the “Landmarks”; and it is not logic, but the gospel which saves souls.

The statements that sorrow and living to God are no parts of the gospel repentance are true, and the “Landmarks” prove it. According to them, the one precedes, the other follows it, and the third text, so far from speaking of carrying on, says it would have happened long ago. The tract insists on the difference of gospel repentance, which is lost sight of when quoted without its context. “It arises,” the commentary says, “out of sorrow,” and is not therefore the sorrow it produces— “the fruit of good works”: they are therefore no part of repentance itself, but a consequence of it. The third text cited does not bear out the statement, but the contrary. The next statement is entirely unfounded, and only proves that the writer does not believe in justification by faith.

There is such ignorance and confusion in the statement of the “Landmarks “on this point, that it is difficult to

deal with. “If once,” it is said, “a man can say ‘I believe,’ he need no longer fear sin; all his past sins are already put away.” What not fearing sin has to do with his past sins being put away, it is hard to see; but, it is added, he need not fear punishment, he is already sure of salvation. The first statement has really no sense, but I shall take up the substance of the subject, not the manner of putting it. The author is, I suppose, ignorant that at the Reformation the universal doctrine was that personal certainty of one’s own salvation was alone justifying faith. I think they went too far, because they made it a faith about their own state, not in the Lord Jesus; but so it was. And it was generally affirmed in their confessions, and condemned in the Popish Council of Trent as the vain confidence of the heretics. I do not know whether the writer has read the Homilies of his own denomination; at any rate he has signed the declaration that they are sound doctrine, and there he will find the doctrine he condemns. It was the great doctrinal turning-point of the Reformation. I do not know whether he believes the Thirty-nine Articles; but if he reads the Seventeenth, he will find as wise a statement of the security of the believers in grace as I know penned by human hands.

But what is more important, let us turn to Scripture. I read, “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God.” Can a man have peace with God if his sins are not already put away? And the blessed reason precedes: “He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification.” “For if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins.” But if He is? And if this work of the blessed Lord on the cross has not put away the sins of those that believe in Him, what is to

do it? For without shedding of blood there is no remission, and there is no more sacrifice for sin. This forgiveness is in contrast with the legal state under Moses. By Him all that believe are justified from all things; Acts 13. Repentance and remission of sins were to be preached in His name: was it to be believed? His precursor John the Baptist came to give knowledge of salvation to His people by the remission of their sins. “To him give all the prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of their sins.”

“Her sins,” says the Saviour, “which are many, are forgiven”; and to her He said: “Thy sins are forgiven, thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.” But it will be said she loved much: no doubt, and repented deeply, and that was all right, but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little. We believe with the apostle Peter that Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, and that thus, “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth no sin.” Does this blessing come on any? We read that “faith is imputed for righteousness”; which the writer may see rightly interpreted in his Thirty-nine Articles. Was “thy faith hath saved thee,” said exceptionally to the poor sinful woman, or written for our learning? See what is said in Hebrews. “How much more shall the blood of Christ who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?” The service of the living God is a consequence, note, of a purged conscience. And, as it is reasoned in the same chapter, inasmuch as without shedding of blood there is no remission, if it was not wholly done on the cross, Christ must have often suffered; but now He has been

once offered to bear the sins of many, and to them that look for Him He shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation. He has obtained an eternal redemption.

Not only so; in consequence of this one sacrifice, worshippers have no more conscience of sins. He does not say conflict with the flesh, but of sins imputed to us on the conscience; because Christ has borne them. The Jewish priests were ever standing up offering new sacrifices: interesting figures, but which could not put away sins; but Christ, having offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down. Why? For by one sacrifice He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. He has sat down on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, when He had by Himself purged our sins, and there He sits as the glorified Man, till His enemies be made His footstool.

And as God's love and will was the source of this, and a divine work of atonement the ground of this, so a divine testimony assures us of it. The Holy Ghost is a witness, saying, "Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Further it is written in Romans 8 that we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry "Abba Father"; that is we have the consciousness of being children, the Holy Ghost bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God. So in Galatdans 3, "We are all the children [sons] of God by faith in Christ Jesus," and (chap. 4) "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba Father." And elsewhere, "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." The Lord Himself tells His disciples in John 14 that when the Comforter should be come, in that day we

should know that He was in the Father, and we in Him, and He in us. Hence in Romans 8 we learn that there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. Hence, according to Hebrews 10, instead of (as in Hebrews 9) there being a veil by which the Holy Ghost signified the way into the holiest was not made manifest, we have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which He has consecrated, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and we are to draw near in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience.

Does the author mean to deprive us of this, or dream that we can be in communion with God with an unpurged conscience? If so, he has never been really in His presence, for the thing is impossible. But I shall be told that we have to be humble: no safety without it. He resists the proud, and gives grace to the humble. But nothing gives lowhness like the presence of God and communion with Himself. We feel, if we think of ourselves, our own nothingness, happy if this be so complete as to think of nothing but Him. But if the conscience be not purged, His presence, who is light, awakens it, brings the sense of the evil upon our souls, and confession is drawn out by confidence in His love. All this ministers to holiness, and there is no holiness without it. He makes us partakers of His holiness, even if He chasten us.

But to return. John wrote to all Christians: “I write unto you, children, because your sins are forgiven for his name’s sake,” 1 John 2. What does this mean? and even the little children know the Father. As to being saved, I read: “He hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling.” Again in Ephesians 2:5, 9: “By grace ye are

saved”; and this is not merely a principle: the word is in the perfect passive, which declares the actual and abiding fact. The principle is there, of course, but a great deal more.

1 John 1:8. No intelligent Christian says he has no sin, the flesh in which is no good thing is ever there; but for salvation, if the Spirit of God dwell in us, we are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, though the flesh be in us. But the words which precede are “The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin,” the divine answer to the flesh being there. Perhaps the author would reply, “Yes; if we walk in the light.” This, though a very common, is a totally false view. But, if so, it is “in the light” as “He [God] is in the light.” Now if we walked according to the light as God is in it, we should want no cleansing at all. Yet it is “If we walk in the light, as he is in it”; that is, the true full revelation of God who is light. (Compare chap. 2:8.) It is the Christian position, a reality. He walks in the true knowledge of God now revealed in the face of Jesus Christ. Failure is referred to in chapter 2:1, 2.

But the writer confounds the flesh in us, and the imputation of sin, guilt, before God. How can I fear punishment if Christ has borne my sins? The Judge before whom I appear is the Saviour that put them away. I speak of those who believe. And when he objects to being sure of salvation, the Christian is, because “He came to give the knowledge of salvation to his people by the remission of their sins.” Hebrews 6:4-6 speaks not of conversion nor forgiveness received at all, but of the enjoyment of all the privileges of Christianity, and open apostasy from it, which is finally and hopelessly fatal: he meets fiery indignation which devours the adversaries.

And this is not only so in this passage, but in every place where falling away is spoken of in the Hebrews; it is final and fatal; it is apostasy. It is impossible to renew them.

Galatians 5:4 is a salutary warning against the doctrine of the author's tract. The Galatians would add law to grace for justification, the apostle tells them they cannot be united, but that, if they look to the law for justification, they cannot have Christ for it. The law specified and required man's righteousness for God most rightly and justly as a law, a perfect rule for a child of Adam, with a curse if he did not keep it, which none ever did (Christ of course excepted); so that as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse. For the law must be perfectly kept for righteousness under it. But in the gospel is the revelation of God's righteousness for men, because they had none for God. There was none righteous, no not one. Men are justified freely by God's grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

Now these two things cannot go together, that is, my accomplishment of law for righteousness, and God justifying me freely through Christ by His own righteousness through faith, because I have not done so. I will speak of holiness, but you cannot at the same time have a man righteous by law-keeping, and righteous by grace through Christ's work, because he has not kept it. If I make out righteousness by law, Christ is become of no effect to me, I have given up grace; for works of righteousness are not grace.

Nothing can be simpler than 1 Corinthians 9:27. The apostle lived as a godly watchful Christian, as well as

preached, that he might not be a preacher to others, and a castaway himself. Quite right, and nothing simpler, and a warning to all who are engaged in such service.

1 Corinthians 10:19 is a most salutary warning too against light-minded presumption; but “thinketh he standeth” is nothing of “in Christ and Christ in us”; for such, there is no condemnation. Nor will you find in the New Testament any word of a man being in Christ, or quickened, and lost. But this phrase does not necessarily involve final ruin. Any of us may fall if we are not watchful, and are on the way to do so, if we do not watch and pray lest we enter into temptation. God forbid any of us should take up these things lightly.

Philippians 2:12 I will speak of by-and-by, because it has a different character.

I will now take up another aspect of Christian truth and privileges—eternal life. This has a double aspect, and is spoken of accordingly as is salvation also in two ways. We have it, a life in Christ. It is also spoken of as the full result in glory, “the end, everlasting life.” There it is according to the counsels of God, when we shall be conformed to the image of His Son that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. This, of course, I need not say, we have not got; we are not yet in glory. But eternal life we have. “This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” “He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life.” And John wrote that they might know that they had eternal life. God sent His only Son into the world that we might live through Him. “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life,” John 3:36. Again chapters 5:34; 6:47-54, “Verily, verily, I say unto

you: he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation [judgment], but is passed from death unto life." And again, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand," John 10:37, 38. And the Lord insists on His Father's power and His interest in them.

I can conceive nothing clearer than these passages. John takes this side of divine truth, Christ came to be eternal life to us, Paul more of presenting us justified and accepted in Christ before God, though each speaks of both. Thus Paul says, "when Christ, who is our life," etc. (Col. 3 and other passages.) "Christ liveth in me," and "that the life of Jesus may be manifested in our mortal flesh." But if the word of God be true, the believer is justified and has peace with God, and has everlasting life, and if sealed with the Holy Ghost, he knows he is in Christ, and Christ in him (John 14), has the witness in himself (1 John 4), has boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus (Heb. 10)—boldness in the day of judgment, because as Christ is, so is he in this world (1 John 4:17), not surely in His personal perfection, how far from it! And I add the only Christian perfection is being like Christ in glory, but in His relative place with God. Christ is gone to His Father and our Father, to His God and our God. We have received, not the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry, "Abba, Father." Nothing can be clearer or more positive than scripture on the subject; we are reconciled to God, we have peace with God. How, if our sins are not put

away, it would be hard to tell if the fear of God be in our hearts.

The “fear of sin” has nothing to do with the possession of the forgiveness of sins, unless that this cleansing of the conscience produces it. For who would fear to dirty himself, one who was quite clean to pay a visit to a superior, or one that was dirty already? But the whole thing is a mistake. The true fear of sin is the spirit of holiness, not justification, not the dread of punishment because of God’s righteous wrath against sin, which in its place is just and useful, but because, as having now a holy nature as born of God, I hate it in itself and as displeasing to God. A fear of wrath is not a fear of sin but of its consequences, which, though right in its place, is a very different thing.

Practical righteousness is the just judgment of good and evil, according to God’s estimate of them, and acting on, and owning God’s authority, and our responsibility in respect of it; it is made good in the judicial acts of God, of which the measure, as regards us, is our duty to God and our neighbour. In this we have failed, and now in grace through faith are dependent on Christ’s work, not on ours; through that we rest on God’s righteousness. On this, blessed as the teaching of Scripture is on it, I do not now enter.

Holiness is the horror of evil, and delight in good, according to God’s estimate of it (though of course our thoughts are imperfect) for its own sake, and as displeasing to God. Supposing even there were no punishment at all, we must come by the first as sinners; but we get into the second, in principle, from the very beginning, but less sensibly till the conscience is

purged, for we must come first as guilty sinners. But for this a new nature which does take God's estimate of good and evil for its guide and rule, is necessary, and that new nature is a holy nature.54 But there is no development of it in the affections, or communion, till justification and peace with God is settled. Its first effect of taking God's mind, His revelation of Himself in light, is to make us find out that we are guilty, unclean, and thus it works repentance. But for this, I must learn confidence enough in God to be willing to open my heart to Him. And He has revealed Himself in love in Christ who is also this light to us. I see what I am before God, first rather what I have done; but His love leads me to confession of it, as the woman in the city that was a sinner, or Peter in the boat, or the prodigal unfit for God, knowing it, yet going to Him because He has revealed Himself to us. And this is genuine gospel repentance, fruit of God's quickening power, our being born of Him, and His revealing Himself.

The first impressions may be more characterised by fear, if light predominates on our coming to God; more gently attractive, if the love does. But, in all cases, in true repentance there are both, because God is both; and God has revealed Himself and quickened me to see things, at least in principle, as He sees them, and judge them by a new nature and will; and my responsibility towards Him is felt. Now the first need here is not holiness in the delight of it;55 there is the sense of the want of it. The new nature feels there ought to be holiness for God; it takes the character of not being accepted, because of that want. What we crave is justification, forgiveness, and righteousness. But it is not the question of holy affections and exercise, but the

want of them pressing as guilt upon the soul. Now Christ's work meets all our guilt. If it does not, we are lost for ever. God's holy authority in righteousness must be maintained; but it has been, and glorified on the cross, and His love at the same time fully, divinely, displayed. A bad conscience cannot be in the exercise of loving affections. But the blood of Christ purges the conscience, makes it perfect with God; and the sense of divine love which gave Christ to do it, and in which He gave Himself, possesses the soul by the Holy Ghost, by which the believer is then sealed. He delights in such a God, knows Him as his Father, dwells on His love shed abroad in His heart by the Holy Ghost, knows he is in Christ and Christ is in him. Christ too is precious to him; His lowly, lovely, perfect path on earth is the manna he feeds on, above all His dying, and perfect love there; and now he sees Him by faith at the right hand of God, in glory unveiled, and is thus changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord. He knows that when He shall appear, he will be like Him, seeing Him as He is, and he that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself even as He is pure.

Hohness in life is the consequence of salvation. "He hath saved us and called us with a holy calling." "Being made free from sin and become servants to God, we have our fruit unto hohness." I admit that being born of God, and having received Christ as life, the principle of hohness is there; as all human nature is in a child of an hour old, but its conscious development and practical exercise is when the question of justification is settled. Desires there will be before, but ending in sorrow of heart, because the desire is not satisfied, the heart is really under law; we must be holy, we feel, and we are not.

Now at peace with God, and knowing that He who bore our sins is at the right hand of God (surely not bearing them now on Him, but sat down there when He had by Himself purged our sins), we are sanctified by the truth, the Father's blessed word, Christ having sanctified Himself, a man in glory, that we might be sanctified through the truth. Beholding with open face the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory. The affections of the heart are fixed on Christ as having so loved us, and given Himself for us, and He is received into the heart, and we are thus sanctified and grow up to Him, the Head, in all things, His walk being the only true measure of ours. And here it is that diligence of soul comes in, not in connection with redemption and justification. There is legal diligence as to that, but only to discover that we cannot succeed, not only that we are guilty, ungodly, which is the first thing, but that, even if to will is present with us, we cannot find how to perform that which is good; we first learn our sins in true repentance and then ourselves, a deeper exercise yet. The former is treated in Romans 1 to 5:11; the second in chapter 5:12, to end of chapter 8; in each part the answer of God in grace to our need being treated of. But supposing all this, there is still the working out our own salvation in fear and trembling.

Now it is perfectly evident that we cannot work out our redemption; we must, as the Psalm says, let that alone for ever. Christ has finished the work, and is as man at the right hand of God, because He has; and God has accepted it as complete. There is no more offering for sin. We have nothing to do with atonement, we cannot bear our sins, or we are lost for ever. If we have a place

with God, it is because Christ has borne them. That is settled for ever. When He had made by Himself the purification of our sins, He sat down, and is there continually, because all is done. But, further, we are in Christ, if sealed by the Holy Ghost, that is, if real Christians, and we know it according to John 14. Now there is no condemnation for them that are in Christ Jesus.56 Also Christ is in us, found in Romans 8:10. Now as to Christ's having wrought redemption, borne my sins, being in Him, and He, in me, there is no working out by me. Exercised and brought to repentance we are surely, if it be a real work so as to feel bur need, but then to believe in a finished work, and to know if we do that we are in Christ, and Christ in us, and so no possible condemnation for us. Scripture is plain. By one man's obedience, the many are made righteous, and to him that worketh not but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

Where then is the working out of salvation? The Christian is viewed in two ways in Scripture, as in Christ, and therefore, as Christ before God, forgiven all the flesh's sins, no condemnation, boldness for the day of judgment, because as He (Christ) is, so are we in this world, and boldness to enter into the holiest now. But this supposes of course, and evidently, that his faith is genuine. Upon the basis of this, and the perseverance of such to the end, the Thirty-nine Articles are sufficiently clear: though being in Christ is not treated of. But as a fact, almost all (the exceptions are rare) Christians pass through a longer or shorter period of exercise and testing. They are men on the earth, even if ever so truly men in Christ. There is no doubt that, if they are really in Christ, Christ will keep them; they will never perish.

None shall pluck them out of the Saviour's hand. He will confirm them to the end, that they may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful by whom they were called. I have already said this is well and wisely put in the Seventeenth Article. Still they are tested and proved in their life down here, and, if ever so truly born of God, have much to learn, much to correct, much to learn of themselves, and of God's tender and faithful love, and what it is to be dead with Christ to sin and to the world; much to learn of the fulness of Christ, and to grow up unto Him in all things. A child a day old has as much life as a man of thirty, and is just as much his father's child, and the object of his tender affections, but evidently his state is very different.

Now the work of Christ completes our salvation as to redemption, and making us His own—all true believers will be like Christ in glory. On this Scripture leaves no shade of doubt. The perfection of His work is such, that while his conversion and faith were singularly bright, the thief with no time for progress could go straight to be Christ's companion the same day in paradise. And we read in Colossians 1, "Giving thanks to the Father who hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light"; but as a general rule, there is the race, the wilderness to cross, which makes part, not of the purpose, but in general of the ways of God. And this course being here below, salvation is spoken of as the full result in glory when Christ comes again, a salvation ready to be revealed, as well as the accomplished work of Christ at His first coming; and the Philippians always speak of salvation in the former sense.

There is very little doctrine in the Epistle, but a most full and blessed development of the life of one [Paul himself]

living in the Spirit. Now in this our course here below, the proof of reality is just the seriousness which works out the final salvation with fear and trembling, for the snares and dangers are real on the way, though there be the promise of being kept through them. That does not hinder their being there. The force of the passage however is misapprehended. Paul, when present watched against and met the wiles of the enemy for them; he was now in prison. They were still in the conflict, and had -to fight the good fight for themselves. But if they had lost Paul, they had not lost God. It was He that worked in them to will and to do. But it was a solemn thing to be the scene of conflict between God working in them and the power of darkness, though the victory of Him who wrought might be certain. But He works in us; we are kept by the power of God through faith. Hence it is a moral process in the human soul; it is a testing, proving, sifting, teaching, helping; we learn ourselves and God, though the result in God's hand be not uncertain. But it bears most precious fruit. It teaches and maintains dependence; it gives the experience of the sure faithfulness of God, of One who makes all things work together for good to them who love Him: we learn not only to glory in salvation, and in the hope of glory, but in tribulations, and finally in God Himself, whom we thus come to know, who withdraws not His eyes from the righteous.

It is not a question of righteousness. As to justifying righteousness, Christ is our righteousness; but God's constant unfailing watchfulness over, and care of, the righteous. Further, so far as we have learnt of Him, we manifest the life of Christ in our mortal flesh; we are set as epistles of Christ. But how is it to be manifested if we

have not got it? Let the author and any reader here remark that all duties flow from the place we are already in, and are measured by it. Child, wife, servant, whatever the relation, I must be in it to be responsible for the duties of it. To be responsible to walk as a child of God, I must be one, and moreover know it. The Christian, every true believer then, is redeemed and in Christ. There, there is no “if” But he is also in fact on the road to glory, and must reach the goal to have it. He has the promise of being kept, but is morally exercised along the road in dependence, in grace, in watchfulness and diligence, the true proof that it is a reality with him, that he knows himself and the God of love and the snares that surround him, a place that belongs to one who is redeemed, where he learns the ways of God, and His faithful unfailing love, and His holy government, and works out his salvation in fear and trembling. For he is ever in danger as to his daily path to glory, though he is dependent on, and counts on the faithfulness of Him who keeps him—grace sufficient for him, and strength made perfect in weakness.

54 This is connected with the recognition of God’s authority, and, in its application to the conscience, will be connected in each with what he has actually done and been.

55 So in Deuteronomy 16 the unleavened bread of the passover is the bread of affliction.

56 The last half of this verse is not genuine. It finds its proper place in verse 4, and if rightly translated would say exactly the contrary of the truth.

Reply To Judge Marshall’s Tract on the Tenets Of The Plymouth Brethren

(so called)

There is sufficient fairness in the statement of Mr. Marshall, in rejecting the greater part of the stupid charges in the paper he quotes, to make it easy as well as pleasant to deal calmly with his objections on other heads of doctrine. Though on one head Mr. Marshall is roused, in general he quietly discusses the merits of the case before him. I cannot be surprised that a Wesleyan minister should hold Wesleyan doctrine, though I may not agree with him; and I can assure Mr. Marshall, that (though he mistakes the Brethren’s doctrine in some points, and I think of course there is ignorance of Scripture truth on others, yet seeing the spirit in which Brethren are generally assailed) I have rather to thank him for that in which he has spoken, than to complain of it. The best return I can make (assuring him at the same time of my sincerity in thus recognising the tone of his pamphlet, and my desire to reciprocate it) is to state what L, at least, hold on the questioned points, and to inquire whether the views he objects to, so far as they are justly stated, are supported by Scripture.

I shall only take up the really important questions. They are four: first, “The moral law is not the rule of Christian life”; secondly, “The doctrine of imputed righteousness”; thirdly, “Abraham has no place in the church, nor could any saint have till the Holy Ghost came after the ascension”; fourthly, “Sanctification,” which is treated by Mr. Marshall in his remarks on imputed righteousness. There are other collateral points, as

ordination to ministry, praying for the Holy Ghost, the sabbath, which I may touch on: the latter will come naturally under the head of law, and our deliverance from it.

Our subjection to the law is a capital point. But the whole principle on which Scripture places the question is unknown to the writer of the pamphlet; namely, that the law has power over a man as long as he lives, but that we have died in Christ, and are not looked at as being in the flesh at all; not in the first Adam, but in the Last.

Let Mr. Marshall allow me first to quote what Scripture says as to the law and our relationship to it. And first in Romans, in which epistle, and in that to the Galatians, the apostle has chiefly discussed the subject. I cannot but think that what he says must give subject for thought to those who insist on law. Many passages are much stronger in the original through the omission of the definite article inserted in English: thus, “But now the righteousness of God apart from law,” that is, on wholly another ground, so that the question of moral and ceremonial law cannot be raised. It is apart from law in every shape and form. So in many other cases. But I shall take the ordinary English translation: enough will be found there to make all clear. Further, I am quite aware that it is alleged that they do not look to be justified by law, but only to be under it as a rule of life. Let the reader only pay attention to what the word of God says, and all will be clear as to this too. I will speak of it, moreover, further on. I desire that Scripture may be before the mind of Christians, so I will quote it; I can add any comments afterward.

Romans 3:20, 21. “Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.”

Verse 28. “Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” I shall consider verse 31 hereafter.

Chapter 4:13, 14. “For the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith; for if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no trangression.”

Chapter 5:20. “Moreover the law entered that the offence might abound.”

Chapter 6:14. “For sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace.”

Chapter 7:4. “Therefore, my brethren, ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin which were by the law did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, having died in that in which we were held.”57 Chapter 7:8. “For without the law sin was dead; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died.”

Verse 13. “Was then that which is good made death to me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin,

working death in me by that which is good, that sin by the commandment might become exceedingly sinful."

Chapter 10:4. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

1 Corinthians 15:56. "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law."

2 Corinthians 3:7. "The ministration of death written and engraved on stones."

Verse 9. "The ministration of condemnation."

Galatians 2:19. "For I through the law am dead to the law that I might live to God.… If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."

Chapter 3:2, 3. "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?"

Verse 10. "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse."

Verse 12. "The law is not of faith."

Verse 23. "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster."

Chapter 4:3-5. "Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world. But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law."

Verse 9. “But now after ye have known God … how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements to which ye desire to be in bondage?”

Verse 30. “Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.”

Chapter 5:1-4. “Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage… Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace.”

Verse 18. “But if ye are led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.”

Romans 8:14. “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.”

“Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.”

Ephesians 2:14-16. “For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.”

Other passages might be referred to, as Philippians 3, Colossians 2, but I pass them over as long general statements, though most important ones as to the doctrine as a whole. I quote only further—

1 Timothy 1:7-9. “Desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they

affirm. But we know that the law is good if a man use it lawfully; knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient."

Hebrews 7:18. "For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof, for the law made nothing perfect."

Chapter 10:1. "The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things."

Verse 9. "He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second."

Chapter 13:13. "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

Now I ask if all these texts do not present the law as a system, and a principle of dealing, which, as to the Christian, has been set aside to introduce another? If they do not give ground for reflection to serious men, whether (when we find, not a scarce text, or a forced construction, but a careful elaborate discussion of the law, shewing that we are delivered from it) there is not something as to the setting aside of law, to which they have not given its full just force?

The apostle insists, that we are delivered from the law—dead to it, that we may live to God (what does this mean?); that it made nothing perfect, that we were kept under it till faith came; that as many as are of the works of it (not bad works, mind) are under the curse; that if righteousness come by it, Christ is dead in vain. I might cite many such.

It is evident, that there is a system called law, from which there is deliverance, and which the Christian has done with, by passing into another.

Now I am not ignorant, of course, that people say the ceremonial law of Moses is passed away, but not the moral law. But this is a fallacy: not that there is no difference—there is. But the statement is a fallacy. Scripture shews that the law system has passed away as a whole. A vast portion of the types and figures has no doubt been fulfilled, but all have not, and these last will be fulfilled. As a system, it is admitted by all, they have passed entirely away. This is insisted on in Galatians especially. In Hebrews, though there be more contrast than comparison, the corresponding antitypes are insisted on. The rites of the law were the shadow, not the image. A veil, which shewed men could not go in, is not the very image of a veil, through which, as a new and living way, we enter with boldness into the holiest. A sacrifice which puts away one sin, or a year's sin, so far as present relation with the tabernacle went, is not the very image of one, by which Christ has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. But, remark, it is not as local immaterial things they were established: Christ has fulfilled them. They were all in the reality meant by them as important as the moral law, nay, more important to us. Still they were only figures, and ceremonies, powerless in themselves. But the moral law, holy, just, and good as it was, was powerless save to curse. It could not give life. Had there been a law given which could have given life, righteousness should have been by the law. But neither life nor righteousness could be attained by it. What was given for life, as soon as a man knew himself, was found to be unto death. It worked wrath.

However, as a general idea, though some types may not yet be fulfilled, as the feast of tabernacles, and others, all admit that, as a ceremonial system, it is passed away for Christians.

But further, although there be confusion of mind, and men really seek righteousness by the law, that is, by works, yet it is in terms generally admitted that the statements of the apostle set the law aside as a means of justification. His statements are too plain, for a person who respects the word of God, to contravene them. “If righteousness come by law, then Christ is dead in vain,” “That no man is justified by the law in the sight of God is evident,” and many other such, are too plain to resist. We read, “Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace,” Gal. 5:4. But they say, we take it as a rule of life: sanctification is as necessary as justification. Now that without holiness no man shall see the Lord is clearly written, and is assuredly true. I should have a great deal to say to this connected with a new life, Christ being our life; but at present I confine myself to our immediate subject. The question is: is the law the means of living rightly? Will a man under the law be victorious over sin? It is not whether a man must be holy: no real Christian denies it. Now many of the statements of the apostle, and many of the strongest which declare we are not under law, or that the law is not the means to live to God, apply, not to justification, but to freedom from the dominion of sin—that under the law we cannot be set free from it, but that deliverance from the law is the way of bringing forth fruit to God. I shall quote some passages. The true means of deliverance, I shall speak of at the close.

Romans 6 treats entirely of living to God, not of justification. “The law,” we read, “entered that the offence might abound,” chap. 5:20. “Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace,” chap. 6:14. “Wherefore, my brethren, ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God,” chap. 7:4. “For without the law sin was dead; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died” (vv. 8, 9.) In 1 Corinthians 15:56, “The strength of sin is the law.” Now here, especially in the passages cited from Romans, the question is not justification, but dominion of sin over us, or ours over sin. The apostle takes pains to say all he can for the law; it is not the cause of sin. The cause is concupiscence, but while under law, concupiscence has dominion over us, nay, the motions of sin are by the law. Such is the positive testimony of the apostle. Although it would be quite false to say the law is the cause of sin, yet sin has dominion wherever a man is under it. Being delivered from the law is necessary to bringing forth fruit to God. Such deliverance is as needed for this as for justification. The strength of sin is the law. It is, even if grace be there, the ministration of death and condemnation.58 There are two passages of Galatians which I have omitted, as long reasonings, not short statements, to which I will now briefly refer; Gal. 2:14-19. The apostle rebukes Peter for turning to legal obligations, after giving them up. And note here how he takes the law as a whole, for Peter’s conduct referred to ritual exactitude. Paul takes up as a whole, for while I quite admit the difference of the “ten words,” or moral law, yet, as all given together by God’s authority, it was

all looked at as one whole, based on one principle, man's satisfying God by fulfilling the obligations he was under as contrasted with grace saving him, when he had not, and God's righteousness. Well, Peter had given up the law to be justified by Christ, and now returned to it, after having Christ. Why then did he leave it to get justification? In building again that which he had destroyed, he made himself a transgressor in putting it down. Who had made him do it? Christ. Then Christ was the minister of sin, for He had made Peter do what his present conduct, if it was right, shewed to be a transgression. That is, taking up the law after coming to Christ is making Christ the minister of sin.

The apostle's reasoning in Galatians 3:15-22 is this: God gave the promise to Abraham, and confirmed it to his seed— which was really Christ, 430 years before the law. Now a confirmed covenant, if it be only man's, cannot be disannulled, nor can it be added to; that is, you cannot add the law to the promise. That was complete in itself, and confirmed before the law existed. To bring in the law was to alter and add to the terms of it, and could not be. How could the law then come in? It was added for the sake (ton p. charin) of transgressions, to produce them—not to produce sin: God does nothing to produce sin. The sin was there, but till the law came, it could not be a transgression; for where no law is, there is none. It is the same sense as in Romans: the law entered (the Greek reads pareiselthe "came in by the bye," that the offence might abound) till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made.

I have added these passages for my reader's sake, as additionally clearing up the point; but the passages I have quoted prove that the law is not the means of living

to God, any more than of justification (on the contrary, if we are under law, sin will have dominion over us), and that we must be delivered from it, in order to bring forth fruit to God. Scripture is distinct and positive as to this. The law is a distinct definite system and principle, under which Christians are not living. People have confounded law with various things and obligations enforced in the law. The truth is, the duties were all there before law was given. Law gives a divine measure of these obligations in contrast with evil, and enforces the obligations by an authority outside ourselves, involving, as it is given, a curse if they are not fulfilled. The law is the perfect rule for a child of Adam, but supposes sin and lust, and forbids them, but does not take them away, nor give a new life. It takes up our relationship to God and our neighbour, and insists on consistency with them. It is a transcript, not of God's character, as is absurdly said, but of man's duties. I say, absurdly. Could God love His neighbour as Himself? Or Himself with all His heart, as a duty? Away with such folly. Further, the ten commandments suppose sin, and unless one, forbid it. It is equally absurd, and I speak for others than Mr. Marshall now, to apply the commandments to Adam. How could he honour his father and mother? How could he steal, or know what it meant? He did not know what lust was till after he was tempted. Adam had a law; but it did not suppose sin in him, but forbad what would have been no sin at all, if it had not been forbidden, and was thus a simple test of obedience, and no more; and we can see the perfect wisdom of God in this. The law formally given on Mount Sinai (for the law was given by Moses) supposes sin, for sin was there, and forbids it, and maintains the relationship in which man stood to

God and to man, and of course was all perfectly right in doing so.

But did law deliver man from the power of sin and lust? That is at least one important part of the question, that is, where it is a rule; and we have seen the apostle stating, that it did not, but left man under it, yea, was an occasion to lust to act. But more, man must be delivered from it to bring forth fruit to God. To have godliness man must be delivered from law. But I add, for what is it a rule? Is it a perfect, adequate, rule? For a child of Adam it is: he is to love God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himself, and not to lust. Only note, it forbids what is in man, without giving life or force, and, because it is a right rule, condemns, and works wrath; and this is law, and this alone, and all that law is.

A law is obligation, enforced by an authority outside us, 59 requires from us whatever the rule expresses, and in God's law, that there should not even be a lust, but is addressed to those who have lusts, who are alive in the flesh. Its requisition is right; but for that reason it condemns us to death, and because man is not what it requires, it is found to be to death. But in its contents it is a perfect measure, or rule, for man in the flesh; but it is not for him who is in Christ. For him who is a son of God the rule is, "Be ye therefore followers [imitators] of God as dear children, and walk in love as Christ also loved us, and gave himself for us, a sacrifice and an offering to God for a sweet-smelling savour." "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." It is not reciprocated kindness, of which love to self is the measure, but a giving up self, as Christ did, in love. It is good in the midst of evil, which is what Christ was—

grace as displayed in Him, doing well, Nsuffering for it, and taking it patiently, as He did. It is forgiving, laying down our lives in the prerogative of divine love, which is our rule, and walking being light in the Lord, as He walked, apart from the world, an epistle of Christ to it; and love and light are the two essential names of God, and Christ was the perfect expression of it as man here.

Of all this the law knows nothing. It does know what a child of Adam ought to be for God, and that it requires: evidently just what it should do. Of what God is for him, it knows nothing; and of what a child of God ought to be, and a dear child as walking in the love he has learned, and which is shed abroad in his heart, it can tell him nothing. The law is God requiring from man what man ought to be, but which he is not; the gospel is God saving him in sovereign love, and, giving him eternal life in the Son, sends him to shew forth this life and the character of Christ (that is, of God manifested in a man) in a world that knows Him not. The law requires righteousness from a man alive in the flesh; and that flesh is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; so that they that are in the flesh cannot please God. And if it is said “but Christianity takes him out of the flesh,” I answer, it does, but at the same time gives him a much higher rule; he is to walk in the Spirit as he lives in the Spirit. The Christian, having Christ for his life, is to manifest the life of Christ in his mortal flesh.

And now a word as to the manner of this. The law did not give life, and could not; it required righteousness from man such as he was. In Christ we have not only our sins wholly put away, which the law could not do, but only curse us for them if under it, but He becomes a new life, and a life as now risen from the dead. But Christ

who is our life has been crucified, and God looks upon those who believe as crucified with Him, and so does faith. Ye are dead, says the word; Col. 3:3. I am crucified with Christ, says faith, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. It reckons itself dead to sin and alive to God, not in Adam but in Jesus Christ our Lord. In a word, as Christ died to the whole scene into which He had come—died unto sin once—so the Christian, crucified with Him, belongs to the place Christ is entered into, the new creation in Christ his fife, and has died to the flesh and sin and the world. He is not before God in flesh at all; he knows this, that his old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed.

Now the law has power over a man as long as he lives; but we have died in Christ—are not in the flesh. Hence we read, when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law. But when we know our death with Christ, and that sin in the flesh was condemned on the cross, the law having been unable to accomplish any such object, and have the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, then we read, Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you: now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His; and if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, and the Spirit is life because of righteousness. That is, practical righteousness is attained, not by a law which was weak through the flesh, applied to that flesh, which was not subject to the law of God, neither indeed could be, and withal cursed the disobedient; but by the gift of a new life, that is, Christ risen, and the power of the Spirit of God, and by being dead to sin, as crucified with Christ, and dead to the law by the body of Christ, sin in

the flesh condemned in the sacrifice of Christ, but we dead therein to it, and alive in the power of a new life. The flesh, the law, and the world are gone together for faith through the cross of Christ. (See Rom. 6:6; chap. 7:4; Gal. 2:19, 20; chap. 6:14; chap. 5:24.)

If we walk in the Spirit, we produce fruits, against which there is no law; if we love our neighbour as ourselves, we fulfil the law. The righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. They only fulfil the law who are not under it, and have nothing to say to it, but who walk after the Spirit which they have received through Christ. The law deals with flesh which is not and cannot be subject to it, and hence righteousness never can be attained. The Christian is dead to sin, having died with Christ on the cross, and does not belong to the scene to which the law applied, is not in the flesh, and is dead to the law and lives in the Spirit, Christ risen from the dead having become his life. The flesh is the life of the sinful Adam, and law belongs to it. We have died to both in the cross of Christ, and are married to another, that we may bring forth fruit unto God.

The great truth is this: we have died on the cross to our whole standing in Adam, and to the law that was the rule for it; and we are risen with Christ into the new creation in Him, alive from the dead to give ourselves to God. We have the treasure in earthen vessels, but our place before God is that— in Christ, and Christ in us. We have died from under the law, but therein died to sin, and are alive to God in Jesus Christ our Lord. We are in a wholly new position, and, though the righteousness of the law be fulfilled in one whose life Christ is, it is because he walks after the Spirit, and does not put

himself under law. He cannot (Rom. 7) have two husbands at a time, Christ and the law. Remark here that I am speaking, as the passages I refer to are, of practical righteousness, a godly life, but if we are under the law for that, the law also curses us. As many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, and if the curse is not executed, the authority of the law is gone. If we are under law, we are under a curse, or its authority destroyed. If Christ has borne the curse, we have died with Him out of the position in which the law reached us; by the law dead to law, that we might live to God, crucified with Christ, yet living, but not we, but Christ living in us. He will not live wrongly. I do not enter here into failure, or Christ's blessed advocacy if we do fail, but only bring out the principles of the life in which we do live to God.

Let me take another view of the subject which is afforded us in Scripture. From the fall to the flood, though individuals were blessed and testimony was there, there were no special dealings of God. The promise had been given to the Seed of the woman in the judgment of the serpent; for there is no promise to fallen man, though the object of faith is thus held up before him. But man went on in wickedness till God had to bring in the flood, to cleanse as it were the earth from the pollution. But after the flood, having instituted the restraint of government in Noah (the world having fallen into idolatry, and nations having been formed), God calls out Abraham to be a root of promise for Himself. Abraham is the head of a seed of blessing as fallen Adam of a seed of sinful men. I leave aside Israel the natural seed here to speak of Christ and the nations. In Genesis 12 the promise of all nations being blessed in Abraham

is given, and confirmed to the Seed in chapter 22. This was sovereign grace, and no condition was attached to it. The Seed was to come, the nations to be blessed in the Seed. This raised no question of righteousness; there was no if, no condition. But the question of righteousness was of all importance; it was raised at Sinai. If they obeyed His voice, they should be His peculiar treasure; and they undertook to do all Jehovah should say, and made the golden calf before Moses was down from the Mount with the two tables. The question was raised by requiring righteousness from man, and this was the law. Man has been tested on this ground and found wholly wanting.

I add some details. The law simply by itself never even reached man as a covenant of works. The tables never entered into the camp (the golden calf was there), they were broken at the foot of the Mount. Moses interceded, and the people were for the occasion as to God's dealings forgiven. But Moses could not make atonement, and with the revelation of goodness the people were put back under law. "The soul that sinneth I will blot out of my book." But God makes all His goodness pass before Moses. The Lord passed before Moses and proclaimed the Lord— "the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear (the guilty), visiting," etc. Now, here we have provisional grace. They are the terms of God's government of Israel, but, in fact, grace which spares and forgives past sin; but no atonement effectual, final, and conclusive, perfecting for ever them that are sanctified, was made, as indeed there was no one there to make it. They were consequently

replaced under legal obligation and the man that sinned was to be blotted out of God's book. It was grace and forgiveness, and law after.

It was when Moses went down after this interview (Exod. 34:29, 30) that his face shone. It is this law after grace and provisional forgiveness that is declared to be the ministration of death and the ministration of condemnation (2 Cor. 3) in contrast with the gospel, which is the ministration of righteousness and of the Spirit. And now see how the apostle reasons on the whole matter. The promise, given to Abraham and confirmed to the one seed (Christ), could not be set aside nor added to by a transaction 430 years after. God had thus bound Himself, but the law came in by the bye till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made, that is, Christ. Then its function ceased, and consequent on Christ's work, all being sinners, the law broken, and Christ rejected (the last means by which God could seek for fruit from man), the attempt only proving that man hated both Christ and His Father—that the mind of the flesh was enmity against God, then God's righteousness is revealed without law (the Greek reads "apart from law"), the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ. Man's probation as to the history of it, on the ground of getting good by any means from him, was over. Now, says Christ, is the judgment of this world. Hence it was Christ cursed the fig-tree never to bear fruit. Hence it is that it is said "now once in the end of the world [the consummation of ages], he hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

When I say the probation is over, it is not that man is not yet dealt with as to receiving the gospel. Of course he is; but what can be made of man in the flesh? It has been

tried, and it is not now the question whether he can succeed in making out righteousness for the day of judgment, but, receiving the truth, find out that he is already lost, and righteousness and salvation and indeed glory his as believing in Christ. As a person under probation, he knows he is a lost sinner, and finds a new life, a perfect salvation, and divine righteousness in Christ. Now all this clearly shews the place of the law between the promise and the coming of the Seed to whom the promise was made, and how we are created again in Christ Jesus unto good works. It is no longer the law requiring human righteousness from flesh to prove what it is, but a new creature and the power of the Spirit leading us in the path in which Christ walked. We are sons and to walk as God's dear children, to put on, as the elect of God holy and beloved, bowels of mercies —the whole character and walk of Christ.

I will now take notice of Mr. Marshall's remarks.

In the first place Mr. Marshall's statements make quite plain that if we are under the law at all we are under it not merely as a rule of life but as a question of righteousness or condemnation. He says expressly of a believer, if he act contrary to the law (p. 10), he would then have come under its condemning power; so, on the same page, if a believer "acts contrary to the law, what then? Will not the law take hold of him and condemn him? "Thus all pretension that it is a rule of life but not the way of righteousness, failure under it bringing a curse, is wholly set aside. If I am told there is a remedy in looking to Christ; so there was in the prescriptions of the law. We have not advanced a tittle. Only remember, reader, that it is for this cause the apostle says "as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse." If

you are on this ground, you are at this moment, according to your theory, under the curse. And this is all true if we are under the law at all.

People talk of not taking it for this, but taking it for that. Who are you to deal with the law and testimony of God thus? It takes you, as God has declared it should if you are under it, and curses you. The curse comes with it, and sin revives when it comes. Mr. Marshall is right: it lays hold of a man and condemns him. And, if "As many as are of its works," they are all cursed. And Christ does not step in to weaken its authority. He bore its curse and delivered us from the law, but He cannot be made a curse for us now, and if it comes on us there is no way left of getting it off us. If it be a rule of life, then righteousness comes by it and Christ is dead in vain.

But let us see what Mr. Marshall has to say of it even as a rule of life. If it be God's rule of life, it must be a perfect one. Indeed a rule that is not a perfect one is pure mischief and deception. But what is Mr. M.'s account? "Christ enlarges it," that is, it is not perfect but has to be enlarged. Suppose I have to enlarge a measure to be honest in what I give; is my first measure right? Thus I must have the law enlarged to go right, a strange rule. But further: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Here then we have a clear, positive, and definite rule. All, and whatsoever they bid you, is to be done. "Of course," continues Mr. Marshall (p. 9), "He only meant such parts of the moral law as were in accordance with His new dispensation; and nearly all parts of it are in such accordance." Here is a strange rule for me. Nearly all of it is right, God's rule, mind; and I am to judge, by my estimate of the new

dispensation, what is not. I am not to find it enlarged, but to pare it off as I see it is consistent with my position. But how can this be called a rule?

Now these remarks prove to me that Mr. Marshall is an honest man. He sees that you cannot reconcile Christianity and the rule Christians are, on this system, to live by; and he honestly says so. But then all becomes "nearly all," and whatsoever is not is cast overboard; and the rule is no rule at all, enlarged in one place and pared down in another by some other which is not given to us at all. Surely this is not establishing law.

The text universally alleged to put us under the law is, "I am not come to destroy the law and the prophets, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil." Now what Christ's fulfilling the law has to do with putting me under it I never could understand. I should have thought that it would have rather been the contrary, and, if fulfilled, there was an end of the matter. Thus He fulfilled the sacrifices, and the rather as He speaks of the prophets, which gives to the word "fulfil," used as it is as to both, a force quite different from that sought to be made of it. It is a mere fancy, let me add here, that a Christian cannot use every word of Scripture for profit, law and all, without (that is) putting him under law. All that happened to Israel is written for our instruction, on whom the ends of the world are come, but that does not put us in the place they were in. All that reveals God to me, His mind, His will, His ways, is profitable to me, is light, without putting me in the place of those of whom I read.

But there is another consideration to be referred to here, the sermon on the Mount. This, blessed as is the

instruction contained in it, was before the cross which judicially closed the relationship of the Jews with God, breaking down the middle wall of partition. We have no hint of redemption in it from beginning to end, nor of the relationship in which men should stand to God by it. It gives, and gives most blessedly, the characters which were fitted to enter the kingdom of heaven just going to be set up. Now that kingdom was not yet set up, but announced as immediately to be so. Nor do I for a moment imply that they were to give up the character necessary in order to enter as soon as they had got into it. It would be absurd. But what it does is to give the characters suited to the kingdom, not to shew the effect of its being set up by the rejection and cross of Jesus. It is not the law, nor is it the gospel. Christ could not preach His death and resurrection as an accomplished ground of salvation. It is to disciples, though in the audience of all, that no man might mistake the true character of the kingdom, nor of those who were to get into it. That and the revelation of the Father's name are the subjects of the discourse. The law and the prophets were until John; since that the kingdom of heaven was preached, and every man passed into it. The gospel of the death and resurrection of Christ could not be preached, though long before and now prophesied of. The preaching was that they might receive Him, not crucify Him.

Nor is the sermon on the Mount, as is stated, in a large degree portions of the moral law. Two commandments are referred to which are the two abiding characteristics of sin since before the flood, corruption and violence, lust and murder. None other are alluded to, sabbath or any other. And if it were to prove the law a perfect rule,

how could it be written to them of old time so-and-so was said, referring to law, but I say unto you, and so teach them quite differently? The whole idea is a delusion. That those who then broke the least commandment and taught men so were not fit for the kingdom is clearly stated, but that is all, and nothing about the law subsisting after Christ's death. Unless it be in temporal things there is no grace, no blood-shedding to cleanse, no redemption to deliver. The kingdom being just at hand the character suited to an entrance into it is given. Israel was on his way with the Lord to judgment, and if they did not come to an agreement, they would be delivered up; and so they have been. It is not grace to sinners, but righteousness demanded to be fit to enter, that is, such a walk and spirit as is set forth in the sermon. Charging scribes and Pharisees who were under it with making void the law has nothing to do with putting Christians under it after Christ has died.

As to establish the law as a system, Christ clearly did not. "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." He is the end of the law for righteousness. We establish law, for that is the real force of the word, in the highest and only scriptural way. They that have sinned under it will be judged by it, unless indeed redeemed out of that state. Christ's bearing the curse of the law established its authority, as nought else could do, but did not leave the guilty under it.

The mistake made is this. Many things contained in the law, all in the moral law as usually understood—say Christ's two great commandments, and the ten commandments ^not now discussing the sabbath which belonged to the old creation, the Lord's day to the new)

—were obligations before the law and are obligations under Christ. But from the law, that is, the enforcement of these obligations by the authority of God binding them on man as his righteousness by a rule of life (and that only is law), or pronouncing a curse on them if they did not keep it, from that (that is, from law) we are wholly and in every shape and way delivered, dead to it. It is adultery, to use the image of Romans 7, to have to say to it, to call ourselves Christians, if we are not absolutely from under its authority. I learn how God viewed evil and good from it, I can learn to support true ministers from what is said of oxen, but the law is not binding on me. I learn more of Christ's sacrifice in detail from Leviticus and other places than from the Gospels; yet I have nothing whatever to say to the law as to them, I am not under it. So of moral obligations—I learn in the law that God abhorred stealing, but it is not because under the law that I do not steal. All the word of God is mine and written for my instruction, yet for all that I am not under law, but a Christian who has died with Christ on the cross and am not in the flesh to which law applied, I am dead to the law by the body of Christ.

In vain it is alleged that this is only as a covenant of works. The law is nothing else but a covenant of works. Mr. Marshall has shewn it in his remarks already commented on. Mr. Wesley, it seems, admits (p. 12) that Christ is the end of the law in the true sense; then let us have done with it. He has adopted, he tells us, every point of it (nearly all Mr. M. says). What he has adopted, if it be so, let us learn from him. "This is my beloved Son, hear him"; and Moses and Elias disappear. His teaching will suffice by itself in such things.

As Mr. M. is content with what he has found in “Brethren “as to the Lord’s day, I should have nothing to say on that head. I take it up here only in its connection with the law. With the insisting on the godly enjoyment and observance of the Lord’s day, which he approvingly quotes, I entirely agree; but as the sabbath and change from the seventh to the first day of the week is closely connected with the question of law, I will treat this point also for a moment. A Christian recognises the first day of the week, not the seventh. Why so? The law we hold absolutely gone as to the Christian (not by enfeebling its authority where it applies, for Christ bore its curse and men who have sinned under it will be judged by it, but) because we have died from under it. Now what was the Sabbath? God’s rest in the first creation. We do not belong to it—our bodies do; hence a day of rest is a blessing for man toiling through the fall. But this did not make it a matter of eternal obligation, but the Son of man Lord of it: an expression in itself quite inapplicable to a moral obligation. The sabbath was God’s rest in the old creation. In that creation God cannot rest now. Hence the Lord beautifully and blessedly says, when maliciously charged with breaking it, “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.” They wrought in grace in a world of sin, but could not rest in it.

Now the Lord took man up on the footing of the old creation, and as undetermined whether he could find God’s rest on the ground of his own responsibility. Hence the day of rest belonging to that was given and imposed upon him, as all the rest, as a matter of law. Death and life were set before him. Now he is known to be dead in sins. Under that system man failed. I believe that the millennium will be in a certain sense the

accomplishment of that day, but on that I do not enter here. But Christ's cross closed for the spiritual mind the old creation and the old covenant. He gave Himself for our sins to redeem us from this present evil world. His resurrection began redeemed man's history on a new footing, on which innocent Adam never was, any more than sinful man: a state based, not on responsibility in which there might be failure, but on a work whose value could never change; a state which was a proof of accomplished redemption by an accepted work.

Thus the first day of the week, that is, the day of Christ's resurrection, became the sign and witness of rest for us. We begin work with it, that is, with redemption in Christ, not end with it, though in fact we shall not fully rest till we are risen. Still, through Christ's resurrection we have rest for our souls, and it is a pledge of the full rest of God into which a promise is left of entering. This entering into the rest of God is the compendium of the fullest blessing of His people; for He rests in holiness and perfected glory and love, and will rest in it when He has His people there, and all answers to His own nature, and His love is satisfied. But this is for us in resurrection and through the resurrection of Christ; and as the seventh day was the symbolical rest under the law because God had rested from the works of the first creation, and made additionally obligatory under the law in connection with redemption out of Egypt, and strictly enforced under pain of death; so for us the first day of the week is the witness of a better redemption and a better rest.

The Lord met the disciples the first day of the week, and again the following; the first day of the week the disciples came together to break bread, the first day

were to lay by for the poor as God had prospered them, and in Revelation John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, when it had already definitely acquired its name. It is not a seventh day, as if we worked when God rested, and rested when God worked. It is not the Fourth Commandment, for we are in no way under the law, but the blessed liberty of rest to serve God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ..

Besides being a boon in itself to toiling man, Jehovah gave His sabbath to Israel as a sign between Him and them, a mark of God's people; Ezek. 20:12,20. Nor is any new institution established in the law (as the setting up of the tabernacle, the manna, or other special things) without the sabbath being specially enforced. It was a sign of their being God's people, though in fact they never really, any more than Adam, entered into God's rest (Heb. 4); there remains a rest. But this has ceased: they are no longer God's people unless in promise for the future, when they will have their rest by grace.

Hence the Lord never has to say to the sabbath in the Gospels but as slighting it. It is a singular fact that, as in the law it is repeatedly and rigorously enforced, in the Gospels it is studiously made light of. The Son of man was Lord of it. He recognises it as existing under the law, but makes use of and acts on it as above it, makes the man carry his bed on it and the like. The old covenant was passing away, and we having died in Christ are not to be judged in respect of sabbaths. Yet for the same reason I hold the Lord's day as a blessed privilege conferred and to be observed for the Lord's service, as "the Lord's day"; and I do not doubt we may, in our little measure, be in the Spirit on the Lord's day, however that may be our privilege at all times.

And let the reader remark that there are many things binding, not as law but the divine good pleasure. I do not pray by law, nor read the word by law, nor praise God by law; yet I should be unhappy and be guilty if I did not. A father's will is a law to a loving child, if he has not given a formal order. But I may add here I am not afraid of the word "commandment." It is a wholesome word because it involves obedience. Christ could say, As my Father has given me commandment, so I do, and this as regards His work on the cross, His highest act of love. Did I do everything in itself right, nothing would be yet right, if obedience were wanting in it. "Lo! I come to do thy will"; and we are sanctified to the obedience of Christ. It is as to this the word "commandment" has its wholesome place. But we cannot be under law without being under a covenant of works, and that Mr. Marshall's pamphlet shews as we have seen.

I come now to the question of righteousness, which connects itself pretty closely with that of law. Mr. Marshall has not quite understood Brethren's views on this. I know not whether I shall succeed in making them clear. Scripture never speaks of the righteousness of Christ, though of course He was in every sense perpetually righteous, but (1) of man's or legal righteousness, man being what he ought to be towards God and his neighbour, of which the law was the measure, or (2) of God's righteousness, what He is in Himself manifested in the display of His own consistency with Himself, and that judicially in respect of Christ and through Him of us. Righteousness is practically recognising the claim of another, claim in the sense of what is due to him. With God, as the source and measure of all claim, it is what is due to Himself. This

may be as to the creature what is due to God, according to the place He has put the creature in, the creature's duty; and law was of this the perfect expression enforced by the authority of God, and sanctioned by the penalty of a curse. In this consistency with God's will man wholly failed; not only that, but God came in Christ, reconciling the world, not imputing their failures, and man rejected Him. Man's moral history was over. Not only God had turned him out of paradise because of sin, but, as far as he was concerned, he had turned God out of the world when He had come into it in mercy.

The Second man comes on the scene. Now our probation was in the first, God's purposes were in the Second. And both these come out into light through the work of Christ, perfect when fully proved. He meets our failure as the sin-bearer for us, and lays the foundation of God's accomplishment of His purposes of glory in the same work. This is our portion. Had man even kept the law, it did not give him a title to be in the glory of the Son of God; but we are predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He may be the firstborn among many brethren. We have borne the image of the earthly, and we shall bear the image of the Heavenly. We rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Now Christ in His death glorified God as to all that He is, and that where God had been dishonoured, in the very place of sin. Man's enmity, Satan's power, death, the curse or wrath of God, all met there, and He in love and obedience there, as made sin. There it was obedience was perfected, God's righteous judgment against sin fully displayed and endured in the forsaking of God, yet God's perfect love to sinners displayed in the same act, God's majesty maintained in the sufferings of

Christ, His truth, and all that was needed, that His purpose of bringing sons unto glory might be accomplished. God was glorified in the Son of man, and man was set at the right hand of God. All that God's glory could claim as against sin, and for the accomplishment of His purposes according to that glory, all that could make it good, and that as only could be done where sin was; all that could glorify God, and, blessed be His name, to the glory of God by us, was accomplished; and righteousness, God's righteousness, what was due to His consistency with Himself, set Christ at His right hand as man, for Christ suffering as man had realised that glory and made it good at all cost to Himself. (See John 13:31, 32; chap. 17:4, 5; chap. 16:10.) God, having all in this work that was due to the claims of His own glory, acted righteously, did what was the necessary consequence according to that glory, and glorified Christ with Himself. "I have glorified thee on the earth "(there where it was needed, and nothing but Christ made sin in the perfection of obedience and love to His Father could do it), "and now glorify thou me with thine own self"; and man entered into the glory of God righteously—this, besides Christ's bearing our sins in His own body on the tree. He was Jehovah's lot and the people's lot.

Much blessed instruction is connected with this, but I confine myself to righteousness. The testimony to the world is that there is none righteous, no not one; but there is righteousness in this, that Christ has gone to the Father, and the world will not see Him any more (that is as then come in grace), until He comes in judgment. Through this work the believer is justified from all his sins, for Christ has borne them and suffered the penalty.

God is just (righteous), and as such the Justifier of him that believes in Jesus—justifies the ungodly, and whom He justifies them He also glorifies. Grace reigns through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord. He is made unto us righteousness, and we the righteousness of God in Him. He is before God the ground and measure of our place before God, and His righteousness displayed in putting us there, while all is grace towards us. He is gone to our Father and His Father, our God and His God, and we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

And now a word as to "imputed righteousness." No such term is in Scripture, but imputing righteousness, of which the sense is wholly different in English, and a different word employed in Greek. Imputing righteousness is simply counting or reckoning us righteous. Imputed righteousness is a certain valuable sum put over to our account. Thus in Philemon: "If he owe thee anything, put that to my account."60 And so "sin is not imputed where there is no law." You cannot put that specific act as a transgression to the man's account, because, when there is no law, it has not been forbidden, as it could be under the law in Israel, though the reign of death proved they were sinners and lost. Now this and the passage in Philemon are the only places where this word is used. But imputing righteousness used some eleven times is, as the Thirty-nine Articles justly state, simply accounting the man righteous. But, whatever the blessed fruits of divine life or of the Spirit, which there surely will be where that life and the Spirit are, and be the proof that it is really there, still, if God justifieth the ungodly, and that it is to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that

justifieth the ungodly, that faith is imputed for righteousness, it is evident that it is not because of what a man is himself, but of another, that he is accounted righteous. “By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” And mark the difference. We are not accounted righteous according to the poor measure of the fruits which we produce, with the defects which may accompany them, but according to the measure of Christ’s work, in which He has borne our sins on the one hand, and perfectly glorified God, when made sin, on the other; the former represented by the sin-offering in Leviticus, and the other by the burnt-offering, or, in another aspect when both were parts of one sin-offering, by the blood on the mercy-seat, and the sins of the people laid on the head of the scapegoat.

Now Mr. Marshall’s system contradicts itself. “The Brethren,” he says, “are quite in accordance with Scripture in holding that a believer is justified solely on the ground of the Lord Jesus Christ’s atonement and satisfaction for his sins; and that so believing his faith is imputed to him for righteousness, and that he is thus justified and accepted of God.” Now, that a true Christian is made partaker of the divine nature having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust, that he is to cleanse himself from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord, that he is not his own but bought with a price, and to live wholly to Him who has died for him and risen again, as a thousand passages testify, cannot be too earnestly pressed on the Christian. It is of vital importance and daily need. That is not the question, at any rate it is no question with me. The question is this, our righteousness before God. But Mr. M. says (p. 16) “if all

a believer's righteousness, at present and in the future, are in Christ alone, why were all those cited exhortations and commands?" If a believer is justified as Mr. M. says, solely on the ground of Christ's atonement and satisfaction, and that his faith is imputed for righteousness, they cannot be for righteousness to be accepted of God, for how then is it solely by Christ's work? But I answer, not to make our righteousness, but for consistency and growth in the place he is set in, to grow up to Him who is the Head in all things, to glorify Christ as he ought, to be able to enjoy God. We are accepted in the Beloved. See how it is said in John 14: "In that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in me, and I in you." By the Holy Ghost dwelling in me, I know I am in Christ, consequently perfectly accepted of God; that is not my responsibility but my place, but this cannot be without Christ being in me. They go together; and there is my responsibility now, namely, to shew forth the life of Christ, of Christ who is my life, in everything—that Christ should be all to me as He is in all that have received the Spirit, and that all I do I should do in His name. My objection is, not that men should press holiness, but that they should make righteousness out of it when Christ is made unto us righteousness.

As to the phrase, "we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith," it teaches the contrary of what Mr. M. supposes. It is not righteousness we are waiting for, but the hope of righteousness; we are made the righteousness of God in Him (Christ), and then wait for glory which belongs to that righteousness. Christ is made to us righteousness; by One man's obedience the many are made righteous; and the objection to this, that we may then continue in sin, is not met by putting us

under law or giving uncertainty as to righteousness, but by shewing (Rom. 6) that righteousness involves death to sin. I cannot have one without the other, and so live to God. It is a sad thing if a Christian never can know he is accepted; and if he was not righteous somehow, he assuredly could not. The scripture shews us it is in Christ we are justified, that is, accounted or held for righteousness, as Mr. M. admits, solely on the ground of Christ's atonement. Otherwise, if we cannot so stand before God, no peace, no joy, no bright hope of glory; for this belongs to the righteous. But He has made peace by the blood of the cross, and we are accepted in the Beloved. It is well that a simple principle should be realised by Christians—that duties flow from the place we are already in; and if I am in a place in which I always must be, as a child with its parents, it only makes the duty perpetual, and this is always the measure and principle of duty. Destroy the relation, and the duty ceases.

I have treated the main questions at issue, and which are of importance to every soul. I only add that, in one aspect all Christians are sanctified in Christ Jesus, saints called and set apart to God by the power of the Holy Ghost; in another they follow after holiness, and, beholding the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, are changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord. They know that when He shall appear they shall be like Him, for they shall see Him as He is, and having this hope in Him they purify themselves as He is pure.

As regards the church or assembly, the question is not at all if Abraham was not justified by faith through Christ's work, nor whether he will be in glory, nor whether he

was more or less faithful than any of us. There were those more or less faithful then. There are more and less faithful now. The question is what place God set the Old Testament saints in, and where He has set us. Now I believe God has set us in a better place, because, after speaking of the faith by which all those elders obtained a good report, it is declared God had reserved some better thing for us; Heb. n. It is a mistake to think that there may not be in God's sovereign wisdom a better place in which some are set. Among them that were born of women there has not arisen a greater than John the Baptist. Who more faithful, or separated to God than he, filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb? Yet the least in the kingdom of heaven Was to be greater than he. What a privilege that of the disciples to have the Lord with them, the long and earnest desire of prophets and righteous men! Yet for these very same persons it was expedient that He should go, for then they would receive the Holy Ghost. Under the law the Holy Ghost signified, that the way into the holiest was not made.manifest, now we have boldness to enter into the holiest. The veil is rent.

But our business is to shew that the church did not exist. "Church" is an unhappy word, because nobody knows what it means. Say "assembly," and all is plain. Every gathering together of people is an assembly, but God's assembly is a distinct thing. Now Adam or any individual saint could not be an assembly. This is clear. Israel was an assembly, and in a certain sense God's assembly; but in every way the opposite of God's assembly now. It was by birth of the race of Jacob: a Gentile as such could not belong to it; it was a nation, not a gathering by testimony and calling. The Gospel of John makes the

difference. Christ “died for that nation, but not for that nation only, but to gather together in one the children of God which were scattered abroad.” The fact of their being children of God did not make them an assembly, but their gathering together into one. But another element characterises God’s assembly, God’s dwelling amongst them. Now this He does not do with man but on the ground of accomplished redemption. He did not dwell with Adam in his innocence, nor with Abraham and others; but as soon as He had brought out Israel by accomplished redemption, though then an outward one, then He came and dwelt among them, as it is written, “And they shall know that I am Jehovah their God that brought them out of the land of Egypt, that I might dwell among them,” Exod. 29:49.

Let us come to the direct proofs of the different positions of the New Testament and Old Testament saints. The Lord’s own declaration should suffice: “On this rock I will build my church.” The confession that He personally, Jesus, was the Son of the living God—this could not be before. Looking for a Messiah with true faith, for the promised Seed, was before, and was surely saving faith: but that Jesus was the Son of the living God could not be before Jesus. And hence the Lord says, “I will build “: not that He had been long building, when in truth in that state as a man He did not yet subsist.

We have two aspects of the church. It is Christ’s body, and the habitation of God by the Spirit. Neither could possibly have existed before Pentecost. First, till Christ ascended, there was no head in heaven for the body to be united to. You would have had a body without a head. Ephesians 1 and 2 declare that we are raised with and seated in heavenly places in Christ “according to the

working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand… and gave him to be head over all things to the church which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

Thus it is distinctly the raised and ascended man that is made head of the body, and set over all things. There was no such man till the ascension, and thus union loses all its reality, the church all true existence, where it is set up by man's imagination before Pentecost. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. All suppose the man Christ, and Christ ascended when union is spoken of, and that is union by the power of the Holy Ghost.

Further, till after the ascension, the Holy Ghost did not come down to form the church and dwell in it. In 1 Corinthians 12 we read, "by one Spirit we are all baptised into one body." They were, as we are expressly taught in the Acts, baptised with the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost; Acts 1. So John, "He it is that baptiseth with the Holy Ghost," John 1. Now the Lord says, "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come; but if I go away, I will send him unto you." I must here notice and correct a mistake. Mr. M. urges that Christ's breathing on the disciples saying," Receive ye the Holy Ghost," was the giving of the Comforter, not the day of Pentecost; but John's Gospel is explicit. It was from Christ risen; as God breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life, so the Lord breathed on them that they might have the power of life by the Holy Ghost. But this was not sending the Holy Ghost.

We read, in John 7, the Holy Ghost was not yet (given) because that Jesus was not yet glorified. We read explicitly (John 14:16), I will pray the Father and He will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever; and verse 26, But the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, which the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, etc.; and chapter 15:26, But when the Comforter is come whom I will send unto you from the Father, the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me. So chapter 16:7-15. These passages leave no question as to the Comforter being sent down from on high when Jesus had gone up, sent down by the Father in His name, and by Him from the Father. Hence we know we are sons, and the Spirit has revealed the things freely given to us of God, and the disciples were enabled to give all that the Holy Ghost led them to give of Christ's life here below. Hence Christ received the Holy Ghost afresh when He went up, to communicate it (Acts 2:33), which identifies the Comforter also with what was given at Pentecost, though gifts may be distinct power, but here the Holy Ghost distributes to every man severally as He will; 1 Cor. 12:11.

It is a mistake of Mr. Marshall's to take the breathing on them the day of His resurrection, for His sending the Comforter from the Father after He had gone away. He must, He tells us Himself, go away in order to send Him; John 16:7.

At all events we learn from 1 Corinthians 12 that it was that coming of the Holy Ghost which is called baptism, which we know (Acts 1:5, answering to John 1:33) to have been the day of Pentecost which forms the church, the one body of Christ here below, whereby the gathered

saints become withal the habitation of God through the Spirit. Thus the facts that the risen and ascended Christ is Head, and that the descent of the Holy Ghost forms the body, make it impossible for the church to have existed before Pentecost.

Another and lower ground of reasoning, though perhaps more palpable to some, alike shews the impossibility of the church's existing before the cross. Jew and Gentile could not be united in one. The Jew was bound strictly to keep up the middle wall of partition. The church is formed by its being thrown down, Christ thereupon forming in Himself one new man; Eph. 2:14-16. The church was formed through the throwing down of that which Judaism was bound to keep up. It could not exist until Judaism was ended. Hence, too, in Hebrews 12 we have "the church of the firstborn which are written in heaven," and "the spirits of just men made perfect," as a distinct class (v. 23). The truth is that the bringing in the Old Testament saints into the church is only dropping the whole proper blessing of the church itself. The teaching of Scripture as to it is wholly lost.

Saints may be individually blest and saved, though that truth is darkened, but a body united to a head in heaven is entirely out of sight. Thus Mr. Marshall diligently argues that, as we are Abraham's seed, Abraham must have been in the church. "Of one seed," he says in concluding, "or church." But the seed are individuals, sons of God and heirs of God; which has nothing to do with being the body of a man who is in heaven, or builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. A man's bride and body is another idea from being children of a father. Viewed as children of God, we are Christ's brethren, not His body.

Mr. Marshall is mistaken, as many others, as to the prophets in Ephesians 2 being Old Testament prophets. The Greek sufficiently shews in Ephesians 2 that they are New Testament prophets; but chapter 3:5 shews without question to any reader that they are New Testament prophets in contrast with all of old time. (Compare chap. 4:12.)

Mr. Marshall again refers to the expression “the whole family in heaven and earth.” Now I have not the least doubt that the only true rendering is “every61 family,” which upsets the argument altogether, in contrast with Amos 3:1, 2. But the whole argument rests on the fallacy, even taking it as it stands in English, that a family is a body—the family of God is the body of Christ glorified. Thus, “surely all the members of a family may be said to belong to it” has no force in any way, because members of a family have nothing to do with members of His body. It is a relationship with God and the Father, and not with Christ, save so far as they are brethren—an individual place. Mr. Marshall’s tract sees nothing of these differences.

The judgment and song in Revelation 15 do not even apply to the church at all. Nor is relationship with the Father introduced into the Revelation. The nearest approach to it is chapter 14 when God is called Christ’s Father. The Book describes the government of God Almighty, and not even sons with a Father. The saints old and new are seen on thrones, but the body of Christ is not spoken of, nor the saints belonging to the church, or even to the Old Testament, seen on earth at all. Taking union on the lowest ground, mere gathering here, Christ gave Himself “to gather together in one the children of God which were scattered abroad.” Even here (and it is

not the unity of the body), being a child of God is one thing, and gathered together is another.

As to judging of the equity of putting them there, with the comparative merits of individuals we have nothing to do, nor has it with the question. We must see what Scripture states. Now I say, that not only the church did not exist, but it was not, even prophetically, revealed in the Old Testament— formed no part of promise or prophecy.

In Romans 16:25, it is said “according to the revelation of the mystery kept secret since the world began, but is now made manifest.”62 Again in Ephesians 3:5, “which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body.” Again in verse 9, “the mystery which from the beginning of the world was hid in God; to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be made known by the church the manifold wisdom of God.” “The mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations, but now is made manifest to his saints,” Col. 1:26. We have thus the distinct and repeated declaration that the mystery of the church not only could not exist while the Jews were a separate people, and bound to be so, but was not revealed. The revelation that there was no difference between the Jew and the Greek would have overturned the whole fabric by its base.

Let me urge Mr. Marshall to read, not the writings of Brethren, but the Bible, and see if the church is not a wholly new thing, consequent on the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God, and that it could not by any

possibility have existed before; and not to confound the promise of a coming Saviour, received by faith, with membership of Christ's body, when He is exalted to be Head over all things to His body, the church; nor to think it impossible, because of the grace given to Abraham, that God may have "reserved some better thing for us."

I will add a few words on ordination. Mr. Marshall cites a number of passages in which Paul exhorts Timothy as to his ministry, stirring up the gift which was in him. Most admirable exhortations assuredly, for indeed they are of the Spirit of God Himself, though we speak of Paul; but they have nothing to do with the ordination of ministers. But Mr. Marshall misquotes the only material citation. Timothy had been ordained, he tells us, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Scripture does not say "by," but "with"; and, when we see what Paul says elsewhere, we see the importance of the difference. The whole sentence is "the gift which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Now here we find the real force of the matter: a gift was given, a very different thing from ordination; and elsewhere we find more information as to it, 2 Timothy 1:6," the gift that is in thee by the putting on of my hands." A man was personally marked out by prophecy (as we see in the case of Paul and Barnabas, Acts 13, and again at Antioch), and then Paul laid his hands on Timothy and conferred a gift, which was the privilege of the apostles; as we see Paul and John going down to Samaria, and so conferring it, and Simon wanting to buy the power.

Now I freely admit that the presbytery also accompanied this by the laying on of their hands, as a testimony to Timothy, just as in Acts 13:3: an act interpreted in

chapter 14:26, and repeated again in chapter 15:40. But the substance of the act was the conferring the Holy Ghost with a careful changing of the word, which has escaped Mr. M.'s notice. Hence in the Episcopal church, in which the officiating prelate professes to give the Holy Ghost, the laying on of his hands is ordered to be accompanied by that of other priests, but no one ascribes ordination to them but to the prelate.

The difference between eldership and gifts is clearly established in every respect in Scripture. It was desirable that an elder should be apt to teach; still it was said "especially those who labour in the word and doctrine," so that some did not, and in their episcopal work—for they were all bishops, that is, in their service as overseers of the flock, he was to be able "to exhort and convince gainsayers, holding fast" (if he had no special conferred gift of teaching on which he had to wait, Rom. 12) "the faithful word as he had been taught." He is even here contrasted with a teacher, and is to use in his service what he had learned, to stop people's mouths. Elders were appointed in every city (Titus 1:5, compare Acts 14:23), aptness to teach being a desirable qualification; but eldership was no gift at all. It is to be presumed hands were laid upon them, though it is never positively said so; but it was the common use in every signification of blessing, approved and commended to the Lord, used with the sick, used by prophets, or the church as to apostles, and, as Timothy was to lay hands suddenly on no man, it may be very well presumed he did so on elders. It is a mercy it is never said, or we should have apostolic succession. And it is not ever said.

But let us see on what a totally different footing gifts stand. First the Lord when He goes away gives talents to His servants, and they are bound to use them without other authority. He who had not sufficient trust in the Lord to do so was a wicked and slothful servant. Then I find the fact, “they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word,” and afterward (Acts 11) “the hand of the Lord was with them.” I find Peter giving directions as to this, “As every man has received the gift, so let him minister the same, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God,” 1 Pet. 4:10. In Romans 12:6, “Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith, or ministry, let us wait on our ministering, or he that teacheth on teaching,” etc. So in 1 Corinthians 12 it is elaborately stated that they had their gifts according to the dividing of the Spirit as He would, making one one member in the body, another another, and wherever a man was he was that member. So if Apollos taught at Ephesus, he taught at Corinth when there, and Silas and Judas at Antioch, and so on, and in 1 Corinthians 14 directions are given as to the use of gifts, when they were not to be used, how many were to speak, etc., that all might be to common edification, concluding by saying, “for ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and that all may be comforted.” The women were to keep silence in the assemblies, it was not permitted them to speak, it was a shame for them to speak in the assembly. So persons (2 John) who went about preaching were to be judged by their doctrine. Then we get a warning in James not to be many masters (teachers), shewing by the moral warning that ordination to do it had no place.

Finally, in the important passage in Ephesians 4 it is referred to gifts from Christ on high, when He fills all things in the power of redemption. Five permanent and regular gifts are mentioned, of which two had been declared to be the foundation, which is not laying now. Pastors, teachers, and evangelists remain, sadly hindered by the state of the church, still they remain. In addition to this we have “the increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part.” The difference of this and 1 Corinthians 12 is worthy of note. There it was mere power, by the Spirit of God, which might be, and was, abused; here it is what Christ, who cannot but be faithful to His own body, gives till all grow up to Him who is the Head. There, being by the present Holy Ghost, you have tongues, miracles, healings, etc., but there is no “till we all come “as there is in Ephesians 4; on the contrary it is “as he will.” We may have lost a great deal, but the principle of Scripture is as plain as possible.

Of ordination as connected with these gifts we have nothing, unless that apostles could confer the Holy Ghost and gift by laying on of hands. Committing doctrine to faithful men, which may be done in any age if one be capable to do it, has nothing to do with conferring official authority, and that is what ordaining means in modern language. And this is why “ordain” is objectionable, because it conveys a distinct meaning in modern language, which Scripture does not warrant. The English version is intentionally unfaithful in this. In Acts 1 it has “must one be ordained,” where there is no word at all. It is simply “must one be a witness.” In Acts

14 it is “they chose for them,” and they have put “ordained them,” and in Titus “ordain elders” when it is simply “establish.” This was not without intention.

The other passages which Mr. M. quotes prove rather the contrary of what he cites them for, as 1 Thessalonians 5:12, 13. Why call upon people to know those that laboured among them, and love them for their works’ sake, if they could not help knowing them as their own ordained ministers? Their work was the ground of knowing and valuing them, and a very just one. Hebrews 13:7 has really nothing to do with it (these were dead, and, knowing their end, they were to follow their faith), verse 17 has; but here their work is again the ground: there is no hint of appointment.

When Mr. M. speaks of the hundreds of thousands of churches which need ministers, he is assuming the whole system of modern churches, of which there is not a trace in Scripture. Men have made the churches, and so they must make ministers for them, whether God has made them or not. Such a church as Paul wrote to does not exist in Christendom; and if he were to address a letter as he then did, no one would get it. “No one,” Mr. M. adds, “ever knew or heard of any such direct divine appointment since the time of the apostle Paul!” Just so. In Scripture such are found as we have seen. And he told us that, after his decease, from without and within ruin would come; and it has. But these would become the perilous times of the last days, for which we have directions in 2 Timothy 3, and more detailedly in 2 Timothy 2. In chapter 3 we have our resource, knowing from whom we have learned, the inspired teachers, and generally the Scriptures, that which was from the beginning; 1 John 2:24.

But Mr. M. has just told what has been, I may say, our desire, certainly mine—to go straight back to the time of the apostle Paul, that is, to the Scriptures, the written word of God; for there only we have His ways and directions. I admit it has never been done since then. The mystery of iniquity was already at work. We have returned to that which was at the beginning, conscious that much has been lost, but persuaded that Christ can never fail His church, and that He will give it needed care and blessing, and gifts to minister to it till all are come. We may fail in our faithfulness, but not the blessed Lord in His love, nor in what is really needed. But however feebly, Mr. M.'s is just the true account of what those commonly called the Brethren have done. They have gone back to Paul's time, that is, to the word of God.

57 Not "that being dead"—see the margin of the Bible. Were it as in the English authorised text, the law itself would be dead.

58 2 Corinthians 3. I say if grace be there, because Moses' face did not shine till God had made goodness pass before him.

59 I do not speak of physical laws here, as is evident, though it may be said then, only the obligation is compulsory, impressed by the Creator's power.

60 [elloga (or ei) verse 18, ellogeitai (Rom. 5:13); whereas logizomai is the word used for imputing, counting, reckoning righteous.—Ed.]

61 It is pasa patria, not pasa e patria.

62 The words are plain enough— "kept secret since the world began." Lest any should be puzzled, I add here

that “by the scriptures of the prophets” is really “by prophetic scriptures according … made known to all nations.” At any rate the mystery was kept secret in all bygone ages.

Present And Eternal And Governmental Forgiveness Of Sins

All forgiveness is founded on the blessed work of the Lord Jesus. But it is important to distinguish between the pardon which clears us once and for ever from all our sins before God, by which we are justified, and have peace with God, and the pardon which we may receive on the way as under God s government, supposing we are pardoned and saved.

Without the work of Christ, a holy and just God, yea a God of truth, must have held man to be what he really is, a guilty sinner, who must be judged according to his works; and we know beforehand from His word, that there is none righteous, no not one. The love of God, great as it is, so great that for us He did not spare His Son, could not say that sin was not sin, or that He was indifferent to good and evil, for He is not, and in His own nature cannot be; and if He judges and makes man himself answer for what he has done, He must judge him righteously.

Besides, we are alienated from God in heart and mind, and so really already lost. I do not now mean finally, nor that we cannot be saved out of that state; but if we can, it is because Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost. Judgment, if we come unrepentant, unbelieving, before the judgment-seat of Christ, will be according to our works, and therefore condemnation: for all have sinned.

But God is love: “God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him

should not perish, but have everlasting life." God has thus anticipated, in grace, that day of judgment. The same blessed Son of God, who will as Son of man sit on the judgment-seat, and judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom, has already, before that day, come as a Saviour, and died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and he that believeth on the Son of God shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned. Solemn as that warning is, I shall not say more of these last. The statement is plain enough and solemn enough without adding anything to it: they die in their sins and are doubly guilty; they have not only sinned against His holiness, but despised His mercy.

Supposing now we do really in heart believe in the Son of God, with a faith wrought in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, and a conscience which feels the need of grace and forgiveness, for that is the great point; a faith which has wrought true repentance, that godly sorrow and sense that we have deserved to be condemned which make Christ and His grace and His work precious to us. I suppose we have been all brought up to believe in the blessed Lord Jesus as a divine history, but that is very different from believing in Him as meeting the need of an awakened conscience.

But, supposing I have this true faith in Him, then it behoves me to be able to say what He has done for me.

"He has died for our sins according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3); "He has borne our sins in his own body on the tree" (1 Pet. 2:24); "He died the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God," 1 Pet. 3:18.

So that here is our question: Supposing I have true heart faith in Him, Christ having thus died for me, what is the effect or efficacy of His death for me?

I have a perfect and eternal forgiveness and redemption according to the glory of God. I do not speak of those who neglect this great salvation; they are doubly guilty; but of what is the value of His work for those who have really a part in it? “Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses,” Acts 13:38, 39. “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace,” Eph. 1:7. “Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God,” Rom. 4:25; chap. 5:1, 2. “By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous,” Rom. 5:19. “Whom he justified, them he also glorified,” Rom. 8:30. “By his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption,” Heb. 9:12. And its effect is complete (v. 14): “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?”

But is this valid for ever?

We have seen that it is eternal redemption, that it purges the conscience from dead works, and gives peace with God. But Scripture is more explicit. Christ is always

at the right hand of God, and has presented His precious blood to God. It is always before His eyes. But Scripture is very explicit on this point. “But this [man], having offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God.” Not like the Jewish priests standing continually at the altar, offering sacrifices which could never take away sins (Heb. 10: n), He sat down because, for redemption and forgiveness, He had done already the whole work; for (Heb. 5:14) “By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sactified.” He sits there at the right hand of God till His enemies be made His footstool; then He will come to deal with them in judgment. But all is done for His friends, that is, true believers, and He has sat down having finished the work, so that those who come by it have no more conscience of sins (v. 2). “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will impute no sin.” “Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered,” Rom. 4:7, 8. And is it only some of them? No, that were useless. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth no sin, and the Holy Ghost testifies of it clearly in that same Hebrews 10 from which we have quoted: “And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more “(v. 17). And so plainly does He put it, that He declares that “where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin” (v. 18). So that, if all were not completely pardoned and effaced, there could be no remedy.

The more we consider it, the more plain it is. Christ is the Judge, and if now I can say by faith, He has loved me and washed me from my sins in His own blood, how can He, when I stand before the judgment-seat, impute to me the sins He has Himself borne and put away? He

would be denying the value of His own work, which is impossible.

Again, if we are believers, we are raised in glory; 1 Cor. 15:43. Nay, Christ shall Himself come to bring us to Himself: “Who shall change our body of humiliation that it may be fashioned like unto his body of glory.” If Christ comes to fetch us, and puts us in glory, where is the place for raising any question then about our sins? And this is clearly said in John 5:24. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation [judgment]; but is passed from death unto life.”

Is it because God is indifferent to their sins? Impossible! But He has given His Son for us. Christ has borne them already, and cannot impute them to those who believe in Him and in the Father who sent Him in love. We know that the Lord says, “If ye do not believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins,” John 8:24. But if we believe in Him, we have the forgiveness of our sins—not of some, to be condemned for the rest. “Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more,” because “by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” And we possess the blessedness of this word, “Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom Jehovah will not impute sin.” Hence repentance and remission of sins were to be preached in Jesus’ name. The Christian has a new life from Christ, and this will shew itself in his walk. He is born of the Spirit; and the faith in Christ by which he has forgiveness makes Christ everything to him, as it is written in Colossians 3, Christ is all and in all, the “everything,” that is, of our hearts, and He is our life.

But I now confine myself to redemption and forgiveness.

There is then a forgiveness identified with redemption and the abiding value of Christ's blood, so that our sins are none of them imputed to us: God remembers them no more. We have part in this through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and the door by which we enter is repentance toward God, which faith in the word of Christ always produces. We have our eyes opened, we are turned from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God, and we receive remission of our sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in Jesus; Acts 26:18.

Under the Old Testament among the Jews this full forgiveness was not known; they got a kind of absolution for each sin they committed; they were shut out from entering into the holiest by the veil, which hung before the place where God revealed Himself. Thus in Hebrews 9 it is written, "The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." But we learn, when the real work of which all these things were figures was accomplished in the death of the Saviour, that the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom (Matt. 27:51), and we are exhorted (Heb. 10:19) in virtue of the work of Christ and the remission of our sins (w. 17, 18), "having boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh," to "draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience." That one work, done once for all, never to be repeated, and effectual to give peace to the conscience, is the ground on which we have eternal

redemption, full forgiveness, so that God remembers our sins and iniquities no more, an entrance into God's presence and a part in the everlasting inheritance of God's children in glory.

This great difference in the state of believers before and after the death of the blessed Lord is celebrated by Zacharias at the birth of John the Baptist, Christ's forerunner; Luke 1:77. "To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins." So the repentant thief went straight into paradise with Christ; so to the repentant woman in the city that was a sinner the Lord said, not only, "Thy sins are forgiven thee"; but, "Thy faith hath saved thee," Luke 7:48-50.

There is, then, for faith, a present but eternal forgiveness, founded on Christ's bearing our sins in a work which can never be repeated, its value never diminished, nor anything added to it. God has proved His value of its worth in setting Him who did it at His right hand in glory, where He was with Him as Son of God before the world was. "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." This cannot be repeated. "Christ is not entered into holy places made with hands (which are the figures of the true), but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Nor yet to offer himself often… otherwise he must often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the consummation of ages he hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, apart from sin, unto salvation." Those whose sins were put away the first time He comes to take into glory, as to

them having no more to do with sin which He put away the first time.

But there is a government of God in this world over those who are thus redeemed, and ever has been. “Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth.” And when God exercises this discipline, which is always for our good in love, when a soul is truly humbled, He in His wisdom often takes it away, forgiving, as to His present government and ways, the sin which made it necessary. Not that all such visitations are because of sins. The world is in a state of misery through sin, and all are liable to be subject to this servitude of corruption. This the Lord states in John 9:3.

Nor even when they are sent of God in reference to the state of the soul, are they always because of sins committed; they may be to prevent them, break the will, humble us as to our state. Thus Paul had a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be puffed up through the abundance of revelations. Thrice he asked the Lord to take it away, but the Lord had sent it for his good; so He would not.

This government of God, and pardon as to the present inflictions of His hand, we find both in the Old Testament and in the New.

Thus, when God had pronounced a terrible judgment on Ahab for his wickedness, Ahab humbled himself, and God said to Elijah who had carried the message to him, “Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? I will not bring the evil in his days; in his son’s days will I bring the evil upon his house.” This had nothing to do with the saving of his soul; indeed, as far as this history

informs us, he died in his sins; but he was forgiven as to that particular judgment on the earth.

So with David: when he had acted very wickedly in a particular case, though in the main one beloved of God, and glorifying Him in his walk, Nathan the prophet declares to him, “Now, therefore, the sword shall never depart from thine house; because thou hast despised me.” Yet in his general walk he was a man after God’s own heart. Very many such instances could be adduced from the Old Testament. There was pardon of the sin as to present chastisement. David was spared and not cut off, but the child of this sin was taken from him.

So in Exodus: when God threatened to destroy all the people, He recalled His threat when Moses pleaded His promises, and sent His angel to guide them, but declared “Nevertheless in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them. And Jehovah plagued the people, because they made the calf, which Aaron made,” Exod. 32:34, 35. But their falling in the wilderness had nothing to do with the saving of their souls: Moses and Aaron died in the wilderness too, and we know they were saints of Jehovah.

It is just what is taught us in the book of Job, where Elihu interprets God’s ways in chapter 33:17-30; and in chapter 36:7 he speaks expressly of a righteous man, saying, “He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous,” but He chastens them for their sins; and he warns Job not to fight against God. If he had bowed in heart, he would have been delivered from his affliction (v. 16), and he is warned, as God was thus dealing with him, to take care he was not cut off from the earth (v. 12). Yet Job was the godliest man on all the earth, but

needed correction as beginning to think well of himself; chap. 31:16 and following. Compare chapters 29:11, and 42:5, 6.

In the New Testament we have the same chastisement and forgiveness as a present dealing of God with man on the earth for their good. See 1 Corinthians 11:30-32. They took the Lord's supper as if it were a common meal, and the poor had not enough to eat, and the rich indulged in gluttony and wine, and many were sick in consequence and even "slept," that is, died. But all this was present chastening in this world, for the apostle says, "When we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world." The Corinthians were chastened for their faults, but were not condemned as unbelievers with the world.

So we read in 1 John 5:16. And this makes us understand what mortal sin so called is. It is a sin that brings the death of the body as a chastisement, and is such that Christians cannot pray that the life of their brother may be spared; whereas in other cases they could, and their prayers were heard, and the man's life was spared who had sinned: he was pardoned in this sense. Thus Peter's indignation arose against Ananias and Sapphira, not his compassion; and they died, through their sin, as a present judgment.

So in James 5:14-16, "The prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." The man recovered from his sickness, being pardoned as a present thing, as to God's government in dealing with him in this world.

We must not confound this pardon which refers to God's dealing with us here, and the chastisements His love may inflict upon us, or deliver us from if we humble ourselves, and the eternal pardon of our souls which belongs to us through the redemption that the blood of Christ has wrought for us, the value of which nothing can alter or take away. Whereas we can easily understand that, if God chastens a man for his good when he is His child, He can take off the chastisement, and in this sense pardon the particular fault if a man humble himself, without the salvation of his soul being in question.

There is only another passage, which it may be well to refer to, John 20:23. The Lord, after He was risen, comes amongst His disciples and communicates to them the peace He had just made, and sends them out to preach that peace to others while He has gone away into heaven. In thus sending them out as His Father had sent Him, He conferred on them apostolic authority, so that they should administer this remission and forgiveness of sins to all those who believed, who became Christians. Thus when the Jews, convinced of their sin in rejecting Christ, said, thinking all was over through their rejecting Him, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replies, "Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Thus becoming Christians through his ministry they received the perfect remission which Christ obtained for them.

So in Acts 10:43; only there, as Peter himself had great difficulty in receiving any who believed from among the heathen, God gave them a testimony, as Peter says afterwards, before they were received, so that men

could not refuse to receive them. So Paul gives the same testimony; Acts 13:38, 39.

And to this day, if a heathen believes in Christ and becomes a Christian by baptism, he then receives full remission of sins. Only the apostles could do it, with not only personal authority, but discernment as to the reality of the faith of those who came; Acts 8:28, 29. The general truth remains sure, “By him all that believe are justified from all things.”

The same governmental forgiveness remains true, too, with the same difference. Peter does not pray for Ananias and Sapphira: it was a sin unto death, and they fell dead. So Paul (1 Cor. 5:3-5) judged to “deliver such an one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh.” There was apostolic discernment, authority and power. Then all were called on too to act on their responsibility as the assembly of God (vv. 12,13), and Paul associates them with him in this act of power.

In this sense the apostles had no successors. There were local authorities, elders, deacons, etc., but apostles were apostles, and did this with Christ’s authority everywhere, only Peter specially among the Jews, and Paul among the Gentiles; Gal. 2:7, 8. As such, even the greatest authorities among the Roman Catholics admit they had no successors.

But there is a succession owned of God, whose authority flows from Christ where His presence is realised in lowly grace. In Matthew 18:18, if a person were wronged, he was to speak to the wrong-doer, and win him if he could; if he could not, to take two or three more; if this did not succeed, he was to tell it—not to the clergy, not to any priest, but—to the assembly. If the wrong-doer would not

listen to the assembly, the person was free to treat him as outside it—as a heathen man and a publican. And the reason is given: that wherever two or three were gathered together in Christ's.name, really met and looking to Him, so as to act really and humbly in His name, He being there according to this promise, the act would have in ordinary church discipline (as "putting out from among yourselves") Christ's authority, and He would own and sanction it.

It is not individual apostolic power (Peter and Paul both announce these would not be after their decease, Acts 20:29-33) acting in Christ's name as Peter could, saying, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole," or Paul delivering to Satan, but an act within the limits of duty, presented by the word, and which Christ sanctions by His presence and authority, acting in the midst of two or three. This supposes they are in unity, really gathered to Christ's name, and truly looking to Him by the Spirit, as the only One who can exercise this authority, and taking His word for their guide. It is this that in the word of God takes the place (I do not say of apostolic power, for it is not individual, but) of apostolic authority, because it is Christ who really acts.

The Spirit, The Water, And The Blood

In i John 5 there seems to be (in the witness that eternal life is in the Son, not in Adam, as heretofore noticed) a double testimony: the water and the blood, which tell of death, the breach with all of the first man, that not till Christ was dead, or otherwise than by death, was there cleansing; the Spirit, witness of life according to the glory of the second Adam. Life is in the Son; but the Son, as man on the cross, as come in the midst of the old thing, has been rejected, and died, and died for atonement and cleansing. But the Son is also glorified man, and as such Head of the new thing in power.

Divine Life

There are three especial privileges and their effect in divine life—obedience, love of brethren, and confidence in God, all manifested in Christ. So in the temptation, and in death as in life, loving His own. Love is the divine part properly, the love of God shed abroad, the spring being God's revelation, and this by the Holy Ghost given. Christ was it in the world. God was in Christ. There the human side is obedience, God's will the motive as well as rule, Christ's obedience, to which we are sanctified. Confidence is the natural fruit of this revelation of God in the dependent creature, only it is but as walking in obedience, and not grieving the Holy Spirit, that we have this confidence. Not that there ever should be doubt of His love, but not liberty in love with Him. Obedience (righteousness) and love are the two figures of divine life, both prevailing in Christ. Thus love to die brethren is the divine side, which is not without importance. It is love to God, the reflex and outgoing of the sense of divine love in the heart; God in us, and so known. "As my Father loved me, so I you: abide in my love." As I have loved you, that ye also love one another. But this is really a weighty proverb. Love never fails.

The Gospel And The Church According To Scripture:

Being A Review Of “Church Doctrine, Bible Truth,” By The Rev. M. S. Sadler There are many things I accept in this book, truths that the evangelical world have, from circumstances, lost, or which have been thrown by them into the background. I shall refer to some of the chief ones here.

First, I believe the Person of the Lord has lost the place —at least in revival preaching—it ought to have, and it makes that preaching, though I doubt not often blessed, seriously defective. Salvation by the love of God to sinners—surely a blessed truth— is preached rather than Christ. This I have long felt and remarked. Still, Mr. Sadler is all wrong about it, as I shall shew. He leaves out the salvation—rather a serious defect, and certainly unscriptural.

Secondly, I have no doubt that worship, with the Lord’s supper as the great and characterising centre of it, and not preaching, is the great object of Christians assembling themselves together. Preaching and teaching is the work of individuals, and goes on pari passu. But it is not the assembly’s (and church simply means assembly) part to teach or set forth the gospel, but the apostle’s, evangelist’s, or whoever is able. The assembly is taught, and confesses the truth.

Thirdly, going to heaven—an unscriptural expression— has displaced in the evangelical mind the coming of the Lord and resurrection. But, for all that, Mr. Sadler has wholly missed the mark here too. He has read the

Scriptures enough to see the defects of the evangelical school, but has not the faith of God's elect so as to know the truth either as to the gospel or the church. Moreover, as to church history, his representation of it—I do not mean intentionally—is far away from the truth. He must have read it with a very prejudiced eye.

I must first take notice of his statements as to the Gospels in a few words. Here, as to what is evidently vital, his statements are quite unfounded. "Gospel" is not applied, as he states, exclusively to the announcement of certain events occurring at a particular time in the history of the world. "Gospel" means simply glad tidings, whatsoever they are. The verb is applied to the good news Timothy brought of the Thessalonians to Paul; 1 Thess. 3:6. As to Mark, the incarnation and birth of Christ form no part of what he calls the Gospels. Further, the gospel of the kingdom being at hand, which above all is called the gospel in the four Gospels, is not included in Mr. Sadler's list, and could not subsist, as chiefly there spoken of, till all the events which are were past. All that is peculiarly Paul's gospel (though surely recognising all) is outside all the events contained in Mr. Sadler's list. It did not begin, in fact and in doctrine, till Jesus was glorified.

Paul calls it the gospel of the glory, and this is vital to his mission, and that which connected it with the assembly or church, which he alone speaks of in his teaching as formed on earth, and speaks of as a distinct and separate ministry; and he is specially the apostle of the Gentiles. Nor even does what is said by Mr. Sadler as to the beginning of Romans give any true idea of Paul's statement as a whole there, nor even of that part of it which Mr. Sadler does refer to. I think it of great

moment to note, as I have often done in public and in private, how the apostle puts Christ personally forward here as the great subject of the gospel; but Mr. Sadler's use of this fact is partial and false. As "made of the seed of David according to the flesh," we have nothing to do with Christ. He was "a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made to the fathers": the Gentiles stand on other ground. They "glorify God for his mercy," having no promises, though prophecies spoke of them. As Son of David Christ was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and could not take the children's bread and cast it to dogs. He declares, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone."

As God manifest in the flesh, He is the object of infinite delight to the believing soul—its food, as the bread come down from heaven; and when we have found peace through the divine commentaries of the apostle on the value of His work3 the soul returns to the Gospels to feed on the bread come down from heaven. But even as to this, though souls may be drawn by the adorable grace manifested in His life, yet, till they eat His flesh and drink His blood, they have no life in them to feed on Him as bread come down from heaven. But, to shew how little foundation there is for this statement of Mr. Sadler, the meaning he ascribes to" gospel "is not the meaning of it in Mark. In the same chapter as that to which Mr. Sadler refers, the evangelist says, "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel [the glad tidings] of the kingdom, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." The preaching is the same;

Matthew 4:12, 23. Such was the constant tenor of Christ's preaching.

The twelve, consequently, were sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. So, in Luke 4:18-21, He preached the fulfilment of promise, not His death for our sins, or resurrection; and so, verse 43, He preaches the kingdom of God. In chapter 9:2 He sends them to preach the kingdom of God. As regards His death and resurrection, we read that, from the time immediately preceding the transfiguration, He forbade them strongly to say any more that He was the Christ; and so far from preaching His death, or that being the gospel then set forth, we find that, when He told them of it prophetically, they could not bear to hear of it. Yet His death and resurrection, now they are accomplished, are become the great subject of testimony (1 Cor. 15:3, 4), and that for our sins. Christ according to the flesh (that is, as presented to the Jews as their Messiah, come according to promise) Paul knew no more; 2 Cor. 5:16. See Matthew 16:20, 21; Mark 9:31; Luke 9:21, 22.

I turn to what is said of it in Romans. We have seen that Paul begins with the double character of Christ, known as Son of David according to the flesh, and Son of God by resurrection. But Mr. Sadler leaves out that Paul was not ashamed of the gospel, or that it was the power of God to salvation, because the righteousness of God was revealed in it (Rom. 1:16, 17); and that he largely sets forth (chap. 3:19-26) how Christ was set forth a propitiation through faith in His blood—how, further (chap. 4:25), He was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification. I believe the gospel will have power in the measure in which it is stated as facts, and I bless God that it comes in the shape of facts,

because the poorest can understand it. But what it is for us is spoken of. God commends His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. The shepherd seeks the sheep, the woman the piece of money, the father has his joy in recovering the prodigal.

It is not merely objective facts concerning Christ, but God's disposition towards us as displayed in them, not merely that Christ was raised but raised for our justification; not merely that God's Son came, but that God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have eternal life. It is not exclusively applied to the announcement of certain events; it is God's dealing with us revealed in them, and our conscience and heart directly dealt with by it. God was in Christ. Yet this is not the way the ministry of the gospel is put, but "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." This was Paul's estimate of the gospel history, and then of his own gospel when Christ had died, that, as though God did beseech by us, we beseech in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God. In the passage quoted by Mr. Sadler from 1 Corinthians 15, it is not that Christ died, "a certain event occurring," but Christ died for our sins; the purpose and grace of God to us as sinners is stated.

Mr. Sadler's account, then, of the gospel in the New Testament is a totally false one as to every part of the New Testament, and falsifies the whole bearing of it, and the way God deals with man in it. And this is connected with his whole system. His gospel is a system of facts, contemplated by persons ecclesiastically born of God in baptism. The gospel in Scripture is the expression in facts, and the public declaration by the Holy Ghost (sent

down when the facts were accomplished, and Christ, having by Himself made the purgation of our sins, had sat down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens), of what God is in His love to sinners, and of how they might be righteous before Him through faith in the work accomplished by the Saviour. The gospel is addressed to sinners in the attractive power of grace. “I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.” Mr. Sadler’s gospel, whether during the lifetime of Christ or after His death, is not what Scripture makes it. With him it is a history for saints: the Scriptures make it glad tidings for sinners. The facts may be the same, and these facts we have to announce; but he announces them, to those whom he deceives as to their state (calling them saints when they know they are not), as objects of contemplation, while the scripture gospel presents them to sinners as what they need, and the expression of God’s love to them.

“The gospel,” says Mr. Sadler, “does not appear in Scripture under the aspect of certain dealings of God with the individual soul apart from its fellow-souls. It does appear as certain events, or outward facts,” etc. We have seen how the gospel is stated in Scripture. Glad tidings are hardly actual operations in individual souls, but such dealings are as much presented in Scripture as pertaining to the gospel, as the blessed facts concerning the Lord. “Except a man be born again” is not exactly glad tidings, but it is with this truth the Lord meets Nicodemus. “In the day,” says Paul, “when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.” The whole Epistle to the Ephesians is occupied with what Mr. Sadler says is not the gospel, but in a large part is dealing with individual souls: and

he is wholly mistaken in saying, as he does, that it is only of the church. The church relationship with Christ only comes in at the end of chapter i; the previous part of the chapter is occupied with individuals and their relationship with the Father, and if it be not gospel, I know not what it is. The whole of the doctrinal part of the Romans—and I suppose there is some gospel there—is occupied exclusively with individual souls, and the church does not come in at all.

The church is not found in the Romans, save in the hortatory part (chap. 12), and for the plain reason that responsibility is individual, conscience individual, justification individual, judgment individual. 1 Corinthians 1, where Paul says he was sent to preach the gospel, is individual. To whom did Paul preach the gospel? to sinners standing on individual responsibility, or to the church? The answer to this will at once shew, not only the falseness, but the absurdity, of Mr. Sadler's statement. See 2 Corinthians 2:12-16: this was preaching the gospel, and nothing could be more peremptorily individual, and dealing with individual souls. We have only to go to Scripture times to learn the absurdity of the whole system. The gospel is for responsible sinners, not for the church, however needed for what Mr. Sadler calls the church now, as it surely is, because they are largely unconverted sinners, though far more responsible sinners than the heathen, but of the church anon.

Read 2 Corinthians 4:14: we have there "the glorious gospel," or rather the gospel of the glory. Paul fancied he was by manifestation of lie truth commending himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. He had not had churchmen to instruct him, it is true. Quite true,

he spoke of the death, resurrection, and glory of the Lord Jesus in his gospel. This assuredly is not what I am opposing, but that he spoke of them only as events and outward facts, apart from dealing with the individual soul. That is, what Mr. Sadler says about it is wholly and entirely false; and I repeat, this is connected with and involves the whole system. Scripture tells us God of His own will begat us by the word of truth; churchmen tell us it is by baptism. Which am I to believe? This is the question.

I might multiply proofs of what the gospel is as presented in Scripture; what I have given must suffice. Mr. Sadler seeks to prove his statements by the Gospels, forgetting that these are records of Christ's life and death, and most precious ones for those who believed already (though surely the Holy Ghost may use them to give faith), not preaching the gospel at all. They are memoirs, as called in old times, richly setting forth the Lord Jesus in the different characters in which He came among men, according to the wisdom of the Holy Ghost. He is Son of David, Emmanuel, in Matthew; the Prophet Servant in Mark; the Son of man, in grace, amongst men in Luke; and His whole Person, with the mission of the Holy Ghost, in John.

What little we have of the preaching of the gospel in Acts is altogether the contrary of what Mr. Sadler states. Peter, who never preaches that He is the Son of God, after explaining what Pentecost was, at once charges their individual sin home upon their conscience: You have crucified and slain, God has raised up, Jesus. What was their condition? And they were pricked to the heart, and he tells them, on their urgent demand, what they were to do. It is not a mere outward event, but their act

of sin, and God's having owned Him whom they had slain, so as to act by grace upon their consciences. It was for as many as the Lord their God should call. It was individual, and those that received the word profited by it. It is the same story in Acts 3:13-15, though with a different object.

In Paul's discourse at Antioch (Acts 13) it is the same thing, verses 38-41 dealing with individual souls. The same principle governs them, verses 46-48. We have no preaching to Gentiles, only we learn that its effect was individual faith. God opened the heart of Lydia; they so spake that they believed; and Paul at Athens preached Jesus and the resurrection. When the jailor asked what he should do to be saved, Paul in his answer knows nothing of Mr. Sadler's system, but says, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved. No thought of Mr. Sadler's system here, though there can be no doubt he was added to the assembly. As he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, salvation is always individual, never what Mr. Sadler makes it to be. The discourse in Acts 17 is Paul's apology, not his preaching. Of course the apostles preached Christ, not His incarnation (perhaps, as Acts 10:37, 38, His service as "anointed"), but man's rejection of Him, and God's testimony to Him in resurrection, and then whosoever believes shall receive remission of sins. That is, they did not only give many, doubtless all-important, facts, but they did always deal individually with souls. That in reasoning they sought to prove with the Jews that Jesus was the Christ is of course true, but it proves nothing. The commission given in Luke is the one that runs all through the Acts; and this was, that repentance and

remission of sins should be preached in His name, which is strictly dealing with the individual soul.

One other point remains to be noticed under this head. The church, we are told, after speaking of these "outward events," makes provision that this gospel of the kingdom should be set before her children; "she provides for the setting forth of the gospel, under this one scripture aspect, by the arrangement of her yearly round of fast and festival." We have seen how little true this statement as to the one aspect of the gospel is; but here, assuming the facts of the gospel, a second point arises, the means of communicating it. The church gives a yearly round of fasts and festivals, so that mere outward events may be before the mind without any dealing of God with the individual soul. Such is Mr. Sadler's approved method, adding a small complement of saints and saints' days— whether to complete the gospel, or for what other purpose, he does not tell us. He seems to bring it in charily (page 12). Scripture says," it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe"; but this foolishness of God dealing with the individual soul does not please the wisdom of the church. It has its own way of doing it. It keeps days, and months, and years. They turn again to the weak and beggarly elements, to which they desire again to be in bondage.

"I am afraid of you," says the apostle. It was, he tells us, going back to heathenism. And Mr. Sadler, with his knowledge of ecclesiastical history, must know that, except Easter, which was the Jewish Passover, and Pentecost, and perhaps some more recently added saints' days, the church festivals were deliberately and formally adopted from heathenism. Christians, so-called,

would have festivals, and they tacked on Christian names to heathen ones. The great Augustine informs us that “the church “did it, that if they would get drunk (which they did even in the churches), they should do so in honour of saints, not of demons. One of the Gregorys was famous for this, and left only seventeen heathen in his diocese by means of it. And another Gregory, sending another Augustine to England, directed him not to destroy the idol temples, but to turn them into churches; and as the heathens were accustomed to have an anniversary festival to their god, to replace it by one to a saint. It was thus Europe, Africa, and Asia Minor at least were Christianised. Sicily, which in spite of all efforts had remained heathen, as soon as it was decided that Mary was the mother of God at what I must call the disgraceful and infamous general council of Ephesus,68 gave up all her temples to be churches.

It was as easy to worship the mother of God as the mother of the gods. But everywhere drunkenness in honour of the saints, and even in the churches, took the place of drunkenness in honour of demigods, the great Augustine and other fathers being witnesses. Such were festal anniversaries, Christmas having been (and it is still celebrated in heathen countries) the worst of heathen festivals, to celebrate the return of the sun from the winter solstice, without a pretence that Christ was born that day, but as they could not stop the revelry, they put Christ’s birth there. Such, in real fact, is the church’s celebration of anniversaries and saints’ days. This is certain, that the apostle declares that it was a return to heathenism, so that he was afraid his labour was in vain—avowedly turning the great and mighty parts of Christianity, by which God acted on souls, to

bring them into blessed and divinely-wrought relationship with Himself, individually and collectively, into certain outward events, or outward facts, and exclusively to their announcement as occurring at particular times. “I am afraid of you.”

In result the gospel is founded on a series of mighty and divine facts, by which, through the foolishness of preaching, God, in the power of the Holy Ghost, does act on individual souls for salvation, and gather them into one. The church system makes of them a set of outward events, historically remembered by anniversaries, Mr. Sadler rejecting the dealing of God in souls by them. According to him these are born, not by the word as Scripture declares, but by a sacrament without any personal faith or operation of the word on their hearts whatever. Of this system I will now speak. The author’s statements are as follows:—

“It may be called the great ‘church’ truth of God’s word; and may be stated somewhat as follows:—

* * * * * *

“This body has always been an outward and visible body known by certain outward and visible marks. Men have always been admitted into this church by a rite or ordinance which betokened God’s special goodwill towards each one of them. This church, or body, has always been governed and instructed by a visible ministry. This church, or body, or family, always has been, and, till the second advent, always will be, a mixed body; that is, it has always consisted of two sets of persons, good and bad, penitent and impenitent, those who realise God’s love, and those who do not.”

Every one of these statements is unfounded. That in Israel and the church there was an assembly, or gathering of individuals, is quite true. Of these we will speak in due time. But it was never God's plan to save people by joining them together in a body or family, kingdom or church; specially it was not so from Abraham's time, and men were called of God before. It is false to say they were always admitted by a rite—false to call them all a church—false to say this church or body has always been governed and instructed by a visible ministry— false to say it has always been a mixed body. The statements following are all equally false, some openly absurd.

People are saved, always were, individually, by grace through the work of the Lord Jesus Christ, and life received from Him, begotten by the word of truth, justified by faith. I admit an outward visible body in Israel and in the church, though in different forms and on different principles. That God has set His manifested blessings in a known place, as Israel or the church, since He raised them up, is true; but in neither is personal salvation by coming into it as a system set up on the earth, though figuratively and formally administered there in Christian times, and, if connected with the personal confession of Christ, then formally received and enjoyed. The church, or assembly of God, has more than one application or aspect, is never the kingdom, has, in its truest sense, privileges other than salvation, and in this sense is distinct from the outward and visible body as it exists at present, though it may be found in it if viewed in a certain aspect. But we must examine the statements.

Abraham is the beginning of the religious institutions of God in the new world, and is the root of the olive-tree of promise. When the world had turned to idolatry (Josh. 24), God called Abram out, and established the promises in his seed. He was the first head of God's family, as Adam of the sinful one. There was no root of a family of God, as Adam was the root of an evil family, till Abram, though there had been saints. This, then, I recognise. But this did not begin salvation. About one-third of the world's history had passed away ere Abram was called of God. Abels and Enochs, and surely many others, had been saved before Abram's time. They were saved, according to Mr. Sadler's own statement, for he begins with Abram, without family, or church, or nation. Was the salvation different in its nature and its ground then? Were they saved in a different way? If not, the whole statement is without foundation. That, as a rule, manifested saved ones are found, where God has publicly and outwardly called a people amongst that people, is quite true. But that is a very different thing from saving men by joining them together as a body, family, kingdom, or church. Either Mr. Sadler must have two kinds and ways of salvation, or his principle is upon the face of it false. For during a third of the earth's existence, taking his own date and commencement of this process of saving men by joining them to a body, family, church, or kingdom, there was nothing of the sort to join them to. Mr. Sadler's system falsifies the nature of salvation.

In the next place the scripture states the contrary of what Mr. Sadler says. It is expressly said of Abraham (Isa. 51:2), "I called him alone, and blessed him." It is first, with Mr. Sadler, a body, and then a church, as if it

was all the same. But the blessing of Abraham was neither in a body nor a church. It was in him, and in his seed, really Christ. The true heavenly promises were made to one Seed only, “and that seed is Christ.” The apostle carefully tells us it was to one. “Now to Abraham were the promises made, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.” “If we are Christ’s, we are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to promise.” Now, that these were in the church, and baptised too, the passage itself shews. I will speak of both, but the promise is exclusively to Christ; Gal. 3:16-29. “All the promises of God are in him, yea: and in him, Amen,” 2 Cor. 1:20.

As to Abraham himself, our immediate subject, men have always, we are told, been admitted into this church by a rite. A church means an assembly, and nothing else. Into the church as formed on earth, an external body, or Christian profession, men were admitted by a rite, and that rite baptism; into the body of Christ, decidedly not. But as to Abraham and his seed according to the flesh, this is wholly a mistake. Righteousness—and I suppose that is the way of being saved— was reckoned to him in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised; Rom. 4:10, 11. That is, Scripture insists on exactly the contrary of what Mr. Sadler teaches. Circumcision was the seal in Abraham of the righteousness of faith, and the formal token of the covenant, according to the title possessed by his family. The title was the being of Abraham’s house. Uncircumcision was a condition of forfeiture: one who was of the seed of Abraham, and who was not circumcised, had broken God’s covenant. Just as if the

old man be not put off we have no part in grace, though baptised twenty times.

But though this was the formal covenant token in carrying out the covenant, God was sovereign. Every one actually born in Abraham's house, or indeed bought with money, was bound to be circumcised. Circumcision was the seal of the promise made to Abraham, and if one of the promised seed was not circumcised, he lost his title; but it was a seal to which he had a title by birth. But, further, the real blessing was by promise: circumcision did not bring into it at all. Abraham's seed was called in Isaac, and the covenant promises to that seed, not with Ishmael; but Ishmael was circumcised as much as Isaac (vv. 19-21). Nor was, indeed, circumcision, as Mr. Sadler speaks, an ordinance which betokened God's special goodwill towards the men of the family: the promise did that. It was an imposed condition subsequent, giving a required state, and, if it was neglected, the person was cut off.

Further, this body, or church, we are told, has always been governed and instructed by a visible ministry. Here, note, family is dropped. It would not do. No one instructed Abraham but God immediately, which He did very often. A large part of Genesis, and a very important part, consists of these revelations. When there was a people gathered, there was a priesthood besides Levitical assistants. When the Christian assembly was gathered, there were gifts bestowed in principle on all, though in distinctive efficacy on some, as apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers, and evangelists, and others called miraculous, or which were subsidiary. There were, besides this, local overseers and servants.

The family is now introduced again. This church, or body, or family, “has always been a mixed body.” The family was never a body, nor was the church always a mixed body; for at the beginning the Lord added such as should be saved; afterwards, as manifested on earth, it became such; but first by false brethren creeping in unawares; Jude 4. Israel never was a mixed body. In Israel moreover it was never a question of salvation, but of the place and inheritance of the promises according to the flesh, and none but those who were of the fountain of Israel, or joined by being circumcised, could enjoy them. There was a strict middle wall of partition. Each part of the statement is false.

To pursue the statements of the book: “The covenant of God has always been with this visible church.” God’s covenant was with Abraham, but he was no assembly, which is all that church means, and the promise was confined to his seed— Christ; but God’s church of the New Testament was not revealed then (Rom. 16:25; Eph. 3:3-11; Col. 1:26): the circumcised alone had part in the blessings. If they were in the covenant of promise, and were not circumcised, they were cut off. Israel subsisted by keeping the middle wall of partition up: this made the church, or the revelation of it, impossible; the church exists consequent on its being thrown down; Eph. 2:11-22. With Israel there was the covenant of the law, or the old covenant, and later, in Jeremiah, the promise of a new one to the same people. Of this covenant we reap the benefit of having it in the spirit, namely, forgiveness of sins, and to be all taught of God, and to know Him. But with the assembly there is no covenant made. The Mediator is come, the blood of the new covenant shed. Israel refused to enter into it; and we,

while enjoying the spiritual benefit of it, have, if indeed believers, what is far better—an accomplished salvation, and the Holy Ghost, the Comforter (the witness, present power, and seal of it, and the earnest of the glory that belongs to it) being heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ, and this individually.

Our body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which we have of God. Of this "the church" knows, perhaps, nothing; but they cannot deny that it is in Scripture, even if they call it fanaticism. They seek to reduce us to the condition of Judaism, but this is not Christianity nor God's church. He has set Judaism aside to establish it. Even in the lowest aspect of it, He has taken away the first to establish the second. The application of church to Israel in the Christian sense (for the word merely means assembly), that is, as the body of Christ or the habitation of God through the Spirit, is without the slightest foundation in Scripture. Nay, more, it contradicts its clearest and most important principles in reference to this subject. Every principle of the one system is in direct contrast with those of the other, save that both belong to God. What the church is I shall consider presently.

"The word of God," we are next told, "has always been addressed to this outward visible body." The Epistles, where addressed to churches, were so no doubt, but all composing churches were held to be really saints. But to say "the word of God has," etc., shews only what a mist of their own raising these people are living in. Paul's gospel, he specially declares, was to every creature under heaven; I suppose that was the word of God. In Mark we read, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." And Paul, in the passage

quoted (Col. 1), carefully distinguishes his being a minister of the gospel, and a minister of the church to fulfil or complete the word of God; and here was one contrast between Israel and the church. Israel had no such commission. It was a nation; and those of the fountain of Jacob had the word and the promises, and there was no word of God to others, but a law and prophets to them. God has raised up a ministry in Christianity because it is grace to sinners, wherever they are.

Before I proceed further to examine Mr. Sadler's views of the church, I will, because of its importance to souls, examine definitely and more at length whether salvation is individual. The church, to which I attach the greatest possible importance, I will examine fully; but salvation is individual. If there was but one saved person in the world, he would be saved as men are now; but he could not be an assembly. When the Lord says, "Ye must be born again," he speaks necessarily and clearly of individuals. Whether it be by baptism, we will inquire just now, but it is individual. "So is every one that is born of the Spirit" is individual. "The wind bloweth where it listeth." At the end of chapter 3, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." The promise of living water in John 4 is individual. "The Son quickeneth whom he will" in John 5 is individual. The promise in John 6:40 is individual, and whatever the eating means (and most certainly it is not die Lord's supper69), it is individual, as verses 35,44 plainly shew. Verse 47 is conclusive as to individual salvation. John 7 is individual, as verses 37, 38. So are chapters 9; 10 (vv. 27, 28) is as clear as words can make it; and this even if the sheep are all scattered by Satan. "Catcheth," in

verse 12, and “plucketh,” in verse 28, are the same word. Chapter 11:25, 26 is individual.

I might quote other passages; but the truth is that all John’s writings are strictly individual. The church is never introduced as a truth in them at all—not even in chapter 17, which seems most like it. It does not speak of the assembly or church, but of the unitedness of the individuals in grace. There is indeed a, threefold unity, of the eleven disciples, of those believing through their word, and of all Christians in glory. It may perhaps surprise some, that in the Epistles the church is never spoken of as a body formed on earth by any besides Paul.

In the Acts, Peter’s words apply to individuals. “Repent and be baptised every one of you for [to] the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” It was to as many as the Lord their God should call. They are addressed as individuals, and there is no hint of a body or assembly. Men repent individually, and are forgiven sins individually. I do not doubt they came into the assembly, but nothing is said by him about it. The first intimation of union with Christ in one body is at Paul’s conversion; Acts 9:5. In Peter’s sermon to Cornelius it is the universal testimony, “Whosoever believeth in him,” Acts 10:43. So Paul: “By him all that believe are justified from all things,” Acts 13.

It is the same story with the jailor at Philippi, “Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house” —no word of joining a body to be saved. I do not doubt a moment that they became part of the assembly of God, but not a word is said of it connected with salvation. So Paul preached “Jesus and the resurrection”

at Athens, and “kept back nothing that was profitable” at Ephesus, preaching “repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ”: individual dealing with souls, and nothing of the assembly or church, and that in the very place where he afterwards unfolded it.

In Paul’s account of his preaching before Agrippa, there is no word of the church in his commission to sinners. He was sent “to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to fight, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me.” Consequently he shewed everywhere that men “should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.” It was individuals; he pressed a work wrought in them; but not a word of the assembly, or joining it, in his testimony to the world.

Now this is the more remarkable, because Paul was the one who specially, and indeed Paul only, built up in church truth those who did believe. But, as we have seen, it was a distinct part of his ministry, as unfolded in Colossians 1. I believe what we may call church truth is more important than ever; and in going to the Gentile as he did, Paul laid the foundation of it (for their free admission was externally the basis of that truth, which God is now mercifully bringing out again); but for salvation he preached “repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.”

I have already spoken of the Romans, where all in the doctrinal part is individual, as responsibility, repentance, justification, and being dead to sin, must be in their very nature with sinners. Hence, having spoken of what Christians knew as such of the spirituality of the law, he

changes from “we” to “I”— “We know,” “I am carnal.” But all is without exception and carefully individual.

In Corinthians he speaks of the assembly; but so far is the church, as God’s building, from being the way of saving, that he speaks of wood, and hay, and stubble, which was to be burnt; and presses upon them, in chapter 10, that they might be partakers of the sacraments, so-called—be in the external or sacramental church—and fall in the wilderness all the same. From that70 on he speaks more of the body than of the house. But of these points anon. But when, as in 2 Corinthians 5, he turns to the gospel and salvation, individuality takes its full place again.

In the end of Galatians 2 again, we see individual state. The promise by faith of Jesus Christ is given to them that believe. The putting on Christ is not salvation, but the giving up being Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female, and being Christians and nothing else. It was (begging pardon of the Thirty-nine Articles) a badge of their profession. But we are children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and heirs crying, Abba, Father, but all this is individual (Gal. 3 and 4); and they are then carefully warned against keeping days and months and years. Faith that worketh by love was the availing thing. All is carefully individual. They were all in the assembly already.

In Ephesians 2:8 salvation is individual, though it be the Epistle in which the doctrine of the church is most fully unfolded; but it is a second order of truth, not salvation. It is when speaking of the individual, that he speaks of the gospel of their salvation, and then they were sealed, by which they were members of the body; chap. 1:13.

The first truth is children or sons by faith, as in Galatians.

Philippians is all individual, though the assembly be fully recognised.

It is in Colossians the apostle distinguishes his ministry of the gospel and of the church. Holy days were but a shadow of things to come, now passed away; Christ being the body, they were now mere heathenish Judaism, against which he was warning them. Take chapter 3, from chapter 2:20, indeed, and see how all is individual.

In Thessalonians men obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, not by the assembly, as in chapter 1:9, where it is clearly individual. In 2 Thessalonians 2:13, 14, we have a formal statement that it is by sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, whereunto they were called by Paul's gospel to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Of Timothy I will speak. Titus tells us that the grace of God brings salvation, but adds no word of the church. Of chapter 3:51 will speak.

Of Hebrews and the rest I need not speak at large. The assembly or church forms no part of doctrine there. That Christ leads our praises in it (chap. 2:12) we learn, and (chap. 12:23) that there is an assembly of firstborn, whose names are written in heaven. Conscience, which is always individual, is perfected, and this gives us boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. Faith is that of an individual coming to God, and by that he obtains witness that he is righteous through the more excellent sacrifice. That salvation is through joining an assembly is alike unknown and opposed to Scripture.

Men are justified by faith, then sealed by receiving the Holy Ghost, through which they are of the one body. Baptism is their formal admission into the external company on earth. Of this we must now speak, and shew all Mr. Sadler's theory utterly false.

I believe, let me now say, that the truth of God as to the assembly is, in these days, of the last importance; that God's order was to gather souls as well as to convert and save them; and that many of our highest privileges are connected with it. But the assembly or church has two very distinct aspects in Scripture, consequent upon its being formed by the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost—that of the body of Christ, and that of the dwelling-place of the Holy Ghost. Besides this, in the latter aspect, that is, as God's house, it has a double character—what Christ builds, and what man builds responsibly.

All this, which is declared in Scripture, is missed by Mr. Sadler. All his thoughts are vague and in confusion; all his statements as to the Ephesians unfounded. He says (p. 45), "a kingdom or fellowship which he deigns to call his body." He never calls His kingdom His body. "He instituted means of grace, by which they were to be brought into this fellowship" (p. 45), and (p. 46) "all baptised into his name are to be accounted as belonging to it… In this case the baptised are the church (p. 46), and responsible for the grace of having been made members of Christ." All this is false.

In 1 Corinthians 12:13 we read, "By one Spirit we are all baptised into one body." That this is the Holy Ghost, and not baptism by water, is as clear as words can make it. The apostle is speaking of spiritual manifestations—gifts

given by the Holy Ghost: “All these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptised into one body.” One has only to read the chapter to see, with unquestionable evidence, that the apostle is speaking of the Holy Spirit Himself.

But, to leave this beyond all controversy, we have a positive declaration by the Lord Himself of what the baptism of the Spirit is: “Ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence,” Acts 1:5. Accordingly, on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues. That coming of the Holy Spirit was the baptism of the Holy Ghost spoken of, and of these and other gifts, which were the fruit of it, the apostle is speaking in 1 Corinthians.

That the apostles even ever received Christian baptism there is not a trace in Scripture, nor indeed the hundred and twenty who were together. They were to wait for the promise of the Father, receiving power by the Holy Ghost coming upon them, which took place accordingly, and “Christ being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear,” Acts 2:33. This was the baptism of the Holy Ghost, by which they were baptised into one body. That water baptism introduced into the body, or made men members of the body, is a notion wholly unknown to Scripture. “He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit.” The gift of the Spirit is always distinguished from it moreover. They were to repent and be baptised for (to)

the remission of sins, and they would receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; Acts 2:38.

In the case of Cornelius, he received the Holy Ghost, God's proof that He would have him in His assembly, as formed down here, into which consequently Peter orders him to be admitted by baptism. Whether before or after, they are always distinct. So in Samaria they believed what Philip preached and were baptised. After that two of the apostles go down and pray that they may receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet He was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. So in Acts 19 twelve men, on Paul's instruction, were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. Baptism and the reception of the Holy Ghost are distinct; and it is by the latter that believers are baptised into one body, which is a real union with Christ. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit," by which we are members of His body, He being the Head.

I turn now to being born of God in baptism. This is equally unwarranted by Scripture—nay, formally contradicted. "Of his own will," says James, "begat he us by the word of truth"; and Peter, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever," 1 Pet. 1:23. Paul tells us, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel" (1 Cor. 4:15), and he was not sent to baptise—strange, if men were born of God by it. He tells the Thessalonians God had chosen them to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the

truth, whereunto He called them by his gospel; and the Lord declares, “Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken to you.” I have quoted positive passages. He who keeps to the word will find it confirmed in every page.

But we will examine the passage which speaks of being born, as they allege, in baptism: John 3:5. It is only an effort to squeeze it out of the passage, for of baptism directly it does not speak. Further, it is well to remark that it is not said, born of the Spirit by, or with, water, but born of water and of Spirit. I have already said the apostles were never baptised (they were clean through the word spoken) nor is there the idea of communication of a nature by water. “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” The water is necessarily dropped here; John 3:6.

As a testimony of the extreme ignorance of Mr. Sadler as to scriptural truth, I would cite from page 54 the declaration that we find no allusion to such a use of water in the books of the Old Testament. This is a singular preoccupation of spirit. The Lord demands how Nicodemus, being a teacher of Israel, did not know this: the Old Testament, that is, furnished him fully with this truth. Let us turn to Ezekiel 36:25: “Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh: and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them, and ye shall dwell in the land… And I will call for the corn,” etc., dwelling on temporal promises to Israel in the last day, which last promises lead the Lord to say,

“If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?” and He goes on to the fuller doctrine of the cross, which involved the rejection of Messiah, and the impossibility of the present fulfilment of earthly promises.

This leads us at once to see what being born of water means; it is purifying from evil, sanctifying through the truth; and the Father’s word is truth, that by which we are positively told by James we are begotten, born again according to Peter, who distinctly says, “Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit.” “Ye are clean,” says the Lord Himself, “through the word which I have spoken unto you”; so Paul, “that he might sanctify and cleanse it, by the washing of water by the word.” There are two things, and, to set Mr. Sadler quite at ease, at the same time communication of a new life or nature. “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit,” and the purifying the soul by obeying the truth, for this birth is by the word, the incorruptible seed of God. The whole tenor of the Lord’s statement contradicts the “church” doctrine. “The wind bloweth where it listeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit.” Whereas it is tied in that system to a formal rite, which all are bound by the system to carry out universally. Besides, it is the way of seeing the kingdom, as well as entering it, with the solemn statement of “Verily, verily.” Does baptism make people see it? Not now, for the child at any rate, to whom that system habitually applies it, does not see it at all; not the kingdom of glory, for they admit that many baptised never see that at all.

To a Jew (a rabbi who looked for the kingdom of God, and had read Ezekiel, and looked for the kingdom

according to that and other passages) the being born of water and the Spirit had the clearest and fullest signification. But nothing blinds like the church system. Speaking of the insignificance of water does not concern me, as I do not apply it to baptism by water at all. But this is a mistake, because baptisms by water were the universal figure for cleansing among the Jews, even with proselytes, at least women. All the rest of Mr. Sadler's statement has nothing to do with the matter; save that, when he rejects believing as the way of being born, the scripture replies, "We are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." The word nowhere joins the Holy Ghost and water as baptism, as if the Holy Ghost acted in it and by it. It is always a distinct thing.

But further: baptism is not even a sign of the new birth, but of death. We are baptised to Christ's death. It is a figure of death and burial, as Romans 6 and Colossians 2 clearly testify, and hence is connected with remission of sins because (in coming up out of death—death with Christ, which is figured by it, and risen with him) we come up forgiven all trespasses, as is said in Colossians 2, and, having, as to our profession, left the old man behind us, we put off the old man, crucified with Him, reckoning ourselves dead.

And note, our resurrection with Christ is not the same as quickening. In resurrection Christ is viewed as a raised man. God raised Him from the dead, and us, for faith, with Him. But we are baptised to His death. I go down there into His death, and am raised with Him, "through faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." It is not the Son quickening whom He will, nor simply our being born; but Christ a dead man raised, which implies the remission of sins for those who have

part in His death, buried with Him, and consequently to walk in newness of life, reckoning oneself dead to sin, and alive to God in Him.

What Mr. Sadler says as to Ephesians is a mistake. Church union with Christ is not the only or great subject of the epistle, doctrinal or hortatory. You do not come to it till the very end of chapter 1. All the previous part, our calling and inheritance, is based on our relationship with the Father, and being in the same place as Christ, as to this, as sons. In the hortatory part we are to be followers (mimetai) of God as dear children, and walk like Christ. In our relationship with Christ, it is with Him as man, whom God has raised. Then the body, and our quickening with Him, is spoken of. There is no reference to this relationship in the hortatory part, except in speaking of husband and wife.

Now as to other passages connected with baptism, the "church principle" gives remission of sins by it regularly, when the person has committed none. So that the application of all this is singular enough in this system. A heathen or a Jew, baptised to Christ, does, I doubt not, receive administratively forgiveness of all past sins—I believe a great deal more in connection with Christ's death (a believer, as to his conscience, is perfected for ever), but I believe that he comes in as one who has died with Christ, and left all the old things behind him—is indeed as a risen man.

But we must consider the passages, which are of great importance in their place. We are all baptised to (never "into") something, as "to" Moses, "to" John's baptism, where it is the same word; and where it is said, "baptised to," or "for, the remission of sins," it is that

which is the portion given in Christ, and we come to partake of it, just as we do to have death to sin; where a person has been a sinner, he receives it, as to all he had done, in it. Baptism is that by which we are introduced into the enclosure in which God has set His blessings administratively on earth, though He be sovereign. There is forgiveness there, the Holy Ghost there, the administration of all God's blessings down here. On entering, I enter into the condition and place where these blessings are enjoyed. Hence we find, washing away sins, the consequent receiving of the Holy Ghost, indeed every blessing in Christ, as far as they exist down here, connected with it. But no one save those blinded by "church principles "could, as having read the Scriptures, ascribe operatively and effectually to baptism the possession of these privileges. The blood of Christ, and nothing else, washes away our sins before God; but I come professedly to Christ in baptism, in whom and where this blessing is. It is the admission into the open confession of His name and death, and, in a certain measure, resurrection. Hence guarding it where he says it saves, Peter says, "not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer (request, eperotema) of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

As to being born in it, such a thought is never found. Regeneration is connected with it in Titus, and modern language has connected that word with being born again. It is only found in one other place in Scripture. "In the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory" — the millennial earth, a new state or order of things. Thus Peter, when he speaks of saving us, is referring expressly to Noah, who came

through the flood, which was death to the old world, into a new one, and was buoyed up by that which was death to them, into that new one—was saved by or through water; so we, seeking a good conscience, find it in Christ's death, brought safe with Him into the new place of resurrection. I believe regeneration in Titus refers to baptism as a sign of this. But we are washed by passing out of the old condition of heathenism, or Judaism, or fleshly life in any sense, into the new state of things, which is, where real, a new creation altogether, of which we are thus—professedly at any rate— partakers. But then Paul carefully distinguishes this from the renewing of the Holy Ghost. I have no doubt he is thinking of the regeneration as a real thing, but not as the renewing of the Holy Ghost as an actual inward work. It is a change of state and position, the renewing an actual internal work. This is never connected with baptism.

I have spoken of Acts 2:38, and of Acts 22:16. Ephesians 5:26 has, on the face of it, nothing to do with the matter: the washing is by the word. Mark 16:16 brings in faith on preaching. Now, if a heathen believed Jesus was Son of God, and refused to be baptised, he refused to be a Christian when he knew he ought; for him it was refusing to confess unto salvation. It has nothing to do with any efficacy in baptism; Tit. 3:5; 1 Pet. 3:21. I have spoken of Romans 6:1-4 and Colossians 2:12. To say that being baptised to Christ's death is being born of God is as absurd as to the meaning of the rite, as it is groundless. That death is the force and meaning of the rite is quite true, and it is so used by the apostle; but it has nothing to do with any inward work, or being born again.

On Galatians 3 (p. 58) also I have spoken. Romans 6 and Colossians 2 are both used as public profession; Romans, as shewing that living on in sin denied it; Colossians, that this profession of being dead subverted the religion of ordinances, which Mr. Sadler is insisting on. We are no longer alive in the world in Colossians, we are dead to sin in Romans. The conclusion Mr. Sadler draws from the passage in Romans, in page 56, is exactly the contrary of that drawn by the apostle. The difficulty was, if one man's obedience made us righteous, we might continue to live in sin. How shall we that have died to sin live in it any longer? And that is what you did professedly, he goes on to say, in baptism; you were baptised to Christ's death. You are denying your profession of Christ by such an argument.

As to Colossians 3:1-10, it is not "yet" (p. 57), but "because," and the passage proves the contrary of what it is cited for. If I am risen with Christ, I have power, and am to mortify these evil members—for he will not recognise the Christian as having his life in this world; he is professedly dead and risen with Christ.

What Paul is shewing in 1 Corinthians 10 is that, belonging sacramentally to the church, taking in both sacraments, did not secure salvation, which I wholly accept. It was a professed deliverance out of the world, but not the new birth. In Jude he shews the same thing: they had an outward deliverance, like Israel, but, he adds, not having believed (and we are children of God by faith), He afterwards destroyed them. This is a poor argument for the value of baptism, and, note, saving out of Egypt has nothing to do with personal or eternal salvation. It was the deliverance of a people, a change of situation; which is just what baptism effects, not

involving any real change or internal salvation at all. And so both the passages declare: a very necessary warning when such a book as Mr. Sadler's is written.

It is perfectly true that in his epistles to the various churches the apostle treats those to whom he writes as saints; not indeed on the ground that Mr. Sadler puts it, but on the solid ground of God's work—on that of real faith—as I shall shew. In the Galatians alone he speaks doubtfully in one passage, but recovers his confidence in the next chapter. And observing days, and months, and years, was one great cause of his doubts—the Judaism Mr. Sadler recommends; Gal. 4:10, 11-20. He recovers his confidence, looking to the Lord; chap. 5:10. He anxiously warns the Corinthians, but is not in doubt of their real Christianity. Brought out of heathenism by the word and Spirit of God, and passing by baptism formally, as Mr. Sadler says, into God's established place of blessing, the apostle treats them as real Christians, but on the ground of their real faith, never on the ground of a fancied work in baptism. He does shew in two instances what baptism implied in the Christian (Rom. 6; Col. 1), but never as the ground of addressing them as saints. When he does in this way refer to it, it is to warn them not to deceive themselves by such a thought; 1 Cor. 10. Let us see this.

In Romans 1:7 they are saints by God's calling, and (v. 8) he thanks God for them all that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. He sought to be comforted by their mutual faith.

The church of God at Corinth were saints by God's calling, sanctified in Christ Jesus. The formal profession is even distinguished as those who everywhere called on

the name of the Lord, though treating them as true, unless proved otherwise; and, so far from not esteeming them as real saints, he declares that God would confirm them to the end, so that they should be blameless in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ. God had called them into the fellowship of His Son, and He was faithful. The worst among them turned out in fact, sad as his conduct was, a real Christian, and was restored. Accustomed to heathen habits, they had everything to learn morally. Indeed, as we read in the Acts, God had a great people in this notedly corrupt city. In those days dissipation in sin was called Corinthianising. In the second epistle, they being restored in state by his first, he speaks of them with full confidence, “having confidence in you all,” chap. 2:3. Titus’ spirit had been refreshed by them all. His boasting of them was found to be a truth. The whole epistle shews his confidence in the reality of their Christianity. In chapter 12 he is afraid he may have to use sharpness as to some who might have sinned, but of their true Christianity no doubt.

Of the Galatians I have spoken. There for a moment he stood in doubt. But this proves what I am saying, and that Mr. Sadler is all wrong. For they had been all baptised like all the rest. It was their actual state which raised the question, though they had been; and when that was turning from the truth, their baptism availed nothing as to their being treated as saints. “Ye did run well: who did hinder you, that ye should not obey the truth?” Nor does he therefore boldly call them saints at the beginning, though in looking to Christ he regained his confidence. Their baptism did not suffice for this.

In Ephesians there is no doubt. They were not only saints, but faithful in Christ Jesus; but here the apostle

distinguishes between one Spirit, one body, and one hope of our calling; and one Lord, one faith, and one baptism—the latter, as public profession. But of the Ephesians he affirms that they were quickened of God when dead in trespasses and sins. They had been sealed after believing. His address is not founded on their baptism, but on their faith. Every verse of the Epistle bears testimony to it. The church is one which Christ has loved, sanctified by the word, and will present glorious to Himself: one was as true as the other, His loving, sanctifying, and presenting glorious to Himself.

The Philippians gives the same testimony—that he looked to a real work. He was thankful for their fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now, being confident of this very thing, that He that had begun a good work would perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ. He writes to them on the ground of true faith and grace, not on that of baptism, assured moreover that the work would go on to the day of Jesus Christ.

In Colossians “faithful brethren” is again added. And what was the ground of his writing? He had heard of their faith in Christ Jesus, and their love to all the saints. It was reality, not baptism. They too had been dead in their sins, and God had quickened them with Christ and forgiven them all their trespasses. Would Mr. Sadler say this to all his congregation, and, as Paul to the Corinthians, that God would confirm them unto the end? and to the Philippians, that He who had begun a good work in them would perform it unto the day of Jesus Christ—that they were all complete in Christ? or with Ephesians, that the same power had wrought in them which had raised Christ from the dead and set Him at

God’s right hand? He knows he would not; his whole theory is false and delusive. Preach to them as baptised, and not as heathen—all well and right. But the Epistles go on the ground of real Christianity in the soul.

With the Thessalonians, he knew not their baptism but their election of God, because his gospel had come to them, not in word only, but in power and in the Holy Ghost; so that they were ensamples, and so spoken of that he needed not say anything. The word worked effectually in them; they were his hope and joy and crown, when Christ came. In the second, their faith grew exceedingly, and the love of every one of them all towards each other abounded.

Of Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, I have no need to speak: they were individually known and chosen brethren.

The whole thing is an awful delusion, which the reading of the Epistles exposes at once, in its bare nakedness and soul-deceiving character. But we have an Epistle which speaks of the converse of this, and, if possible, proves more strongly, because negatively, what I say. The church was soon corrupted.

Jude tells us that false brethren had crept in unawares. Who could creep unawares into Mr. Sadler’s system? Baptised, no doubt, but crept in, and unawares, but shewing distinctly that, where they were not real saints, they were not recognised as saints on the ground of baptism indiscriminately, but detected as having no business there. They had crept in unawares, spots in their love-feasts, feeding themselves without fear. If Mr. Sadler’s theory were right, why not address them as saints, like all the rest, by baptism?

Peter equally takes the ground of true saints, elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, and declares they were kept by the power of God, through faith, to the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. They had purified their souls in obeying the truth. Christ was precious to them. In the Second Epistle he stirs up their pure minds by way of remembrance. The other Epistles are mere treatises, not addressed formally to Christians.

Only that in John some had gone out that it might be manifested they all were not of them. They had slipped in undetected, but were manifested as “not of us.” God did not allow them to remain: if of them, they would have continued, shewing clearly what “of us” means. But baptism is never laid as the ground of addressing saints as such, but faith and being obedient to the truth: in a word, being Christians in truth, though some false brethren began to creep in unawares.

I conclude then (that, while baptism was the public and outward admission into the Christian assembly, as formed on earth, and so to its privileges here, and so formally to the remission of sins, which was found there, and hence, when sins were already committed, their remission received administratively, and men passed into a new place and position, being accounted to have wholly left in Christ’s death, to which men were baptised, their old standing), it is not being born again at all according to John 3, it has nothing good or bad to do with being a member of Christ’s body, nor was it any way receiving the Holy Ghost, which is always carefully distinguished from it. It is not receiving life, not being made a member of Christ’s body, not receiving the Holy Ghost. The whole theory is antiscriptural as to the

meaning and import of baptism, as well as to any fancied actual efficacy.

I now turn to the scriptural view of the church or assembly of God. It is formed, we have seen, by the descent of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit is given to believers as a seal on God's part of their faith, by reason of their being cleansed by the blood of Christ. They are sealed to the day of redemption. The effect of this in the individual, though full of blessing, and as important as the others of which we shall speak, is not our subject now. But the result, as stated in Scripture, as to the assembly, is that it is the body of Christ, each individual who is thus sealed being united to Christ the Head, and a member individually of His body; all thus sealed constituting His body. This, though it will be perfected as a whole in glory, is constituted on earth; for the Holy Ghost has come down here consequent on the Head being a Man exalted to the right hand of God. This may be seen in Ephesians 1:19-23, as it is in the counsels of God: and in 1 Corinthians 12 as in fact down here.

But there is another aspect of the assembly, the house of God: only we must remark that the body of Christ exists by true union with Christ by the Holy Ghost. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit," and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." If he be thus united to Christ, it is a real thing. "If Christ be in you," says the apostle. People have taken the Spirit of Christ here to be a temper or state; but the words cited which follow shew at once the fallacy of this. "If Christ be in you "is the sense the Holy Ghost puts upon it. Ephesians 5 clearly shews what this body is—the bride of Christ. It is what Christ loved, and which He will present to Himself, as God presented Eve to Adam. It is no doubt

established on earth, because the Holy Ghost is come down to earth, and the baptism of the Holy Ghost took place then; but it is real—if one member suffers, all suffer with it; if one rejoice, all rejoice with it. We are members one of another. Of this the Lord's supper is the symbol and the outward bond; 1 Cor. 10:17. Baptism with water is not what makes us members.

But I now turn to the house. God's dwelling amongst men is a great truth, and the consequence of redemption. He did not dwell with Adam innocent; He did not dwell with Abraham. But as soon as Israel was redeemed out of Egypt, though by an external redemption, He came to dwell among them in the Shechinah of glory. We read in Exodus 29, "They shall know that I Jehovah their God have brought them up out of the land of Egypt, that I might dwell among them." Consequent on a true eternal redemption, Christ as Man being at the right hand of God, the Holy Ghost comes down, making the assembly His dwelling-place.71 But here we have to look at the house, as Scripture presents it to us, in two distinct ways; according to the purpose of God, and indeed as founded by Him on earth; and as administered by man responsibly.

According to the purpose of God, it is not yet complete. The Lord says, "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This is not yet complete. At least, we trust that souls will be yet converted. God is not slack concerning His promise, but long-suffering. So Peter: "To whom coming as unto a living stone … ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house," 1 Pet. 2:4, 5. So in Ephesians 2:21: "In whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." Here, in the first case,

the Lord Himself builds, in the others no instrumentality is spoken of: the living stones come, the building grows, to a holy temple. This is the Lord's work and it cannot fail, and the stones are living stones, built on Christ the living Stone. It may be visible, as it was at the beginning; or invisible, as it has become through man's sin. But the Lord builds His temple, and that cannot fail, and His work cannot be frustrated.

But the external body, as a house and temple down here, in which we are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit, has been entrusted to the responsibility of men, as everything has to begin with. "As a wise master-builder," says Paul, "I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon." Here is man's responsibility. Wood and hay and stubble may be built into the house. Till God judges it, it is the temple of God, as the Lord calls the temple His Father's house, though it was made a den of thieves. We have instruction how to conduct ourselves in a state of things which, in its hidden germ, began in the apostles' day. Where there is the form of godliness, denying the power of it, we are to turn away; to purge ourselves from the vessels to dishonour. In the beginning it could be said, The Lord added daily such as should be saved, and that visibly. Now we say, "The Lord knoweth them that are his"; and "every one that nameth the name of the Lord," must "depart from iniquity." The wolf may catch and scatter the sheep, but cannot pluck72 them out of the Saviour's hand.

The mystery of iniquity wrought in the apostles' days. All, at the end of his career, sought "their own, not the things of Jesus Christ"; and he knew that after his

decease, the barrier gone, grievous wolves would enter in, and from within men arise speaking perverse things to draw the disciples after them. Jude tells us that false brethren had already crept in unawares, and these, we learn from him, were the class who would be judged by Christ at His coming. And John tells us that the last times were already there, manifested by apostates. The church then, as God's house, might be largely composed of what would be burned up—wood, and hay, and stubble. But when this was so, when there was a form of godliness and the power denied, from such true Christians were to turn away, and walk with those who called on the name of the Lord out of a pure heart. True saints would be hidden, or might be, so that we could only say, the Lord knows them that are His.

But there are explicit directions what to do when this is the case—turn away from them. The church could have no authority, for Christians were called upon to listen to Christ's judgment of it. See the seven churches. Jezebel would be its teacher, the mother of its children; and from its lukewarmness it would be spued out of Christ's mouth. And the apostle in 2 Timothy 3, when the perilous times of the last days should be come, refers to the Scriptures as able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. When the church would be a false and insecure guide (having the form of godliness, denying the power of it) the believer is referred to the Scriptures as a secure one, and called on authoritatively to listen to and hear the Spirit's judgment of the church.

The body of Christ, though set up manifestly and visibly on the earth, cannot have false members, because it is such by real union—by the Holy Ghost—with Christ its

glorified Head. The baptism of the Holy Ghost formed it, not the baptism of water. It is the church which Christ loved, and for which He gave Himself to sanctify and cleanse with the word, and which He will present to Himself a glorious church without spot or wrinkle or any such thing. He nourishes and cherishes it, as a man does his own body, for we are members of His body. But as this is by the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, the assembly takes another character. It is the habitation of God through the Spirit—His house; in its origin identical in its extent with the body—the Lord adding daily those whom He was saving. This also will be an everlasting character of the assembly of God. Glory in the church, to all the generations of the age of ages, is the desire of the apostle, and in the new heavens and the new earth the tabernacle of God, the heavenly Jerusalem, will be with men. This Christ builds; it is formed of living stones, and grows into a holy temple; the workman is the Lord Himself in His grace. Nor can Satan prevail against it.

But, as man himself, the world under Noah, the law and priesthood in Israel, the kingdom in Solomon, and Gentile power in Nebuchadnezzar, it has, as to present administration and manifestation, been committed to man’s responsibility, and man, as in each of the cases named, has signally failed, and failed the first thing. So it was with man, with Noah, with the law, with the priesthood, with the royalty, with the Gentile power. So it has been with the professing church. As to general decay, all sought their own, the last days had come, nor was there to be recovery. As a dispensation on earth, they did not continue in God’s goodness, and would be cut off. Evil men and seducers would wax worse and worse; there would be a form of godliness, denying the

power; and the evil that had come in by false brethren would grow to be subject of judgment when the Lord came. History only confirms it.

Things were read in the churches forty years after John's death which would scarcely be received by an infidel now as doctrine, and contained practices as superior piety which would be scouted in decent society. I challenge anybody to deny it who has read the Shepherd of Hermas. It issued in the abominations of the middle ages and of Romanism, which truly made, as an infidel has said, the annals of the church the annals of hell. No heathenism was so systematically bad. Baptism does not make any one a member of Christ. The church was set up visibly, both as the body and the house. The body nothing can touch, because it exists by real union with Christ, the Head. The house, according to the counsels of God, is built by Christ, and is not yet complete; but, as every system ordained of God, as formed down here, it has been committed to the responsibility of man, and man has failed. And not only will it be set aside, but it is there judgment begins. Corruption and apostasy mark its result, and it will be set aside, as Israel was. This, indeed, is a general truth, that everything has been first committed to man's responsibility when it was established, and man responsible has failed, and all is to be set up in power and perfectness in the Second Man.

2 Timothy directs us how to act when the church has failed, as 1 Timothy gives us the order in which it was established. The attributing the blessings and promises, given to the body and the house as built by Christ, to the house as carried out by responsible man and built of wood and hay and stubble, is the origin of popery and

what is called Puseyism, leading men to trust in, and cling to, that which God is going to judge and cut off, instead of to the word of God, to which He has referred us in the perilous times of the last days. It is just this, with many false details, which the church services do, and Mr. Sadler seeks to justify.

I notice a few details. Regeneration is a falsely used word. But being born again is not by union with Christ, but by His quickening power by the word; nor is baptism being born again. It is wholly false that the Galatians were children of God by faith, because, as Mr. Sadler says, as many of them as had been baptised to Christ had put on Christ. Indeed Mr. Sadler contradicts himself, for he says it is a needful supplement to faith, and, if a supplement, it could not be because of baptism they were children by faith. The Galatians states they were children by faith, and faith only. That in baptism they had professedly put 04 Christ, in contrast with being Jews or Greeks, or anything else, is true. But the epistle expressly speaks of the Spirit as that by which those who are sons by faith cry, Abba, Father. The doctrine that a child who has not committed sins receives remission of sins in baptism is a cruel mockery. That he is baptised to that which thus belongs to Christianity, as its leading privilege, may be true, if it be done intelligently.

Speaking of being baptised “into” anything is a mistake. It is “to,” as to Moses, to John’s baptism. There is no Christian covenant. The kingdom of God is not the church, nor the body of Christ. That men enter into the kingdom by baptism may be all well, though entrance into the house seems to be more accurate. It is into the public company of God’s professing people, but even so

“house” is only a figurative word; but they do enter where God dwells in the Person of the Holy Ghost.

I do not discuss the question of Calvinism. Mr. Sadler’s statements as to the falling from grace are not sustained at all by the passages he quotes. That they may fall away after being baptised Scripture plainly states. He cannot have a better human statement as to it than his Article XVII. Baptism is not the seal of any covenant. It is expressly declared that the Spirit is the seal of faith in the believer. The whole of this part of Mr. Sadler’s book assumes as admitted truth what there is not the smallest warrant for in Scripture (as page 95). There is no admission into a Christian covenant. Regeneration is not grafting into Christ. Circumcision was not entering into the covenant, nor did it effect that infants should be children of God under the old dispensation. The whole statement is fancy. “Children of God “was not a title even of believers in the old dispensation; see Gal. 4. This and the following pages are a congeries of unfounded assertions, but the general discussion of the subject in the previous pages suffices.

I will now take up Mr. Sadler’s teaching on the Lord’s supper, the precious and blessed memorial of the Lord Himself, who deigns to care that we should remember Him. If ever there was anything calculated to touch the heart of a Christian, it is this; nor do I doubt that, as with all means of grace, so, especially with this, positive and direct blessing ensues to the believer. For my own part I know of nothing, of what I may call the institutions of Christianity, connected with so much joy and fruitful influence to my soul. No Christian will despise preaching, teaching, exhortation, reading the word, or common praise and prayer, if he knows his

need or his privileges, nor indeed other things less properly institutions; but in none are the affections, as formed by the Spirit of God, so fully and solemnly moved as in the Lord's supper. But I reject, and reject as indeed destructive of this, the view Mr. Sadler takes of it. Solemnity, seriousness, and self-judgment in going to it is every way to be cultivated. But superstition always cultivates mystery and fear in our nearest approaches to God; Christianity, the contrary everywhere. We have boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but the Spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father. Fear hath torment, and he that feareth is not made perfect in love. God's perfect love—for it is God's love that is spoken of—casts out fear; 1 John 4.

He would not have us always in torment. And with striking beauty, when speaking of our love to Him, it does not say we ought to love Him, but, in the sense of love fully displayed in what precedes, we love Him because He first loved us. For in the case of a superior even of a mother, or any one we look up to—and in this case it is infinitely so—the deep sense of their love to us is true love to them. In what precedes, God's love towards us as sinners, dead in sins and guilty, is shewn (1 John 4:9, 10); in the Christian enjoyed in a new nature by the Holy Ghost (v. 12); and then perfect with us—for there is no excuse for the translation, "our love" —giving us boldness for the day of judgment, because as Christ is, so are we in this world. The thought of God's love has reached from the condition of guilty dead sinners to the day of judgment; and this takes away fear, for we know Him. He has revealed Himself to us as the Father sending the Son, and bringing us, while once guilty

sinners, far from Him, as sons into His presence, in Christ Himself; He is fully revealed in Him, and we complete in Him, before Him; and hence, while redoubling our praise and adoration, taking away fear, save the blessed and most wholesome reverence which fears to offend. In this sense “blessed is he that feareth always”; it is the beginning of wisdom and a beginning that is never lost, but increased in our fullest blessedness: indeed then we feel our own nothingness and forget ourselves, but never Him, when sensibly in His presence, as His fear makes us.

The whole spirit then of Mr. Sadler’s system though engaging to the natural man, the effort at mystery and fear, is contrary to the very character and object and nature of Christianity, as made known to us in the word. In it the veil is rent from top to bottom, free entrance into the holiest given, and that with boldness. The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, has declared God, and made Him known as He knew Him in His bosom. That the Person of Christ is mysterious is most true, but this would go quite too far, for no one knows the Son but the Father; so it is absolutely because of the union of Godhead and manhood in one Person. But in intercourse with men the Lord was openness and affability itself among them, as one that served, and just as free with His poor ignorant disciples as with Moses and Elias in glory, and speaking on the same subject. See the kind of intercourse of Ananias in Damascus (Acts 9:10-16), and of Paul (chap. 22:17-21), and how the Lord met them.

The truth is, that it is just bringing us, as the whole system does, to Judaism. There the Holy Ghost signified by the veil that the way into the holiest was not yet

made manifest; Heb. 9. To us the word is boldness to enter in by the new and living way through the veil, that is to say, His flesh. And it is this Mr. Sadler wants to make a mystery and a veil of again; and the Christian may be assured that it is not God's presence known in the holiest that will give him levity or carelessness in his conscience; he will be, as Paul expresses it, "manifested to God," and he is speaking of manifestation as it will be in the day of judgment (2 Cor. 5),73 for God's holiness and judgment of evil never vary. But it is not fear, because we are before Him in Christ as sons, accepted in the Beloved, blessed, if I am to believe Scripture, as men to whom the Lord imputes no sin. And of that state only the scripture says, "and in whose spirit there is no guile." Why should there be, if we are white as snow? and, if we fail, have confidence in God to confess it, with a full and open though a broken heart, the Holy Ghost who dwells in us leading us, through the advocacy of Christ, to do so?

I have said thus much because of the importance of the truth of Christianity in itself, its true nature, and because it changes the whole aspect of the subject we are upon. But I will enter directly on the subject. And, first, it is difficult to acquit Mr. Sadler of a want of honesty. It is hardly conceivable that a person who seems to have studied the text of Scripture on his subject should not know that eating "damnation "to themselves is exactly the opposite of what we mean now by damnation. Either the word was not used then as it is now, or the translators were not honest; for the "damnation "here spoken of is a chastisement sent that they might not be condemned. They ate and drank judgment to themselves; for if we judged ourselves, we

should not be judged, but when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. And the judgments are spoken of: sickness, which went on even to death, called “sleep “because it was that of Christians. Thus the speaking of “damnation” is in open contradiction of the passage, and subverts its whole purpose and object.

No true Christian doubts the divinity of the blessed Lord, but, solemn as was the institution of the Lord’s supper, every word He spoke, and every act He did, was the expression of the same divine Person, so that the attempt to make anything especially mysterious on this account, in the Lord’s supper, is utterly groundless; and, indeed, when He says, “in remembrance of Me,” it is much more of Him viewed as man, conversant with them on earth, than as to His divine nature. “Remember Me” suits His presence and love down here; and if we add His death, it is certain that, though the whole value of His divinity is attached to His death, and only as a divine Person could He have done it, yet He died as man, not as to His divine nature. He was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death. And whilst holding fast the full deity of the blessed Lord as a very foundation of Christianity, we must not forget there is one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus. His Person was no more mysterious in the Lord’s supper, though the occasion was more solemn, than at any other time. If we speak of circumstances as especially mysterious, it was when a babe lying in the manger. But in truth it was always the same.

What we have to examine is what He said. But it may be well, in order to simplify this, to reply first to what is alleged of John 6. The Gospel of John has a peculiar

character; it does not present Christ to be received, but, in chapter 1, speaks of Christ as unknown by the world, and rejected by the Jews, save such as were born of God. Electing love is insisted on throughout, and the Jews treated as reprobates. Hence, in every chapter in this part, Christ is brought out in contrast with that people. Here the Passover is referred to, and what Christ was as Jehovah, manifested in feeding the multitude, according to Psalm 132. He is owned as prophet, will not be king in a carnal way, and then sends the disciples away to find their way alone on the sea, and, having dismissed the Jewish multitude, He goes up on high to pray. He is Jehovah, Prophet, Priest on high, rejecting the royalty in a carnal way then. He is on high, and the disciples alone. He then shews their true food while He was on high, and externally separated from Him. Is it Christ Himself, or the Lord's supper? I might say really, or exclusively the Lord's supper? For the Lord speaks of the eating of Him, whatever that is, as one thing, though in two aspects, but of that which is one, and which is in itself absolutely efficacious. Indeed, down to the end of verse 53, it is in Greek the aorist, an act which has happened; from verses 54 to 58 it is the present characteristic of the person spoken of, the eater of My flesh.

Remark further, you have the incarnation, death, and ascension of the Lord Jesus closely connected one with another; in a word, His whole history, so to speak, as become Man. But the middle and most important part is not Himself, but a rite! so they would tell us. Then the first part of which the eating is equally spoken, and closely connected with the second (v. 51), is not in the Lord's supper at all; so that the doctrine does not fit at all as a whole. When we come to the substance of the

chapter, the impossibility of its application to the Eucharist stares you in the face. “This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.” And it is well to begin before this. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life… I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat [have eaten] of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world… Verily, I say unto you, except ye eat [have eaten] the flesh of the Son of man, and drink [have drunk] his blood, ye have no fife in you [yourselves]. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day… He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.”

I ask if the Lord would say to a parcel of Jews surrounding Him, that they had no hope of life but in the Eucharist, which they had never heard of, and knew nothing about? or did He speak of Himself, whom they were to receive, living and dying? Why, if they had not life by faith in Him—had not come to Him by faith, they had no place at His table at all. But I quote a few words more: “As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me shall live by me. This is that bread that came down from heaven … he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.” Now mark, first, if a man has not eaten His flesh, and drunk His blood, he has no life in Him. The man begins all real living Christianity by receiving the Eucharist before he is one! Their own doctrine of receiving life by baptism is all a fable; or, if he has, he must make sure and die

spiritually, or he is not in the case to participate in the Eucharist.

They talk of sustaining life by the Eucharist, as men by eating; but these men have life, and daily eat as living men, sustaining life by it, as God has ordered. But here they have no life in them at all unless they eat. If it be by receiving Christ into the heart, incarnate and dying, by the power of the Holy Ghost, that is intelligible enough, especially addressed to unbelievers; but to say it of the Eucharist is alike false, absurd, and contradictory of its nature, for it is for Christians. According to Mr. Sadler's system, it is "received by the faithful"; they are to receive it with a true penitent heart and lively faith. Mr. Sadler has to admit that the Lord confers eternal life on the whole man by it; but then he also admits that no carnal wicked man can get any benefit by it; but, if not outwardly wicked, it is a man who has not had eternal life conferred on him.

The language of the Lord, as to a Person who has not eaten His flesh, nor drunk His blood, not having life, makes it perfectly impossible to apply it to the Eucharist; for the eating and drinking the Lord speaks of is the first receiving of life: till they ate and drank, they had no life in them. None but dead souls can partake of it, and so receive life. To talk of preserving or sustaining is in the teeth of the express terms of the passage.

But further he who did so eat was to live for ever, and that not hypothetically or conditionally, but live for ever. The Lord repeats and insists on this, and carries it expressly on to final blessedness in the eternal state. "I will raise him up in the last day." It applies, says Mr. Sadler of the Eucharist according to his system, to body

as well as soul. That is easily slipping over what is said. The Lord, repeatedly and with emphasis, insists on eating being eternal life, living for ever, never dying; and, not content with this, goes on to make him who eats sure of final blessedness in resurrection.

Does that apply to the Eucharist? And let not any one come here and say it puts him in that state, and if he continue well. This is not what the Lord says. He declares that he who eats, according to this passage, “shall live for ever,” and starting from the assertion, “He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.”

The point of difference between the manna and this bread was, that they did die: with this kind of eating, “never die” is the very point of the passage. Whoso eats His flesh and drinks His blood has eternal life, and Christ will raise him up in the last day. It cannot be the Eucharist, for no believer can partake of it in that case; for the believer has everlasting life, as declared in this passage, but he who eats of this has no life in him till he has eaten of it. On the other side, he who partakes of the Eucharist has obtained (though there be, as being dead, “no life in him”) eternal life, will live for ever, and be raised by the Lord at the last day. They know, as well as I do, that this is in no way or aspect applicable to the Eucharist. The Eucharist refers symbolically to one of the three great events referred to in the chapter, as the chapter does in one part to the realities of which the Eucharist is a symbol. But the chapter in no part, and in no way, refers to the Eucharist. Not one word of it can be honestly applied to that rite, while every word fully and blessedly applies to that to which the rite itself refers.

This disposed of, I turn to the only real inquiry: What do the words of institution mean? I have already spoken of the value I attach to the right use of the Eucharist, and, so to speak, meeting Christ there; but we are now speaking of a particular view of it. Mr. Sadler tells us that taking it as a memorial is a rationalistic view of it. My answer is, Christ said, “Do this in remembrance of me.” He tells us it is not “doing” on our part, but Christ’s giving and we receiving (page 122). But Christ says, “Do this.” As to figure, Mr. Sadler recognises that the bread and wine are still and ever bread and wine, and nothing else in themselves. They have therefore, if any value beyond bread and wine be in them, that value as figures.

And now note that there was not then any such Christ as is symbolised in the bread and wine, nor is there now. What is unquestionably symbolised is His body (given) for us, and His blood shed; that is, a Christ in death, and no way else. There is no such Christ now. And this the apostle expressly states: “We do shew forth his death, until he come.” Whatever means of grace it may be, it is not an existing Christ as He is or was then. So He speaks of His shed blood. It is, in a word, a Christ on the cross, and His death, that is in view, though it be done in remembrance of Himself. To turn it away from this is to turn it away from Christ’s institution, and the express declaration of Scripture.

John 6 represents to us Christ as the Word made flesh in the incarnation, and then suffering on the cross, at the end hinting at His ascension as Man to glory. But the subject of the chapter is a humbled and dying Christ, made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, and actually dying (though to take thereupon a

glorious place as Man where He was with the Father before the worlds), in contrast with a reigning Messiah.

We have the same path of grace in Philippians 2, contrasted there with the first Adam. He made Himself of no reputation (eauton ekenose), and took a servant's form; then, being found in fashion, He humbled Himself unto death, the death of the cross; then He is exalted of God. But He is fed upon as humbled and dead, His blood shed; once exalted, both these things are passed and closed. He is the subject of eating only as bread come down, and dying, and shedding His blood.

In John 6 this is presented solely as the beginning of life to us. He gave His flesh for the life of the world. Till I eat it, I have no life in me. Feeding is more than simply believing, though inseparable from it. It is nourishing the soul with the object of faith. Though first phage, an act past and done, yet trogon, eating, characterises the believer; but no such Christ as he feeds on is in existence now. It must be by remembrance. It is shed blood he drinks. If it be not shed and out of the body, there is no redemption, and so we must receive it peremptorily or not have life. Without, shedding of blood there is no remission; and the corn of wheat must fall into the ground and die, or it abides alone.

In the institution of the Eucharist it is the same subject, only not here bread come down from heaven (a position just closing in John 6), nor an exalted Christ, but blood shed and the body dead, and only so. There is no such Christ in existence, as the one represented in the Eucharist; but it is Christ in that way in which He wrought redemption, obtained remission, and laid the foundation of the new covenant. It is Himself we

remember in the infinite love of this, but His death we shew forth. It was done once for all in the end of the world.

Mr. Sadler tells us that the slaying of the lamb and the passover was not a remembrance, but that Jehovah did pass over them. This is a great mistake; for it answers to Christ's actual dying and shedding His blood, so that God should pass over; but the passover was to be kept yearly as a remembrance when there was no passing over, when they were in the land, as we are in heavenly places in Christ, and celebrate a deliverance and redemption accomplished long ago. "And it shall come to pass when ye be come to the land which Jehovah shall give you, according as he has promised, that ye shall keep this service. And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of Jehovah's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel, when he smote the Egyptians," Exod. 12:25. It was (v. 24) "an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever." And again, "Remember this day in which ye came out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage … there shall no leavened bread be eaten," Exod. 13:3. "And thou shalt shew thy son in that day, saying, This is done because of that which Jehovah did unto me when I came forth from Egypt. And it shall be unto thee upon thine hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes … thou shalt therefore keep this ordinance in his season from year to year." It was a perpetual remembrance. It was at a season when they killed the passover; Matt. 26:17 and following; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7, 8.74 At this season of the passover the remembrance of Israel's deliverance

from Egypt, Jehovah institutes the remembrance of a better sacrifice and a better deliverance.

Mr. Sadler would think a slain lamb a better memorial. Thank God, the Lord did not think so. I pity Mr. Sadler. Would he (I am ashamed to speak of it) have drunk the blood of it, a most weighty and momentous part of it to us? Further, death was death, and could not be touched but as death and the wages of sin. Now death is life and gain; for Christ has in all the depth of it paid those wages, and we feed on it as life. And the memorial of what wrought this is sweet to our souls, as is His love who did it. The giving of the blessed Lord, celebrated in the Eucharist, is His giving Himself—His life on the cross for us in infinite love. We know Him as living now in glory, we feed on Him as once dead on the cross for us. He is in us as life now. We remember Him as once a sacrifice, whose value, and the sufferings and love in it, none can fathom. His love is divine and human and constant now; but He cares, though now in glory, that we should remember Him as He was then, that time of love when He gave Himself for us. Mr. Sadler may think it rationalistic. We cherish the thought that He cares for our remembrance—did so when suffering—in our inmost soul. We feed on it. Hereby know we love, that He laid down His life for us. It is infinitely precious at all times; but the Lord's supper is a special occasion instituted by Himself, at the moment of His doing it, the same night in which He was betrayed, to recall and be a memorial of it. That He meets His gathered people there I do not doubt.

Looked at merely doctrinally, it was the substitution of a sweet memorial of eternal redemption wrought, for one of an earthly deliverance of a people who now rejected

their Messiah but only accomplished the higher purposes of God in doing so. That blessed work was also laying in blood the foundation of the new covenant. Of a covenant with the communicant, or with the church, no trace is found in the word. It is a mere doctrinal fable. We get the blessings of it spiritually, as I have said; but formally the new covenant, as the old to which it refers as new, is made with Israel, and with no one else. There was a covenant made with Abraham (besides promises relating to Israel) confirmed to the seed Christ; and those who have Christ's Spirit, being in Christ, and Christ's, have the blessing of this (though they have a great deal more), but as the new covenant, promised in Jeremiah 31, the Mediator of it having come, and the blood of it shed, we participate in spirit in its blessings, God having done all needed to set it up, and the Jews having refused to accept the Mediator, even in glory; Acts 3 and 7. It will be established, according to promise, but by grace in God's due time. This Christ also teaches. It is the new covenant in His blood, and, further, shed for many. It is thus shed blood alone which is before us in the Eucharist. It is an abiding witness that, as to God's part in it, the foundation of the covenant is laid in the blood of the Mediator of it, and that that blood is shed for many. It is further a sign of the unity of the body, so that those who take part in it are there as one body in Christ, identified withal with all true saints.

The word "blessing … we bless," as is perfectly evident from Scripture, is simply giving thanks. (See 1 Cor. 11:26; chap. 10:16; Luke 22:17; compare Mark 14:22, 23; Matt. 26:26, 27; exactly the same word as John 6:23.) When the Lord therefore says, "this is my body,"

He speaks, it is admitted, figuratively. It is still bread.75 It could not be His body then, nor, in spite of Augustine, did He hold His body in His own hand, nor was there thus any such body, that is, dead and the blood poured out, as it is said (ekchunomenon). Nor is there now. It is the figure of Christ as a victim and only so. I do not insist on “broken,” for I suppose it is not the true reading. If “given” be genuine, it is the same thing; but I rest on the whole evident meaning, and it is expressly for us, not to us. It is the shed blood, shed for many. That we feed on Christ as then dead for us, and His blood shed, when eating the bread and drinking the wine specially, though at all times, is all well. But it is we who eat, and we who “do “in remembrance of that which must be, and can only be, remembered as past, though the One I remember is now ascended to the right hand of God, the same loving Saviour. The real act is our eating, and our drinking, our doing in remembrance; and even if “breaking” be spoken of, on which Mr. Sadler insists, it is we who break too. The wine is equally a figure, and a figure of blood shed, a shedding which took place on the cross, of which we perpetuate the memory.

As regards its being a figure, as Mr. Sadler says, identified with its object in the use of it, I have no objection to the thought at all. The more it is realised the better. Were I to do, or capable of doing, so horrid and wicked a thing as spitting on my mother’s picture, I should be putting disgraceful and most wicked contempt on my mother. If I eat unworthily (not be unworthy to eat), (and they were carousing and drinking their fill, and despising the poor) I am guilty of so slighting and

counting a common thing the Lord's body. I have no thought to weaken this a moment.

There is also communion; but Mr. Sadler's translation and explanation, and his church's with it, is wholly false. The English translators, most unhappily and avowedly fond of changing the word when it was the same in Greek, have translated the same word, communion, partaking, fellowship. Thus it is koinonia of the blood, of the body. But in verse 18 the priests who ate of the altar are kotnonoi of the altar, and in verse 20, kotnonoi of devils. Communicating or communicators of altars or devils does not give a very intelligible sense; but the moment we use the word rightly, the sense in each case is evident. They are morally identified with that of which they partake. The priests among the Jews were (koinonoi) morally identified with the altar of Jehovah, the heathen with the demons or devils to which the Gentiles offered. Were they going to identify themselves with devils and with the Lord, and provoke the Lord to jealousy? If they ate and drank with each—partook of them, they were koinonoi, morally partakers or identified with them. "Communication of" is a simply impossible sense if we read the passage.

The reasoning as to covenant (in page 136) proves just the contrary of what it is produced for. Covenants were ratified with blood, not with figures of blood. The covenant therefore was ratified on the cross, where blood itself was spilt, not in the Eucharist, where Mr. Sadler admits there is really no blood at all. It arises from his notion of ratifying a covenant with the communicant, a tradition perhaps of his church, but an idea of which no trace is found in Scripture. "I am the true vine "refers to Israel, the vine brought out of Egypt.

There was no church union then with disciples. This began at Pentecost. Ephesians 1 and 2 shew it to have been impossible till after the death and exaltation of Christ. They were already (ede) clean by reason of the word He had spoken. I do not pursue this farther, because it has nothing to do with our subject. “Vine “and “door” remain figures in any case. The statements of page 132 are wholly without foundation. Supposing He is the true door, “door” is a figure, nor is there any entrance into the innermost sanctuary. “True vine” refers to a vine not, after all, the true one, that is, to Israel. All this is ranting. The image in Hebrews is a veil, not a door, and they went through it, and had not to eat it. All this is hardly worth so many words.

As regards a sacrifice, the scriptural answer is simple enough, “There is no more sacrifice for sin.” The insisting on the flesh of Christ is of all importance. His true incarnation and true death was a crucial point. So only was He a man, so only could He make atonement. It was an evil spirit which did not confess Him come in flesh. This was that spirit of Antichrist. All acquainted with church history know that the church was tormented with this at the beginning, teachers called Docetæ or Gnostics denying He came in flesh; whence also Paul says “the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” The insisting on it by John, and his motive for it, are as plain as plain can be to any one reading his writings, knowing the value of the truth, or, as I have said, acquainted with church history. Christ was a real true man, in a body, in flesh, and really died as a man shedding His blood, though God over all blessed for ever. But all this has nothing to do with the Eucharist, save that it is in the most important way presented to us there in what is the

external bond of the church's very subsistence. Nay, it is all frightfully weakened and subverted, by turning these vital truths into a false explanation of the Eucharist; for I recognise as I have said, that the Lord's supper is the central point of union and worship, as to its forms, and according to Christ's institution.

Mr. Sadler admits that the Eucharist has scarcely one feature in common with the things which in Scripture are called sacrifices (page 173). He tells us (page 174) that the real spiritual value lay, not in the costliness of the victim, nor in its death and the outpouring of its blood, nor in its consumption by fire, but in the implied reference to the atoning death of Christ. But it was in these things that the reference consisted; and they made them, and above all Him, a sacrifice together with the offering of Himself up to God, to be one; not one of which elements is found in the Eucharist. A "memorial "of Himself will not do, it must be Himself. Christ must offer Himself without spot to God. He must, as we are told in Hebrews 9, suffer to be a sacrifice.

He gives the disciples the memorials or symbols of His body and blood to eat and drink, not to offer. They were to do it in remembrance of Him, not sacrifice Him over again. That His sacrifice of Himself is in remembrance, no Christian will deny or be' disposed to deny. But if we are sacrificing Him, then it is not a remembrance of Him,. Blood must be shed for a sacrifice; what is sacrifice must bear sin, or suffer, or at least suffer as made sin. But the Eucharist looks at the blood as already shed, at the sacrifice as already complete, and is a witness in remembrance that it is so, and that nothing can be added, taken away, or repeated. God has accepted it, and Christ is sitting at the right hand of

God, because by one offering He has perfected for ever them that are sanctified. A commemoration of His having died cannot be a sacrifice. He did not offer a sacrifice in the upper room; and though the value of His sacrifice is ever in heaven, He is not doing it in heaven. He is, as Hebrews 10 insists, in contrast with the standing Jewish priests, always at work because nothing was really done, sitting at the right hand of God because all is done, expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. To the Judaism of an unfinished work always doing, this “church system” would reduce us. A glorified Christ cannot be offered in sacrifice. He is, as man, glorified, because He has finished the work which His Father gave Him to do.

Let any one read Hebrews 9 and 10 carefully, and see if this theory is not the subversion of Christianity in this respect. He does intercede, thank God, with God. He is an advocate with the Father to obtain help not to sin, to restore our communion if we have sinned; but this is founded on a finished work, and a complete righteousness. Where in Scripture is it said Christ was pleading His sacrifice in the upper chamber? where that the church is pleading in the holy Eucharist? (Page 175.) It is a pernicious fable, and that is all. I challenge Mr. Sadler for his authority to produce such a thought from the word of God. It is superstition, not piety: presumption, not lowliness; a pretension to be offerers of Christ, as if He had not finished all.

Mr. Sadler pretends there are better means to recall Christ to our hearts than the Eucharist. The answer is simple: Christ did not think so. For my part I thank God He did not. Doing it in commemoration, doing it to shew the Lord’s death, is not offering a sacrifice in any sense.

No doubt it is with Christ, not with our faith, we are occupied, but we are not offering Him. All that Mr. Sadler is obliged to add to make out bis case (p. 177) is not in what Christ said. Doing a thing in remembrance of Him is not sacrificing Him, and does not mean it; nor was He then offering Himself at all, but giving the symbol of a finished sacrifice to eat. No comparison of the Eucharist and Jewish sacrifices is needed. In many respects it is more excellent. We drink what represents the blood of Christ. It is occupied with the sacrifice as already finished, not as being constantly done typically and never done really. But each was right in its place.

It is never said in Scripture to shew forth [the Lord's death] before God, and angels, and men. The church, as were God's servants individually, is a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men, and this act will come in with the rest. But a sacrifice is offered, presented, shewn to God only; and this applied to the Eucharist is abominably false, and subversive of Christianity, which rests stamped with this seal and impress, "no more sacrifice for sin," or else the full value of the finished one is denied. I repeat, it is that only one, once offered as finished once and for ever, that is remembered in the Eucharist. To refer it (p. 186) to the giving thanks, blessing (not two things in Scripture), breaking, taking, eating, drinking, as the sacrificial character, shews the fallacy of the whole thing, for the drinking could not be till the sacrifice was over, nor indeed the eating. As to the others they are at best only consecrating to be a victim. Breaking referred to Christ is unscriptural;76 the bread is broken. It is not said of Christ.

I hardly know if it be worth while to answer the chapter on priesthood. The whole system is so foreign to

Christian truth, and the subject of the ministry has been so fully discussed elsewhere, that it is a weariness to go over it again. Still I will say a few words. First, Mr. Sadler expatiates on the apostle having peculiar powers. He might save himself the trouble. Every Christian owns it, I suppose. In the next place, I absolutely deny any ordination to ministry, a principle now very generally admitted by Christians, even by those who submit to it for the sake of order. Scripture, at any rate, is clear as to it. Further, he confounds everlasting redemption and forgiveness, or justification by faith, never recalled (for whom He justified, them He also glorified; and being justified we shall be saved from wrath), with administrative forgiveness in God's dealings or government, where, if a person be sick through chastisement, he having committed sins, they shall be forgiven him. (Compare Job 36.) In this sense the assembly forgives sins (2 Cor. 2:7, 10); nay, I forgive my brother his trespasses. Of an elder or priest's doing it with authority there is no trace in Scripture. On the contrary, where the elders are introduced, the prayer of faith saves the sick; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him, not a trace of any act of the elder.

Mr. Sadler goes on the principle of administering the sacrament. Sects may profess it, as he says, but Scripture knows nothing of it. They broke bread, kat oikon in their houses. The disciples came together to break bread. That the thanksgiving and breaking of bread should be, for comeliness and edification, done by some grave brother, is all well; but we have no administering it in Scripture. The bread which we break, the cup which we bless, speaks of what Corinthians do as such. The apostle was not there, and there is no hint

of elders at all, though we know there commonly were, but their existence is ignored at Corinth if there were. There is no hint of any administering it. It is probable at Troas that Paul did it, though the words are very general. It was natural.

As to baptism, as a rule the apostles did not baptise. In Mark, if it be genuine, they are not sent to baptise but to preach the gospel. “He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved”; but of who did it, not a word. From Galilee (not Bethany) the twelve were sent to baptise the Gentiles, making them disciples, and this, note, from a risen—not from an ascended—Christ. In the commission in Luke, always acted on in the Acts, there is nothing of baptism. The commission in Matthew 28 was to the Gentiles alone. This the apostles formally gave up to Paul and Barnabas (Gal. 2), the Lord having expressly called them to this service, and Paul tells us he was not sent to baptise—contrasts himself with the twelve who were. It is alleged this refers to his motive, not to have them counted his disciples; but this is not so: he gives it as a general reason for his conduct, though for that reason he rejoiced in the result. I do not doubt they baptised all their converts, Jews or Gentiles; but they had no commandment for the former, and they gave up the latter to Paul, and he expressly says he was not sent to do it.

So much for the commission. Then as to practice; in Acts 2 no hint of the apostles, or of any commissioned by them, doing it. They were to be baptised for the remission of sins, and they were baptised. In chapter 8:12 they were baptised, men and women: not a word of who did it, only not the apostles, nor, as it appears, any commissioned by them. It was all news to the apostles.

In Cornelius' case Peter commanded them to be baptised, and Paul boasts, save in a few cases, of not having done it. As an argument for Mr. Sadler, I may add that lay baptism is valid in the English Establishment, as it is, and very common too, with Romanists. As regards commission to administer the Lord's supper, I should have added, there is none such; they were to take, eat; they were to divide it among themselves. It is exactly the opposite of a commission to administer it to others. The whole statement from beginning to end as to administering sacraments, in principle and as to the facts, is wholly without foundation in Scripture; that all things should be done decently and in order is not. Indeed this thought is generally received by Christians on the continent, and is growing rapidly in England. But scarcely one of the assertions of Mr. Sadler (pages 206, 207) is founded on fact.

Christ did send the apostles to preach, at least if the end of Mark be genuine: at any rate they were to be Christ's witnesses, and Paul was expressly. He did send the twelve to baptise the Gentiles, which commission they relinquished, and He did give authority to remit sins administratively; He did not to administer the Lord's supper to them, nor to any one. And, note, if by baptism remission of sins was received, which to those thus brought in I do not deny, as a rule it was not the apostles who remitted them, but other people without any commission at all. That the apostles had an extraordinary commission, authority to ordain things in the churches, power to confer the Holy Ghost, besides their gifts, is quite clear. But even as to preaching and teaching, let us see how this clerical commissioning stands. At the persecution of Stephen all were scattered,

except the apostles, and went everywhere preaching the word, and after the special case of Cornelius, by these first the gospel was carried to the Gentiles.

Here was a strange case: either all were ordained, and there were no laymen; or all laymen were preachers without any commission. And what makes it more striking is, that the hand of the Lord was with them, and many believed. Peter tells them, as every one had received the gift, so to minister the same. If one who had received a talent did not trade with it, without any other authority than having it, he was a wicked and slothful servant. If preachers came, women even were to judge of their doctrine, not of their commission: this never occurred as a safeguard to the apostle. Diotrephes would have found it convenient if only such had existed. And in the assembly they were only to speak two or three on one occasion, that all might speak and all might be edified. Everyone had a psalm, interpretation, doctrine; but all things were to be done to edifying, not to confusion. The whole tenor of the New Testament denies emphatically a clerical order of ministry. There are gifts given from on high, apostles, prophets, as foundation; pastors, teachers, evangelists, till we all come, etc.; and, besides these positive ministries, that which every joint supplieth, making increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love. And those who had this gift had it everywhere. Local elders there were, some ministering in the word, some not. That they should be didaktikoi was to be desired. Their overseership was evidently made more useful by it.

To all Mr. Sadler says about the effect of administering I have already spoken; the administering itself, we have seen, is an invention, as appointing others to administer

it. Hebrews 6:1-4 is in contrast with spiritual Christianity. Baptisms are washings; laying on of hands is not spoken of ordination, as far as appears. The things are Jewish knowledge of Christ, and ways, as contrasted with the Christianity brought by the Holy Ghost. Laying on of hands was used for everything, sacrifices, healing, etc. The deacons had hands laid on them as apostolic sanction; I have little doubt the elders too, but Scripture carefully avoids saying so. Acts 13:2 was commending to the Lord, and nothing else (chap. 14:26); and was repeated on a second journey (chap. 15:40); and, if anything else, was the ordination of an apostle by laymen, a singular proceeding, if giving a commission and authority be in question. The apostles, and the apostles only, could give the Holy Ghost by it. On the one hand the Holy Ghost distributed to every man severally as He would (1 Cor. 12); and on the other, as to permanent ministry, the Lord gave, as ascended up on high, and as every one received the gift, he was to minister the same, as coming directly from God. Not a word of ordination in any case of ministry.

Mr. Sadler does not indeed venture to say more than "there is reason to believe." I can only say that, if we read the New Testament, we have reason to be sure of exactly the contrary. And this to justify a man, established by God knows who, pretending to give the Holy Ghost to make a priest to forgive sins! a power which the apostles administratively had, and which as to details was exercised by the assembly in its discipline, and even through individual prayer in chastisements, but the conferring of which on a priest, or the idea of a priest, is unknown to the New Testament, save as we are all kings and priests to God. The whole system is a false

invention, denying the power and presence of the Holy Ghost. I challenge all the clergy to give me a case of ordination to ministry. I have quoted what gives thousands of cases of ministry without ordination. That they commended to God, and bore witness of consent and approbation by the laying on of hands of laymen, so-called, or the elderhood, we find; but conferring ministry there was not, save from on high and by the Holy Ghost. Communicating the truth there was, to faithful men too, but never ordination to ministry. It is the substitution of man for God the Holy Ghost.

I have examined thus all the great principles of Mr. Sadler's book. They can in no respect stand the test of Scripture. I do not feel it necessary to discuss Confirmation, or the Burial service. The chapter on Confirmation is so excessively weak (suppositions founded on suppositions, to defend a poor imitation of apostolic power not half owned in the service itself) that it is not necessary. The Burial service depends on the whole system, though in many cases a horribly unfeeling thing too. But with the details of the particular sect I have nothing to do.

[End of Doctrinal—Vol. 8]

68 I do not mean the Concio Latronum, which however, though disowned, was just as much, in every respect, a general council. There the bishops beat poor old Flavian, the patriarch of Constantinople, so that he died of it. Yet in no point did it fail of what made a general council.

69 Verse 51, and other verses, as 54, prove that whosoever eats, as here spoken of, is saved for ever. So that everyone, the worst hypocrite, that took die Lord's supper, would be saved!

70 The transition is in the middle of chapter 10.

71 The individual saint, doubtless, too; but this is not our subject here. 1 Corinthians 6 gives the individual; 1 Corinthians 3, the assembly. Each is called a temple.

72 In the original it is the same word as ‘catch.’

73 “Appear” in verse 10 is “manifested,” Paul saying not only we all should be, but he was then.

74 John taking the divine side of His Person, we have no account of this but the doctrine as to the work itself in the doctrinal teaching. Chapter 5 is the life-giving Son; chapter 6 the incarnate and dying Redeemer—our food while He is absent; chapter 7 the Holy Ghost given instead of the feast of tabernacles, where He will shew Himself to the world, which He could not keep then. I add, chapter 8, His word rejected; chapter 9, His work. In chapter 10 He will have His sheep in spite of them, and other sheep too. Chapters ir, 12 are God’s recognition of Him as Son of God, Son of David, Son of man, which introduces His death, besides Mary in Bethany, a remnant who in a measure entered into it. From chapter 13 He is looked at as going up on high, but we have no suffering Christ led as a sheep to the slaughter; no sorrows in Gethsemane, but power and giving Himself freely up: no sorrows on the cross, but giving up His own spirit to the Father, when the time was come.

75 It is a curious fact that the epiklesis, or invocation of the Holy Ghost, which was used to prove that there were two natures in Christ, when superstition had set in, as there was bread and the divine thing too, and which was considered the consecration and still is by the Greek church (though since the time of St. John Damascene

they have tended, though with uncertain steps, to transubstantiation, a word now used among them), is not in use in the Roman Missal (which in this essential point differs from all ancient liturgies), nor in the English. The Greeks use “this is my body” too; but though appropriating the elements thus in a certain measure in a side chamber, called prothesis (if my memory be not treacherous), this is not full consecration.

76 It is a false reading where introduced [in 1 Cor. 11:24].