

*The  
Collected Writings  
of  
A. C. Ord*

Made and printed  
in the USA  
Present Truth Publishers  
825 Harmony Road  
Jackson NJ 08527 USA  
[www.presenttruthpublishers.com](http://www.presenttruthpublishers.com)

Second Edition

# Table of Contents

<b>Editorial Notes</b> . . . . .	<b>v</b>	<b>The Manifestation of the Divine Nature</b>	
<b>“Is There Not a Cause?” or, Evidence of the</b>		<b>in the Person of Christ</b> . . . . .	<b>71</b>
<b>Departure from the Principles of Truth, Holiness,</b>		Introductory Remarks on the Errors and Dangers	
<b>and Loyalty to Christ, Which has Occasioned</b>		of the Present Moment . . . . .	<b>72</b>
<b>a Separation from Certain Brethren. A Dialogue</b>	<b>1</b>	The Manifestation of the Divine Nature in	
“Is There not a Cause?” . . . . .	<b>2</b>	The Person of Christ . . . . .	<b>77</b>
Appendix: A Summary of Mr. B. W. Newton’s		Appendix A . . . . .	<b>87</b>
Doctrines on the Person of Christ, with Extracts		Appendix B . . . . .	<b>88</b>
from his Writings. . . . .	<b>13</b>		
Extracts from Mr. Newton’s Writings Touching		<b>An Explanation as to Statements Made on Page 46</b>	
the Soul of our Lord, and its Relation to God. . .	<b>14</b>	<b>of “The Manifestation of the Divine</b>	
Extracts from Mr. Newton’s Writings Relative to		<b>Nature in the Person of Christ.”</b> . . . . .	<b>91</b>
the Body of our blessed Lord and His Asserted			
Natural Subjection to Death.. . . .	<b>14</b>	<b>The Glory of the Person of the Son of God:</b>	
List of Mr. Newton’s Tracts here quoted. . . . .	<b>15</b>	<b>His Title as the Eternal Life, and the</b>	
		<b>Connection of the Believer with Him as Such</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>The Teaching of Scripture on the Subject of</b>		Introduction . . . . .	<b>95</b>
<b>Spiritual Life and the Sealing of the Holy Ghost</b>		Chapter 1: Eternal Life: Its Nature -- The	
<b>with Examination of Mr. F. W. Grant’s Views</b> . .	<b>17</b>	Diversity of Thought Existing on	
		this Subject . . . . .	<b>97</b>
<b>The Christian’s Heavenly Position &amp; Portion With</b>		Chapter 2: Is Christ Personally the Eternal Life	
<b>a Review of C. E. S.’s Pamphlets on “Christian</b>		Which was Manifested Here? And	
<b>Standing and Condition”</b> . . . . .	<b>35</b>	Was Eternal Life Received	
Introductory Remarks . . . . .	<b>35</b>	From Him Whilst on Earth? . . . . .	<b>99</b>
Chapter 1: Is Standing Before The Throne		Chapter 3: The Person of Christ Unfathomable	
Christian Position? . . . . .	<b>37</b>	. . . . .	<b>103</b>
Chapter 2: What is the Scriptural Estimate of		Chapter 4: The Person of Christ. The Result of	
Height Conferred		this System in Dividing that ever	
by God on His Saints? . . . . .	<b>41</b>	Blessed Person . . . . .	<b>107</b>
Chapter 3: Standing and Position before God		Chapter 5: Does the Fact of Christ Being	
and Acceptance . . . . .	<b>45</b>	Himself “The Life,” Involve	
Chapter 4: Headship of Race; Its Nature and		Association with Him in Deity,	
Extent . . . . .	<b>49</b>	in Those Who Partake of It? . . . . .	<b>109</b>
Chapter 5: What is Being “in Christ”? The		Chapter 6: Participation in the Divine Nature	<b>111</b>
New		Chapter 7: On the Introduction of What Is	
Man . . . . .	<b>51</b>	Human into the Godhead, and the	
Chapter 6: “In Christ,” As Membership of His		Denial of Divine Attributes to	
Body . . . . .	<b>57</b>	the Second Man . . . . .	<b>113</b>
Chapter 7: New Creation . . . . .	<b>61</b>	Chapter 8: Current Objections and Their	
Chapter 8: The Summing Up And Conclusion	<b>65</b>	Fallacy: With Remarks on the	
Appendix: “In Christ” . . . . .	<b>67</b>	Manifestation of Eternal Life	
<b>Eternal Life</b> . . . . .	<b>69</b>	and on Divine Principles	<b>117</b>
		Appendix A . . . . .	<b>121</b>
		Appendix B . . . . .	<b>128</b>
		Appendix C . . . . .	<b>130</b>

The Blessedness of the Person of Christ in its Unity as Presented in Scripture . . . . .	133
“The Man Christ Jesus” . . . . .	149
Note 1: F. E. R. Heterodox on the Person of the Christ . . . . .	170
Note 2: Did the Incarnation Dissolve on the Cross? . . . . .	172
Scripture: Its Inspiration and authority, With Remarks on two Lectures recently delivered in the Temperance Hall, Bristol, by the Rev. F. M. Wilson, M.A., Head Master of Clifton College, Entitled: “Why Men do not Believe the Bible” . . . . .	177
Subject Index . . . . .	187
Scripture Index . . . . .	

## Editorial Notes

### Known Missing Papers

All of the papers by Alex. Craven Ord that have come to my attention are included in this book except for the following:

- *Dispensational Privileges as Distinguished in Scripture*. The British Library copy was lost in WWII and another copy has not been located. It is 20 pages long.
- *Appendix C. On Christian Responsibility and Manifestation of Love* also has not yet been located.
- *Justification and Acceptance with God*, available from Present Truth Publishers as a separate book, is believed to be from the pen of A. C. Ord, although his name does not appear in the original printing.

It will be greatly appreciated if anyone knowing of other papers by A. C. Ord would contact Present Truth Publishers.

### Typography and Layout of the Papers

The order of the papers follows the order, it seems to me, in which they were written, except for the last paper -- on inspiration.

The typography of the originals has been improved in several ways:

- generally, references to papers have been italicized rather than enclosed in quotation marks;
- quotations have often been indented on both sides and set in smaller type
- footnotes have been numbered.

To make these papers more useful, a Scripture Index as well as a Subject Index has been added.

To make the Scripture Index more useful, Scripture references have been inserted in places where the author had not used them. These additions are enclosed in braces { }. Also, in some cases, references to Scriptures have been abbreviated.

To make certain references to persons or their writings more apparent to the reader, an explanatory name or phrase has been inserted in braces { }.

Where footnotes have been added, they are enclosed in braces { }.

Keep in mind that the references to J. N. Darby's writings are to old editions.

### Notes Concerning the Papers

The reason for the republication of these papers is because

of the great value they have in setting forth truth. A. C. Ord's ministry herein shows a definite Phinehas character, so often lacking among God's people.

The first paper, *Is There Not a Cause?*, concerns the 1848 Bethesda (Open-Brethren) division. It exposes the unsound and unholy principles on which Bethesda and its supporters acted. The paper also contains information regarding the fundamentally evil teachings of B. W. Newton. The truths set forth in this paper are very relevant today. W. Rickards, in his *Bethesda in 1892*, states that the paper was written by A. C. Ord.

The second paper, *The Teaching of Scripture on the Subject of Spiritual Life . . .*, refers to two of F. W. Grant's papers, *Life and the Spirit* (Sept. 1883) and *Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit* (Nov. 1884).<sup>1</sup> Page 33, column b, herein, shows that A. C. Ord's paper was published a little after the Grant division, which took place in Dec. 1884. Thus this paper can be dated 1885.

The third paper, *The Christian's Heavenly Position and Portion . . .*, regards teaching put forth by C. E. Stuart that lowers the Christian standing to that of a millennial saint. I suggest that the present movement afoot in 'dispensational circles,' erroneously called "Progressive Dispensationalism," does the same thing. The truths set forth in this paper are not only continuously relevant, but especially so now. The paper contained no date of publication, but we may arrive at 1885-1886 in the following way:

N. Noel wrote that C. E. Stuart's paper, *Christian Standing and Condition*, was published in May 1884,<sup>2</sup> which paper A. C. Ord refuted. I have a copy of the fifth edition of this paper by C.E.S. and it is dated Dec. 1884.

A. C. Ord speaks of J. B. Stoney's remarks on C.E.S.'s teaching. J. B. Stoney had written a letter (which was published) dated Dec. 1884, *A Letter to the Brethren in the Lord, Meeting at Queen's Road, Reading, Reviewing Christian Standing and Condition*, by C. E. S. Thus A. C. Ord's paper was not published in 1884.

A. C. Ord also speaks of C. E. S.'s *Is it the Truth of the Gospel?* Internal evidence indicates that this was published in early 1885 (a postscript written while the paper was passing through the press mentions a postcard received Jan. 29th).

C.E.S.'s reply to a number of his critics under the

1. Note 20 on p. 32.

2. N. Noel, *History of the Brethren*.

title, *Recent Utterances. Some Such Examined*, is dated 1886 and seeks to rebut A. C. Ord.

So, either in 1885 or in 1886 A. C. Ord published his paper.

The fourth through the ninth papers have to do with the teachings of F. E. Raven.

The fourth paper, *Eternal Life*, appeared in 1888 in E. Dennett's magazine, *The Christian Friend*. It seems to me that this addressed issues which came to light at a conference early in 1888 regarding erroneous notions of F. E. Raven on this subject; which notions rapidly developed into fundamentally evil doctrines.

The fifth paper, *The Manifestation of the Divine Nature in the Person of Christ* can be dated to 1890. A. H. Burton, *Reflections on the Park Street Notice*, Oct. 1890, p. 4, refers to this paper by A. C. Ord, and in which A. C. Ord refers to letters written in early 1890.

The sixth paper, *An Explanation . . .*, appears from internal evidence to also be an 1890 paper.

The seventh paper, *The Glory of the Person of the Son of God . . .*, was probably issued in late 1891 or early 1892. It refers to the Sept. 1891 issue of J. B. Stoney's magazine, *A Voice to the Faithful* (on p. 190 herein) as well as a letter by F. E. R. dated Sept. 25, 1891.

The eighth paper, *The Blessedness of the Person of Christ . . .*, quotes a letter by F. E. Raven which is dated Dec. 7, 1893 in *Letters of F. E. Raven*, Stow Hill: Kingston-on-Thames, 1963, p. 85. Thus, let us assign early 1894 to this paper.

The ninth paper, "The Man Christ Jesus" has been found since the first edition an added for this second edition. It is an answer to F. E. Raven's paper, "The Person of the Christ" (1895).

The last paper, *Scripture: Its inspiration and Authority . . .* was written after 1881, since there is a reference in it to the Revised Version (which was printed in 1881).

## A. C. Ord

N. Noel wrote that:

A. C. Ord was also a most excellent teacher, and also lived at Bournemouth, and had also been an Anglican clergyman, and also came from an old wealthy family. Three of his large pamphlets, written during the trouble of 1890 . . . were among the most useful and enlightening that were issued, and they helped very many brethren, and were sent to them all over the world.<sup>3</sup>

In the papers by him, we learn that he separated from fellowship with Bethesda (1848). It appears that he was gathered together to the Lord's name (Matt. 18:20) just before, or during, the troubles with B. W. Newton (1845-1847), since he could look back to that era (p. 36), having "quitted human systems" (p. 26). The truth of the New Creation had profoundly affected him (pp. 123, 124). It must have been quite an experience to see the brethren F. W. Grant and C. E. Stuart undermining the truth he had embraced in leaving the Church of England.<sup>4</sup> This was followed by the further undermining by F. E. Raven, who also taught wicked doctrines concerning the Person of Christ. I thought it well to add two Notes at the end regarding F. E. Raven's Apollinarianism; and how J. B. Stoney, C. A. Coates and James Taylor Sr. agreed with F. E. Raven. The first of these two Notes also takes note of F. E. Raven's denial of the Eternal Word. A. C. Ord wrote of F. E. Raven's denial of the Personality of the Eternal Life as well as the evil teaching that He brought what constituted manhood with Him, thus holding that something of humanity was in the Godhead. Well did W. Kelly say that F. E. Raven had a mission from an opposing and evil spirit.

R. A. Huebner

3. *The History of the Brethren*, p. 141.

4. C. E. Stuart went on to teach that Christ took the blood to heaven in the disembodied state to make propitiation there, a doctrine denounced by W. Kelly to be fundamentally false. This evil teaching is found as one of three alternative views found in the Scofield Reference Bible on John 20:17 ("touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." In the Introduction, C. I. Scofield mentioned, among those to whom he was indebted, "Mr. Walter Scott, the eminent Bible teacher." Walter Scott supported C. E. Stuart, and held and propagated this teaching.

*“Is There  
Not a Cause?”*

*or, Evidence of the  
Departure from the Principles of Truth,  
Holiness, and Loyalty to Christ,*

*Which has Occasioned a  
Separation from Certain Brethren.*

*A Dialogue*

*by*

ΦΙΛΑΛΗΘΗΣ <sup>1</sup>

---

1. {W. Rickards, in his *Bethesda in 1892*, states that this paper was written by A. C. Ord.}

## *“Is There not a Cause?”*

**A.** I am glad we have met, for I have long wished to have some conversation with you on your exclusive position, and to learn what reasons you can offer from Scripture on behalf of it. You certainly ought to have very good ground for maintaining it, for you represent an unpopular cause and one that, by its unamiable features, has little attraction for Christians in general, however valuable may be the truth that you hold.

**B.** I am thankful to hear what you say; were it otherwise, I should fear something wrong; you remember the words of the hymn:

God's glory is a wondrous thing,  
Most strange in all its ways  
And of all else on earth least like  
What men agree to praise.

As He can endless glory weave  
From time's misjudging shame,  
In His own world He is content  
To play a losing game.

How could the path of Christ and the exclusion of all that is contrary to Christ at all costs, be popular in an ease-loving generation? Was Christ Himself popular (I do not mean in His grace but) in the self-denying way He trod, and in His separation from, and judgment of, the evil that surrounded him? Let me add, that, you seem to me, on the other hand, to represent the latitudinarianism of the day, which sacrifices all principle to persons -- God to man -- and His rights and truth and glory -- to mere human considerations, liberality of mind, and charity (falsely so called) towards His creatures.

**A.** Is there, then, any real difference of principle between us? I have been accustomed to consider, and have been often told, that we are kept apart by diversity of judgment respecting a practical detail; though, perhaps, one of a serious nature.

**B.** Novices are easily imposed upon. Knowing only half the truth, they are apt to fancy that they are acquainted with the whole, and that their opponents can easily be shown to be in the wrong. “He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.” You have, doubtless, been told many things which, upon full enquiry, you will find to be without foundation. I hope to be able to show you that important principles are at stake, by means of tracts printed by your friends, advocating sentiments (in justification, of course, of the practice pursued) that undermine the very nature and existence of the Church of God. I think you will find upon examination, that the acceptance of the false position you occupy arises from want of apprehension of the relationship of the church to Christ as its Head and Lord, and of its being the dwelling-place of God by the Spirit, whose presence and character form the standard by which its government and conduct should be regulated.

**A.** I confess, if that is what you mean, that we meet simply as Christians; which seems to me all that is right and desirable.

**B.** Perhaps it does, but there is no such expression or idea to be found in Scripture, and it discloses the secret of your looseness of practice. To meet in the name of Christ is a very different thing, for that supposes the recognition of His character, His title as Head and Lord, and the claim of His authority over those that are His. What you call meeting “simply,” I fear, is just without having any fixed or defined principles, in ignorance that the word of God supplies such as necessarily characterizing the house of God.

**A.** But is that sufficient reason for cutting off or excommunicating whole bodies of Christians for evils with which they have no tangible connection, whilst admitting members of the Church of England and other sects?

**B.** That is a misrepresentation, as you ought to know. When were you excommunicated? For my own part I have *left* (not excommunicated) those you are now united to, because I could not recognize as the Lord's table, that which did not maintain His glory, or regard the rights of His Person as paramount to all other considerations; but I am not aware that by doing so I excommunicated anybody. To this path of separation we have been driven, in order to keep our consciences clear, and the principle is the same whether applied to one or many. We withdraw when evil is admitted, as the Scripture directs, where it has carried the day: “Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity” {2 Tim. 2:19}. Refusing to receive those whom we have been obliged to leave is not excommunication, just as it is not the same thing to decline a person's visit as to turn him out of your house. I do not regard the Establishment as an assembly of Christians at all, but as the world, and therefore not on the same ground as yourselves and others, who are professedly associated as Christians. But I know of a recent instance in which persons who desired to break bread with us were refused, because they came from an Independent Chapel where false doctrine was sheltered; so that the measure we mete is not so uneven as you imagine.

**A.** You admit, then, that you would not allow me to break bread with you next Lord's day, which, as far as I am concerned, I could freely do.

**B.** You astonish me! Do you wish to convince me of your own inconsistency and to show what has been too evident in others -- that you are not acting before God, from any real principle, or from conscience either? You charge us with behavior which, if it were true, would render us nothing but a set of violent schismatics, acting in direct contravention of the word of God, and then profess, in the same breath, your readiness to unite with us in such wicked conduct! Alas! what laxity the least abandonment of right principle leads to.

**A.** But keep to the point, and explain how you can justify what you call separation, and refuse us a place at what, at any rate, you regard as the Lord's table?



**B.** All in good time; but it is no departure from our subject that I should point out to you to what your principles lead; and, I may add, that some have gone much further than you, -- and made meeting in the holy, blessed name of Christ and the remembrance of His death, a pretext for publicly disturbing the worship and order of His saints.<sup>1</sup>

**A.** I was not aware of any such conduct, for I thought this sort of unhappy opposition was all on your side; but I suppose they thought your proceedings unscriptural and contrary to love and unity.

**B.** That is, "doing evil that good may come." Love and unity seem a mere pretense when used by persons for violating the consciences and feelings of others whose principles of meeting are diametrically opposed to their own; and a shameful desecration of the Lord's table, though there might possibly be some persons present of similar sentiments. Do you think that self-will, and violence, and false pleas have a claim at the Lord's table, not to speak of other things which will appear presently?

**A.** Certainly not; but how can you reject Christians, if you profess to meet in the name of Christ? Will you not meet them in heaven?

**B.** It is because they are Christians I am bound to judge them: "Do not ye judge them that are within, them that are without God judgeth," says the Apostle Paul, so that I am forced, in obedience to the word of God, to disallow all that is contrary to God in my fellow Christians, and to call upon them to do the same in themselves, and certainly not to admit it "within" if they persevere in it. You are greatly in error in thinking that meeting in the name of Christ is to be a cover for evil conduct; it involves the rejection of everything inconsistent with His name and the upholding of all the truth, glory, and holiness of that name. Look at the same chapter already referred to (1 Cor. 5:4), and you will see that, "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ," the Corinthians were to deliver to Satan the man who had offended, who was, moreover, evidently a converted person, for the apostle wrote to them in his second epistle to restore him on his repentance. Think of degrading the name of Christ so as to make it a reason for passing over evil, because those who are guilty of it are Christians, instead of using that name as the highest contradiction of, and warrant against, all evil! It is because a man is a Christian or "within," that the apostle holds him to be a subject of discipline, and under the judgment of the house of God. In heaven there will (blessed be God!) be no flesh to judge or false principle to watch against, nor Satan's power and deception to beguile the mind; so that a man's

being in heaven by and by, has nothing whatever to do with his not being dealt with in discipline when on earth, and only shows a perversion of thought in those who can make use of such an argument. The same principle of judgment of evil being indispensable at the Lord's table, is applied in 1 Cor. 11:30-32 to individuals, and to the Lord's dealing with them; where the assembly had failed in its duty He had to judge them Himself.

**A.** But let me hear more particularly: first, how you could leave what you once owned to be the Lord's table; and next, however inconsistent in us, how you can refuse us a place where you break bread, whilst we ourselves do not hold false doctrine.

**B.** To those points I am coming. With reference to the first enquiry, I may say briefly that I cannot own *that* to be the table of the Lord which in principle or practice admits of His dishonor, and your's does both; but the principle I hold to be the most important, for it is a denial of the essential character of the Lord's table, to make it the sanction for that which destroys the true glory of His blessed Person.

**A.** Your statement seems to me extravagant: I suppose that you allude to Bethesda Chapel, Bristol, and to the fact that we receive persons coming from that meeting; but surely that does not warrant such a sweeping condemnation of us all. For my own part, I would not go to Bethesda, but there are many dear Christians there, and I could not treat them as you do.

**B.** If the dearest Christian on earth treats Christ badly, in faithfulness to such an one and to the Lord Himself, I cannot suffer it or allow him a place at the Lord's table. Even the Old Testament lays it down as a principle, -- "Thou shalt in anywise rebuke thy brother, and not suffer sin upon him" (Lev. 19:17).

**A.** But explain your strong language and how persons communing at Bethesda can involve us in such sin.

**B.** I do not by any means allude exclusively to Bethesda, though what has happened there illustrates the ground which has been taken generally. You have doubtless heard of the "Letter of the Ten," so called because it was signed by the ten leaders at Bethesda. This letter was twice read over to the whole assembly of those who were in communion there, and they were all required -- to justify the course which had been pursued, -- to accept the principles contained in this letter -- and show that they did so, by rising from their seats, under pain of their two pastors, Muller and Craik, withdrawing from them, as they insisted upon being cleared in this manner. This letter was a defense of what had been done, in receiving into communion well-instructed followers of Mr. Newton, and propagators of his doctrines, after the remonstrance and the entreaty of many that they would forbear to do so, and that at least they would examine and see for themselves the dangerous tendency of his heresies before committing themselves, and those sheep of Christ they professed to watch over, to association with his followers.

---

1. This was done at Bath, Dublin, Torquay, Exeter, and other places. At Exeter, with the deliberate sanction of all the leaders of your community in Devon. At Torquay this was twice repeated; one person from Dartmouth, and another subsequently, sent for from a long distance, being brought to the meeting at this most solemn time by Mr. ---, for the purpose of breaking it up; besides this, on the intervening Sunday, a division was formally and publicly proposed by the same person at the Lord's table, so that his meeting at Torquay is founded upon schism and wrong, as well as containing false principles, in common with others; of these facts there are many witnesses.

**A.** You mean that every member of Bethesda who was present on the occasion referred to, has bound himself --

**B.** To this treasonable declaration of indifference to the person of Christ, for I can call it no less.

**A.** What are the sentiments contained in it which will bear out such an appellation?

**B.** In its general statements it disclaims all responsibility, as an assembly, to maintain the truth of Christ's blessed person, which had been called in question, refusing to investigate and judge the matter; and after giving certain specious and dishonorable reasons for thus declining to obey the Scriptures which exhort us to "try the spirits whether they are of God," and "earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3), it declares, that though Mr. Newton be fundamentally heretical, those coming from under his teaching are not to be rejected on that account; that the requirement that they should judge this question is the introduction of a new test of communion; and that the "examining a work of fifty pages" is too much to be required of them, lest it should be construed into an evil (!) precedent, and so involve too great an expenditure of time. <sup>2</sup> Thus, before God, His Church, and the elect angels, this assembly has formally and publicly and in the most offensive way, proclaimed its neutrality to the defamation of the person of the adorable Son of God; for the honor of His person is not of sufficient importance to them to induce the reading of fifty pages, lest it should be used as an evil precedent; weighed in this balance, the Son of God is not worth so much time and trouble!

**A.** But, perhaps, they did not know to what these errors related, and conceived them to be different in their nature to what you represent them to be.

**B.** That cannot be; for in the commencement of the letter they disclaim holding Mr. Newton's views in the following terms, which show that they are fully aware of their serious character, and that they altogether affect the integrity of the person of Christ:

We add, for the further satisfaction of any who may have had their minds disturbed, that we utterly disclaim the assertion that the blessed Son of God was involved in the guilt of the first Adam; or that He was born under the curse of the broken law, because of His connection with Israel. We hold Him to have been

always the Holy One of God, in whom the Father was ever well pleased. We know of no curse which the Savior bore, except that which He endured as the surety, for sinners, according to that Scripture, "He was made a curse for us." We utterly reject the thought of His ever having had the experiences of an unconverted person; but maintain that while He suffered *outwardly* the trials connected with His being a man and an Israelite, -- still in His feelings and experiences, as well as in his external character, He was entirely separate from sinners.

**A.** But there has been some change subsequent to all this at Bethesda; for I have heard that Mr. Muller has himself denounced these doctrines?

**B.** Mr. Muller did so as an *individual*, and declared that any one who "maintained, upheld, and defended" them should not be received. But the position of the assembly has never been altered, nor has it been allowed to judge the errors in question. Mr. Muller's declaration would still admit of any being received who concealed or even did not prominently bring forward these errors, and the artifice which persons under the influence of such doctrines make use of, is only too well known. That Mr. Muller's personal statement, however inconsistent with his previous or subsequent conduct, was not intended to alter the course of action laid down in the "Letter of the Ten," Mr. Craik himself declares in a letter of his, printed in Mr. Trotter's tract, entitled, "Bethesda in 1857," in these words, "The judgment expressed in the 'Letter' has never been repudiated so far as I am aware by any of us." This letter of Mr. Craik, he says, was read by him to the other laboring brethren, who allowed it to pass as an expression of their sentiments. It would be impossible, however, that any mere change of action, or anything short of the fullest repentance and confession before the whole Church of God, would purge away the sin of which Mr. Muller and his coadjutors have been guilty in putting their names to such a document, and in inducing their followers to give their adhesion to it. The division and scandal which they have been the cause of among their fellow-Christians, are irreparable; but no trace of sorrow for this has ever appeared, nor anything else but regard for their own credit and character. When, in order to stay this evil, they were appealed to in a formal request, made by brethren in London, that a solemn meeting might be held, open to all who were concerned or troubled in conscience about these things, in order that whatever was wrong in their accusers or their own course might be judged, they refused; nothing but what was one-sided would suit them. They were as careless of the evil consequences that might ensue among their brethren, as they had been of the feelings and entreaties of the little godly company driven out from among them by their declining to listen to their remonstrance respecting the "Letter of the Ten."

**A.** You said just now that the conduct of Bethesda was not the only reason for your separation from us.

**B.** Because, as might be expected from the want of faithfulness regarding that meeting, the same principles in reality prevail generally more or less amongst your party;

---

2. The statements referred to from the "Letter of the Ten" are as follows:

For, supposing the author of the tracts were fundamentally heretical, this would not warrant us in rejecting those who came from under his teaching, until we were satisfied that they had understood and imbibed views essentially subversive of foundation-truth.

The requirement that we should investigate and judge Mr. Newton's tracts, appeared to some of us like the introduction of a fresh test of communion.

We felt that the compliance with Mr. Alexander's request would be the introduction of an evil precedent. If a brother has a right to demand our examining a work of fifty pages, he may require our investigating error said to be contained in one of much larger dimensions; so that all our time might be wasted in the examination of other people's errors, instead of more important service.

for this I can refer to the tracts printed and circulated by your friends, or to facts which have come under my own knowledge.

**A.** Let me have a few of the latter first.

**B.** You have heard of Mr. Morris, who denied the eternity of punishment, and spread this false doctrine at Brixham, Exmouth, and elsewhere. This serious error, involving the nature of the sufferings of Christ, the judgment of sin, the character of God, and the integrity of His word in its statements concerning the punishment of the sinner, when it broke out awakened earnest resistance in those who felt the truth of God was undermined by it. Persons holding this doctrine were allowed to break bread at Dartmouth, and when their doing so occasioned trouble at Torquay, brethren there found, that notwithstanding the sorrow and distress it had caused them, not only their request that such persons should be refused a place at the table was disregarded, but that no remonstrance or warning would be addressed to any in this error, for those meeting at Dartmouth would take no action at all in the matter. This meeting, as far as I am aware, has stood on the same ground ever since, and in the same association with you. At a place called Venton, about four miles from Totness, a meeting was formed in connection with Mr. Morris, who used to go there from Plymouth, and after he left it was supplied by preachers of his connection. A leading brother, who lived there, himself informed me that Mr. Morris had preached his false doctrines there, as his followers did after him; Mrs. ---- received these doctrines, and sought to make proselytes to them, as two persons assured me whom she tried to convince; this meeting was subsequently taken into communion with you just as it stood, without any repudiation of Mr. Morris or his doctrine, or exclusion of any persons who had imbibed them. Mrs. ---- I have recently seen when staying in Torquay, breaking bread at your meeting there, who owned to me she had not given up this false doctrine, nor in a long conversation could I succeed in inducing her to renounce it. Another man, an American, a Mr. P., I also found breaking bread at Torquay, and seeking to make converts to this doctrine; at Edinburgh also there were similar instances of this laxity.

**A.** That is all very loose, I admit, but I should like to hear something more respecting the reception of Mr. Newton's followers, and I imagine some of those things you speak of are not recent.

**B.** Whether recent or not they equally show the principles acted on among you, and I must give you such cases as have come under my notice. Though I am not now in the way of hearing of them frequently, I can tell you the names of several associated with Mr. Newton who were allowed to break bread in Welbeck Street, in London, on the mistaken plea that they were such "nice" Christians. In Torquay also I know of four similar instances occurring at different times, the particulars of which I could give. Some places, doubtless, may be slightly more lax than others, and where attention has been awakened there may have been an effort for a moment to avert the scandal occasioned, but that is no

proof of decision for Christ. I think I have now brought forward facts sufficient to substantiate what I have said; and if you choose to enquire, instead of trusting mere general denials too lightly given, you may discover many more, and so at least prove your sincerity and honesty, though you may find it more painful and more serious than you are inclined to think, if you really have the glory of Christ at heart. You will not be surprised that I cannot own that to be the table of the Lord where these things are suffered.

**A.** But that does not make it evident why you reject us all, which was the second point we spoke of.

**B.** As regards Bethesda, I look upon every Christian coming from thence and cognizant of what has taken place as identified with the principles of the "Letter of the Ten," and therefore as one who has *defaced his Christian title*; and with respect to yourselves, I cannot own your right to the Lord's table, whilst you are associated with others upon the principle that the glory of Christ may be sullied provided Christians are the parties concerned in it. It is practical indifference to Christ; you do not do the wrong to Him yourself, but you suffer others to do it, which is rather the worse action of the two. They may be deceived in what they hold or have fellowship with, but you know it to be evil and allow them to go on in it though ruinous to the soul and withering to its apprehension of the glorious person of Christ, on which alone all our knowledge of and communion with God depend. What would you think of a soldier's loyalty or even sense of duty who could quietly sit and tolerate in others treasonable language, practices and associations against his rightful sovereign?

**A.** But does Scripture warrant your treating others in this way, because they are linked with evil, if they are personally sound in the faith?

**B.** It is perfectly clear on that point, and this is one of the differences of principle I spoke of. You, to justify yourselves, deny that association with evil defiles. Let us hear what the word of God says to the contrary. He that receives a heretic into his house and bids him God speed "*is partaker of his evil deeds*" (2 John 10). "Be not partakers of other men's sins: keep thyself pure" (1 Tim. 5:22). Again we have the allusion to, and application of, the laws of defilement laid down in the Old Testament in the words, "For ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and I will walk in them; and I will be their God and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate saith the Lord, and *touch not the unclean thing*, and I will receive you and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters saith the Lord Almighty" (2 Cor. 6:17, 18). If contact with evil does not defile, why are we told not to touch it? and is not fellowship at the Lord's table the closest moral and spiritual association or contact that can exist amongst Christians? In 1 Cor. 10:16-22, we have the principle clearly laid down that association at the Lord's table involves unity and partnership or participation in whatever takes place there -- that we cease to be isolated individuals whose acts do not

affect each other, becoming by the fellowship of the Lord's table where we partake of the same bread -- "one body, one loaf."

**A.** But this notion has been quite scoffed at amongst us, and you surely do not mean that defilement can now be contracted by physical contact, as it was in Old Testament times. The passage in John relates merely to social intercourse.

**B.** Alas for those that despise the word of God, instead of taking heed to it, as a humble, obedient soul will ever do, however absurd men may deem such a course. Do you think the house of God is to be kept less pure than that of the elect lady, whom the Apostle John addresses? I know well that every effort has been made to get rid of this passage, because the edge of it is felt. It too plainly condemns the person who sanctions evil doctrine, and that in the smallest degree, even to an ordinary salutation, as a *participator* in the sin of it. It unequivocally establishes the principle that a man may "partake" in the guilt of evil doctrine, which he does not personally accept. Persisting in doing so, we are bound by it to treat him as a "partaker." Of course contamination in this dispensation is moral, not physical. We have so regarded it throughout. The apostle's quotation from the Levitical law shows, however, that the principle holds good (indeed it is that which the ceremonial defilement was intended to teach) that any sort of communion with evil in the least degree unfits for God's presence and the place *where God dwells*, which the Church is. For my own part, I have always found moral deterioration to be the result of corrupt association. Is not the idea that evil may be tolerated in the house of God, a most evident proof that the soul has practically got away from God, and is itself becoming *leavened*? The leaven is to be excluded or "purged out," as the apostle says to the Corinthians, "that ye *may be* a new lump as (in principle, or nature, or calling, not in the actual condition of the Corinthians) ye are unleavened." "A *little* leaven," he adds, "leaveneth the whole lump" (1 Cor. 5:6, 7). Is not that the effect of association? and, remember, though it be but a *little*, it will effect the corruption of the whole. Let no one, therefore, think lightly of a *little* evil; if at all allowed, it will soon gain ground imperceptibly; and when you have relaxed upon one point, the natural heart will soon take leave to do the same in others.

**A.** But does it seem Christ-like to exclude so many for the faults of a few?

**B.** It is for their own sin they are excluded; but you are also seriously wrong in your ideas of our blessed Lord, and abusing His blessed character in His personal grace to sinners, to make Him tolerant of evil in His Church, which He never is and never could be, for He would deny His own nature were He to be so. Have you forgotten the scourge of small cords with which He drove the intruders out of the temple? Was that grace? Surely something else was required when the condition of God's house and the "holiness which becomes it *for ever*" were at stake. Again, what is His

sentence upon the Church at Pergamos? <sup>3</sup> Does He not condemn *the whole body* for the selfsame conduct for which you are now arraigned, because they had those among them who *held* (He does not say taught) the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes? They allowed these persons among them though they did not accept their evil doctrines as a body, and the Lord calls on them to repent of their indifference, threatening that otherwise He will come to them quickly in judgment, besides fighting against the individuals in question. They did not hate the evil, but He did, and "*the fear of the Lord is to hate evil.*" Did you hate these things as you ought, you never could allow such connection with them or plead for it.

**A.** But I have always taken the addresses to the seven churches as showing how much evil could exist in a church; for the Lord does not disown them or call upon the saints to leave any of the seven He addresses.

**B.** The Lord calls to repentance, and whilst that call sounds and until it is rejected, of course, it would not be the moment to quit them. But if that word is unheeded, what then? Would you stay to be spued out of Christ's mouth? For that is what He threatens in one case -- to take away the candlestick in another. Is not that disowning their church position and relationship, and their consequent claim to recognition by the faithful? Your argument is precisely what I have just seen in a letter from a clergyman, addressed to one who was uneasy about her position in the Establishment, in order to induce her to remain in it. You do not seem to understand the posture the Lord here assumes, which is that of Judge, passing sentence, not that of a Lawgiver, framing laws or explaining details of conduct for individual guidance, though He adds, "He that hath an ear let him hear"; so that the individual is to bow to the word of Christ and be faithful to it at all costs, when the body fails to listen to the call. You will forgive me for saying, your use of this passage reminds me of Satan's use of the Psalm in the temptation in the wilderness, for the Lord makes His glory the standard and judges everything by it that does not come up to that standard or is inconsistent with it, and you turn it into a reason for bearing with what He condemns, and inciting others to do the same; thus you are exactly in opposition to the Lord in the solemn judgment He here passes.

**A.** You do not surely mean that *any* practical evil which may exist in a body of Christians, destroys their title as a part of the Church of God?

**B.** Only where it is known and sanctioned, for then *the fundamental principles and essential nature* of the Church of God are denied. God cannot and will not sanction sin where He dwells. When the evil committed by Achan was pointed out, and thus became known to the children of Israel, then it was that God said He would not be among them *any more*

---

3. His words are, "I have *against thee*, that thou hast them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing *I hate*. Repent, or I will *come unto thee* quickly," &c. (Rev. 2:14, 15).

except they destroyed the accursed thing from among them. Previous to this, its existence produced weakness and defeat, "they could not stand before their enemies," for God could not put forth His strength amongst them on account of it. Has God changed His own eternal nature and become tolerant of evil? Or is it the society of Christians that has become all-important, so that we are to sacrifice His presence to theirs? Impossible that He can abide what denies His very being and glory, and is the cause in those who know Him not, of everlasting exclusion from His presence. He declares He "will be sanctified in those that come nigh Him." "He is greatly to be feared in the assembly of his saints, and to be had in reverence of all them that are *round about him*" (Psa. 89:7). The moment sin in principle is admitted, or the truth denied, or false doctrine acquiesced in, it is no longer the "house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth." Even leaving their first love, the Lord calls on the Church at Ephesus to repent of, or He would take away the candlestick, which would be to disown them as His light or witness -- the sole end of the Church's existence as a body on earth -- and it would then cease to have any claim as such. Let me read you a passage from a tract of great value, entitled, *Separation from Evil, God's Principle of Unity*:

If the body refuse to answer to the very nature and character of God, and the incompatibility of that nature with evil, so that it becomes really a false witness for God, then the first and immutable principle recurs -- the evil must be separated from. Further, the unity which is maintained after such separation, becomes a testimony to the compatibility of the Holy Ghost and evil, that is, it is in its nature, apostasy; it maintains the name and authority of God in His Church and associates it with evil.

**A.** But the Lord does not hold one Church responsible for the rest, and it does not seem to me that we are at all involved in what is done elsewhere.

**B.** You forget that the Church is not seen here at all in its unity, or as the body of Christ, of which He is the Head, for He is *outside* it, judging of its state as His candlestick or light-bearer on earth, which it was set to be. Your reasoning betrays your ignorance of what the Church of God is, in its nature and constitution. The moment the existence of a divine person, the Holy Ghost here on earth, is understood as the essential characteristic of the Church, its unity, fellowship, and the judgment of evil necessarily follow. The Holy Ghost cannot act differently in different places, for He is ever one and the same, and forming the body of Christ, *produces by His presence* a unity such as subsists in the natural body; thus and thus only do the epistles ever treat of the Church of God. "There is one body and one Spirit" (cp. Eph. 4:3, 15, 16; 1 Cor. 12:12, 13). The presence of God necessarily gives unity, and the corporate responsibility we have been speaking of. It was so in a lower sense even in Israel of old in the passage to which we have referred, so that God said after the sin of Achan, "*Israel hath sinned and they have also transgressed my covenant which I commanded them; for they have even taken of the accursed thing, and have also stolen and dissembled, and they have put it even*

among their own stuff. Therefore the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies, because *they were accursed*; neither will I be with you any more except ye destroy the accursed from among you" (Josh. 7:11, 12). The whole nation was charged with the guilt which existed among them; the whole nation suffered for it, and was held responsible for its extermination. The unity which the Holy Ghost produces now in the Church of God -- though flowing from the same cause -- the presence of God -- is not national as it then was, but of a much deeper and closer character. It is threefold: we are *living* stones of the temple in which God dwells, as the Apostle Paul says, builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit," and thus the whole building grows unto an "*holy temple in the Lord*;" secondly, there is the unity of the body of Christ, which also results from the presence of the Holy Ghost, forming the one body united to its Head in heaven; this, unity is still closer and more intimate, as my body is much nearer to me than the house I live in; and, lastly, that which flows from connection or association at the Lord's table, and fellowship in His death, and being united in His name, so that what is done in that Name in one place, is done as to the principle of it for all, and is binding on all; reception, discipline, and other acts done in any given place are valid for the whole, and gifts are common to the whole. If this is not recognized, the unity of the Church of God is denied and the presence of a divine person in it is entirely disowned.

**A.** We do not profess to be "the Church of God;" <sup>4</sup> we believe the Church to be in ruins, and have never claimed to be the "one assembly of God."

**B.** It is evident that the Lord gives the sanction of His presence and authority, to even two or three met in His name (Matt. 18:17-20), and to their acts, for they are in His place and represent Him in what they do. Solemn and blessed thought! Though the Church is in ruins, this principle remains ever true to faith, for Christ cannot fail in what He has promised, whatever the ruin; so that the essential privileges, action, and discipline of the Church of God remain untouched, though but two or three are there to enjoy or carry them out, and though apostolic authority, appointment, and office, as well as the (so-called) sign-gifts are wanting. It is a wretched plea, that the ruin of the Church is a reason for submission to evil, and subversive of all moral principle and sense of what is due to Christ. Scripture, when contemplating the disorder and confusion that would ensue in the Church, says, "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (2 Tim. 2:19). Besides, if you are not upon the true ground of the Church of God, you are a sect, the word of God ceases to be applicable, and you have no direction to guide you as to discipline or anything else; without pretending in any exclusive sense to be the Church of God, we can meet

---

4. The idea that any body of Christians could assume to be "the Church of God," in any exclusive or even complete sense, was publicly disclaimed at large meetings held at Barnstaple and Torquay, in 1863. Alas for those who go on repeating false accusations without scruple!

together as forming a part of it and acting in the unity of the body of Christ, seeking to carry out the principles laid down in Scripture for its guidance; whilst the Holy Ghost remains on earth, it would be impossible to do otherwise, notwithstanding the ruin, without ignoring His presence. The expression you allude to, viz., "*the one assembly of God*," I have been positively assured by the person who used it, was intended to indicate that the meetings in London were in reality one, though locally distinct. If you allow your mind to be diverted from the real point at issue by such idle or wicked misconstruction, you will never get into the right track. It is the object of the enemy to mislead by throwing dust into the eyes in this way.

**A.** I have told you I would not go to Bethesda; ought you not, therefore, to make a difference between me and others?

**B.** Of what avail is this practically, if you are united to a body which has formally refused to be dissociated from it -- if others of your community do go there -- and some even glory in doing so? Let me ask you why you would not go there? Is it not because you suppose you would by so doing be sanctioning evil, and it would be sin to do so? You allow others to sin, but you will not do so yourself. Where is the consistency of such a course, and of what worth is such a principle in the Church of God? If you would not go there and believe in the unity which the Holy Ghost produces, you ought to associate yourself with the company who were excluded by the adoption of the "Letter of the Ten."

You promised to give some evidence from certain writings which you said showed unsoundness of principle in the formation of our assemblies.

**B.** I did and this is most important, for were there no such facts as I have stated, your principles alone would keep me entirely apart from you. You will however perceive what is historically true, that these principles were and are brought forward, as a defense for the course pursued in reference to Bethesda and Mr. Newton's doctrine in general, at the same time they throw additional light upon the value of the facts themselves, so that it is vain to attempt to gainsay their double testimony. I will first quote the statements of their principles put forth by corporate bodies and afterwards those made by individuals.

"The Tottenham Statement, adopted by Brethren at Tottenham, the 4th of March, 1849," contains four resolutions, of which the third and fourth are as follows:

3. We welcome to the table, *on individual grounds*, each saint, not because he or she is a member of this or that gathering or denomination of Christians, nor because they are followers of any particular leader; but on such testimony as commends itself to us as being sufficient.

4. We distinctly refuse to be parties to any exclusion of those who we are satisfied are believers, except on grounds personally applying to their individual faith and conduct.

The Scarborough Statement, Article 5, runs thus:

We do not think it right to exclude Christians from communion because they have happened to belong to gatherings in which there may have been persons of unsound opinions; but we think that every Christian ought, in any case requiring examination, to stand or fall by his own personal innocence, or his own personal offence.

The statement of certain Christians meeting for worship in Union Street, Torquay:

3. We cannot *refuse* to receive any person, except on *individual* grounds, that is, on grounds that reflect on that person's *individual* faith or walk.

In the Statement from Torquay, where the whole of these declarations were printed, is added the following reasons for publishing them, showing distinctly their object:

Statements of certain Brethren in other localities (besides Torquay), drawn up with the view of resisting the pressure of a certain sectarian movement, whereby whole communions, sound in doctrine, are corporately cut off, and persons presenting themselves are refused, not because of any defect in their own individual faith or walk, but because they belong to such communities.

It is plain that these Statements are intended to avow the determination to admit persons to communion from bodies tolerating those holding false doctrine, that the Scripture principle that association with evil at the Lord's table contaminates or defiles, is entirely denied, and that any corporate connection with others in the unity of the body of Christ is disowned. I will now give you specimens of publications which have been mostly sent me by post, the object of which is to show the principles publicly taught amongst you. They contain the following conclusions:

1st. That in the days of the apostles one church was not held responsible for the decisions of another, although fellowship and sympathy were in exercise.

2ndly. That no individual in any church was held responsible for evil existing in it, either doctrinal or practical, simply because he was one of the worshippers.

*A Drop of Oil on Troubled Waters*, p. 11,  
Caswell, Birmingham.

You teach that partaking of the Lord's Supper at the same place and time with a defiled person defiles . . . I do not of course speak of cases in which association at the Lord's table *or elsewhere* leads to the actual imbibing of the heresy, because then the heresy, being in the man, defiles him. St. Paul does not tell the Corinthians that they are defiled because a fornicator breaks bread with them. He warns them against the leavening effect of evil communications. They had broken bread with him, but they were yet unleavened; but if they continued to countenance the evil doer, they would themselves be corrupted.

*R. Howard's recent Letter to G. V. W.*, p. 10.

From these notices we learn, first, that believers ought not to have fellowship with the defiled; and, secondly, that they do not become defiled by such fellowship, but only by receiving and holding, or practicing that which defiles. Hence it follows, that under no pretense of defilement are believers to be rejected who have been in contact with false teachers without imbibing their doctrine . . . It also follows, *a fortiori*, that meetings of believers *cannot be defiled by the allowance of false*

teaching in them.

*The Church of God According to Scripture*, Yapp,  
Welbeck Street, 1861.

**A.** What is the meaning of the words repeated in each of the public statements, that they will only receive on “individual grounds,” or “grounds that affect persons’ *individual* faith and walk,” words which I see the writers have put in italics?

**B.** It is intended to show that whatever evil such persons may be sanctioning, to whatever extent, they will not hold them in any way responsible for it or defiled by it. We have seen how different is the Lord’s sentence upon the Church of Pergamos. It also disowns any position in practical recognition of the unity of the body of Christ, and in principle takes the ground of independency, for they do not allow that the action of any other gathering of Christians gives a title to recognition, or involves the duty of exclusion, at their table. The Tottenham circular distinctly affirms this, the others imply it. Mr. Robert Howard declares that the Corinthians were not defiled by the evils amongst them, not even by the horrible crime of incest, which he calls fornication; and that to suffer false doctrine to any extent does not corrupt morally, unless the false doctrine be imbibed; nor, according to his argument, would any toleration of sin to any amount defile, unless the parties themselves became fornicators or drunkards, and this the last extract declares in so many words {cp. 1 Cor. 5}. In dealing with Scripture, however, these writers are quite at variance with the apostle, who would not go to Corinth because of the state of the Corinthians, and who tells them to purge out the leaven that they “may be a new lump as they are unleavened,” that is, in the principle of the new nature which was born of God, to which their practical condition ought to correspond. It is on the same ground that he addresses them as “saints” in chapter 1, though so deeply failing in holiness of conduct. They were to act according to this divine nature and calling in purging out the leaven, which, indeed, as the apostle puts it, *was leavening* the whole lump, that they *might be* a new lump, fit for being presented to God. It is evident the apostle did hold them responsible for the evil -- till they had so acted, and not only this, but had repented of their former guilty indifference to it, with the most thorough manifestation of deep and godly contrition. “For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, *what fear*, yea, *what vehement desire*, yea, *what zeal*, yea, *what revenge!* In all things ye have approved yourselves to be *clear* in this matter” (2 Cor. 7:11). They were not till now, that their decision and repentance had been evidenced, clear in the apostle’s eyes. Besides this, far from allowing the evil that remained amongst them, as has been falsely stated, he declares that he “has in readiness to revenge *all* disobedience when their obedience is fulfilled” (2 Cor. 10:6); that is, that when the spirit of obedience had been thoroughly wrought in them, he will insist upon the judgment of *everything* wrong amongst them. He further declares to all, but especially to those that had sinned, that if he comes again, he “will not

spare.” It is remarkable how totally opposed is the spirit of these writers, in persisting that such disobedience ought to be tolerated, to that of the apostle. And his pronouncing them clear, upon this obedience and rejection of the evil, demolishes at one blow the entire host of sophistical conclusions they indulge in. The Corinthians, *clearing themselves* thus by what they had done, and their thorough change of feeling from their former complicity with the sin, for which they had now been so deeply humbled, is very fully dwelt upon by the apostle (2 Cor. 7:8-12). No one can read this passage, in which their repentance is declared, and the apostle’s confidence again restored to them on account of it, without being shocked at the hardihood with which such senseless and unholy arguments are brought forward, traversing the apostle’s treatment of the subject from first to last, and that in the face of the effect produced upon the Corinthians by his first epistle, which he also records.

**A.** There is no good in using such strong language.

**B.** I speak with truth and soberness. Read the whole passage for yourself to which I have alluded, and then contrast such statements as that they were not responsible for or defiled by the presence of fornicators, and tell me if such reasoning does not deserve to be stigmatized as unholy, because calculated to make souls insensible to the presence of sin, and as senseless and degrading: for even worldly men, in only human societies, know very well, that their moral support and sanction is given to evil and the tone of their society lowered, if they admit or allow of unworthy members, and that they are disgraced by so doing. Thus the Church is sunk, by these arguments, below the level of the world’s morality. But I can show you statements stronger than these, which adopt the very principle which has been already referred to, as the essence of apostasy.

**A.** Let me hear what they are.

**B.** In a tract entitled, *Uncleanness: Leaven*, we find as follows:

When once the tabernacle had been consecrated with blood its place was thenceforward in the midst of the camp. The blood of the day of atonement was sprinkled there. “And so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation that *remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness.*” No holy man after this set up a rival center of worship, on the plea that there was *uncleanness in the camp*. Jehovah had said, “I will dwell among the children of Israel”; and the blood which provided for His presence availed for every clean Israelite, *however many unclean ones might be there* (p. 2).

A wilfully defiled Israelite defiled the *tabernacle*, but it is not said that he defiled the *congregation* (p. 4).

This last point recalls the answer of the Lord to those who made a similar statement: “Ye fools and blind, whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold?” for the holiness of the congregation or camp consisted in this -- that God’s dwelling-place was in the midst of it; now they are identical, for the congregation is God’s dwelling-place (Eph. 2), so that this argument is as fallacious as it is

mistaken; and the total ignorance of Scripture it displays may be seen by reference to Num. 5:2, 3, "Command the children of Israel that they put out of the camp every leper and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is defiled by the dead. Both male and female shall ye put out, without the camp shall ye put them, *that they defile not their camps in the midst whereof I dwell*" (cp. Deut. 23:10, 11, 14). The words addressed to Joshua with reference to the children of Israel on account of the sin of Achan, also flatly contradict this statement. "And ye in anywise keep yourselves from the accursed thing, lest ye make *yourselves accursed* when ye take of the accursed thing, and make *the camp of Israel a curse* and trouble it" (Josh. 6:18). "Therefore, the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies because *they were accursed*. Up, *sanctify the people*" (Josh. 7:12, 13). The idea that the provision made by sprinkling the tabernacle with blood allowed of sin amongst them is most wicked, for it was the very means of the maintenance of holiness, provision being made in connection with the tabernacle for putting away sin and defilement of every kind, instead of dealing with it in simple judgment as must have been otherwise the case; but all this is the very reverse of the toleration of evil and of the notion that defilement of the camp or congregation was rendered impossible because the tabernacle was there (see Num. 19:13, 20). <sup>5</sup> That such is the meaning of the writer is undeniable; for he adds further on:

What as to a faithful saint, whose lot is cast in the midst of individual or corporate unfaithfulness . . . whether the evil be individual or whether it prevails *amongst many* . . . In all this there is no *defilement*, no *uncleanness*, which should trouble his conscience for a moment; nothing to hinder his communion with God. He who asserts to the contrary, obviously does not believe in the holy catholic Church . . . He joins the Pharisees against Christ. He forgets the great value of the blood and knows not the meaning of the day of atonement. He does his best to render service to failing saints impossible. The place of service to such . . . being *within*, he insists on standing *without* (p. 12).

These principles identify the holiness of the Church and of God Himself, and even of the blood with allowed evil and forced connivance at it; of course, if God Himself could be so indifferent to it, the individual saint need not be troubled in conscience about it; he may be "humbled and strive for the removal of these things," but if he does more and departs from the evil when the rest persist in it, he joins the Pharisees against Christ; in other words, Christ has become the minister of sin; for he who departs from it sins against Him, and allies Himself with Pharisees. Nothing can be worse than this or more revolting; it is the surrender of holiness as an eternal principle of God's nature, and using His name and that of Christ to bind the saint to avowed iniquity. How striking is the contrast between this and the plain and pointed injunction of the apostle (2 Tim. 2:17-22), in connection with these very

circumstances, "Let *every one* that *nameth the name of Christ* depart from iniquity"; and he adds the special direction that the faithful disciple should purge himself from vessels to dishonor, and associate himself "*with those that call upon the Lord out of a pure heart.*"

A. I do not fully understand the following enquiries?

14. The grounds of expulsion from the ostensible household of faith?
15. Whether Scripture ever contemplates expulsion for errors merely in opinion or judgment?
16. Whether distinct and open violations of the commands of our Lord are of less importance than mistaken views on abstract points of doctrine?
17. Whether Scripture contemplates the breaking up the ostensible household of faith?
18. "Remove thy candlestick" (Rev. 2). What? (*Subjects Regarding which the Children of God are Earnestly Entreated to Search the Holy Scriptures*, London, November 18, 1850).

B. They are a further practical proof of what this indifference to evil comes to, and how much it subverts right feeling in the heart towards Christ, making His beloved and glorious person an abstract point of doctrine of little importance -- an error of opinion or judgment which is no ground for exclusion. In other words, if Christians will only love one another and be united together like good children, it is no matter what they think about Christ. They may give Him up as of little consequence. He is only a matter of opinion; the Christian is a great deal more. This is denying the foundation of Christianity for the sake of the superstructure. I do not know that you can have a more definite justification of the ground I have taken than such a statement supplies; viz., that it is a question of maintaining or sacrificing the glory of the person of Christ.

A. The difference between us respecting unity, does not seem to me of great importance.

B. There is a unity which God has established, and if you have not that, you become a human confederacy, instead of the Church of God. The Statements already quoted may serve to show my meaning, but if you require further evidence how entirely the unity of the body is denied, you may refer to *Christian Unity Contrasted with its Counterfeits*, <sup>6</sup> also published by Mr. Yapp, which contains the following statements:

But it formed no part of the commission which the risen Savior gave the apostles to execute, that they should form all those of whom by the preaching of the gospel they made disciples, into one "visibly connected community" . . . So soon as there were other churches planted in addition to the first church formed at Jerusalem, believers ceased to form *in all respects* one community. We read afterwards accordingly not of

5. The sin of Achan was not what answers to worldliness, for Jericho was the fortress of the enemy's power on the border of Canaan, i.e., the heavenly country, and represents therefore spiritual corruption.

6. The errors of this tract have been exposed by Mr. Darby in *Discipline and the Unity of the Assembly*, (W. H. Broom, Paternoster Row) where these subjects may be found treated at greater length.



one church or religious community, but of numerous distinct religious communities, *independent of each other* (p. 3).

The body of Christ is, no doubt, one, and so is the human race one; but not as a society or community on earth (p. 21).

The apostles . . . being led to form an indefinite number of distinct and *independent churches instead of one community* under one government on earth (p. 26).

We read in *The Church of God*, a tract already quoted:

We own no other body of any kind or description, *nor is there any unity* of meetings in the name of the Lord only, and under the rule of the Spirit only . . . We must carefully distinguish between a recognition of the obedience of certain believers to the scriptural rule of meeting, and a recognition of the meeting as having *any distinct standing before God or relation to us* . . . Thus if there be *no corporate relation*, there can be no corporate action of the churches. Each has its distinct organizations, functions, and actions . . . God (?) has therefore limited the action of our judgment to *our immediate sphere* in order that we may not be continually clashing and striving with one another (!!!). He would have us attend to our own concerns, not indeed without constant interest in those of other churches and readiness to interchange brotherly intercourse and counsel with them, but without supposing that we have any right or duty of *interference* with those who are accountable to the Lord alone and who cannot admit such *interference* consistently with their own duty to Him.

These statements are unmistakable and very serious in their nature; for they disclaim that unity which flows from -- the essential nature of the Church -- the headship of Christ over His own body, and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the Church. Every one admits that Churches are spoken of in the New Testament, each of which included all the saints in a given locality, because here on earth the distinctions of time and place with relative responsibility must exist, but to use this fact, to deny the unity which the Lord most emphatically prays for in John 17, which was to be palpable to all -- a special testimony, by which the world was to believe -- and to declare that the unity of the Church was not to be visible and that believers ceased in *all respects* to form one community is a most barefaced contradiction of, and implies shameful indifference to, the divine purpose and glory in the Church, whilst it tends also to make men satisfied with the consequences of their sin in what they have reduced it to. Observe that the author remarks that the body of Christ is one and so is the human race; that is, we have the unity of a common race of separate individuals distinctly put in the place of that of the human body, by which Scripture invariably represents the unity of the Church, the body of Christ. "For as we have many members *in one body*, and all members have not the same office, so we being many *are one body* in Christ, and every one members one of another" (Rom. 12:4, 5). Thus the principle of divine unity has been lost and that of the body of Christ deliberately broken up into detached, independent fragments which have no corporate unity at all -- no longer one community under one government. All that is left is to have "fellowship or

sympathy," as they say, amongst different bodies. What a miserable substitute for the unity which, while necessarily including truth, principles, feelings, interests, and hopes as common to all, flows from the power of life, organization and headship, such as subsists in the human body. "From whom *the whole body* fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure *of every part*, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love (Eph. 4:16; see also Col. 3:19). And still more, this unity is produced by the divine presence pervading and filling every part with its own blessedness (Eph. 1:23; 2:22; 4:4, 6). Wherever the Church is spoken of in the word of God and the unity which God has formed, viz., that of the body of Christ, it is treated, not as an impracticable theory or mystical idea, nor as something that will be true of it only in heavenly glory, but as a present, practical reality. There are gifts and ministries which are exercised in this body of Christ. There is constant growth as well as supplies by joints and bands which contribute nourishment and produce compactness; and these are common to the whole body (1 Cor. 3; Eph. 4; Rom. 12; Col. 2), and evidently only exist here on earth, for they will not be needed above. The writers in *The Church of God*, who talk about a unity of churches, have not even understood the question at issue, for that would only be a congregational unity, or unity of separate and distinct bodies, not that of the body of Christ, such as the Epistles and Acts exhibit, and which may be acted on, and realized in measure as long as the Holy Ghost is on earth. These writers have not even a conception of anything beyond independency; and instead of "one body and one Spirit," and the endeavor to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," they plead for many bodies wholly separate and independent, and who are by this means preserved from interference and falling out with each other -- a striking proof of the degradation of their own ideas of the Church of God and of the level to which it would bring it. It is not surprising after this, that they should come to the conclusion that unscriptural principles, or the recognized admission of the world, are no hindrance to the blessing of saints meeting together (p. 6). The wonder is, that they should ever have left such associations.<sup>7</sup>

A. But why bring forward such a number of passages?

B. I have done it purposely that you may see how generally, I had almost said universally, prevalent these corrupt principles are amongst your community. I own I am surprised and grieved to find that some I have known in years gone by should have allowed themselves to be thus drifted away from truth they once held so precious, because practically connecting the soul with God, and carried down the current of a common degeneracy. But such is the consequence of having become involved in a false position

7. In a recent number of a periodical called *Precious Truth*, (?) C. P., of East Moulsey, volunteers the information that he acknowledged one body and one Spirit, "the guidance of the Holy Ghost, and the unity of the body, just as much in the Church of England as he does now. Doubtless he says the truth.

and association with others, who, like those to whom we have just referred, never enjoyed the same advantages, or accepted in their hearts the true ground of the Church of God. Indeed the more deeply I love and honor, as I am sure I do, some who are committed to these principles, the more imperative the duty seems for love as well as for truth's sake, of giving them no sanction whatever in a course so injurious to themselves and which has such serious consequences to the Church of God, in misleading others, so far as their example and influence extend.

**A.** To revert to the subject of discipline, What reply would you give to the enquiry, "Is it right to look at Christians apart from Christ; are we not always to consider them as one?"

**B.** Certainly not, in doing what is wrong or in being corrected for it, which is what is in question, though we surely even then regard them as belonging to Him. Do you, let me ask, worship Christians when you kneel before that blessed One; are they the foundation or the object of faith? The Scripture says, "If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?" The Church is built upon the person of Christ, as He Himself says, "Upon this rock will I build my Church." Whatever does not own His person, and maintain the integrity of His person, has no right in it. What sort of building can you have if the foundations be undermined? Is He not the Head, to whom all allegiance, honor, and obedience are due? The apostle says, "As the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in *everything*"; that is, he makes what is due to Christ paramount to anything else, or our relationship to Christ is denied; for a wife's first duty is to her husband, and to require that his personal rights should be respected.

**A.** But we meet in the name of Christ.

**B.** Or, rather in the name of Christians; for your principle of association is your own estimate of a man's Christianity, not Christ Himself, and the truth of His person, what is worthy of Him and suitable for His presence. Thus you lower down your unity to whatever Christians are capable of, instead of bringing them up to what accords with His name and glory.

**A.** In John 17, to which we have referred, our Lord prays for unity among His disciples, and is not your mode of action calculated to produce the very reverse?

**B.** Your remark is founded on a very superficial view of the passage. Jesus prays indeed that they all may be one "as we"; that is, as the Father and the Son are one; and again, "that they all may be one *in us*." Is this a unity which admits of evil and its constant toleration? Does it not, on the contrary, involve the absolute exclusion of everything that does not harmonize with the divine nature? No doubt it includes practical external unity, for the Lord says "that the world may believe," so that it must be visible; but it goes much deeper than that, and if it is this which you would aim at, you must seek to draw Christians into closer fellowship with the Father and His Son Jesus Christ; for if they were to come together in their present state, mixed up as they are

with all sorts of evil, it would be anything but a realization or fulfillment of this blessed unity, in the Father and the Son. The Scripture speaks also of our fellowship one with another, but it lays the basis of it in divine fellowship; i.e., "Truly our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ," which must be according to the character of God, who is not only love,<sup>8</sup> but light, and "in whom is no darkness at all"; and then it adds, "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, *we have fellowship one with another*." It must begin with God and be maintained according to His nature, or it degenerates into the intercourse of mere human kindness and sociality, amiability of nature, &c., and pleasing each other, whilst its true character is gradually lost.

**A.** I was told you had no Scripture to support your view of the subject, but I shall feel inclined for the future to disregard such representations.

**B.** It is evident that there are many who have an interest in giving such an impression to their followers, which may have, perhaps, unintentionally occasioned this; and you may have heard that we have departed from the original principles on which saints were first gathered, whereas, in truth, the departure is with those who have evidently ceased to hold the unity of the body of Christ, or the assembly of saints to be the house of God. You may search in vain amongst the earlier writings valued among brethren for the loose principles now advocated. In their early days, when Christ was everything to them, and when they had not learnt to prefer their own ease and credit, and the society of their fellow-Christians to decision for Him, they would have been indignantly repudiated. Those who were the earliest leaders amongst them, and whom God specially used to bring out the truth, which has distinguished the teaching of brethren, and which other Christians are now learning to value, have all rejected these false ideas and practices.

**A.** It does seem to me now more like a question of principles.

**B.** Of far more than principles -- of God Himself and His presence; of the headship of Christ in His own Church; of the value of His person, and of the Holy Ghost abiding in the Church, and the unity and holiness He produces and maintains, so that under the specious form of charity for Christians, every blessing essential to the existence of the Church here and characteristic of this dispensation has been sacrificed. When I quitted human systems, the thought of the

---

8. The Apostle John, when speaking of the love of God and its manifestation, to guard expressly against the mistaken view now made of love to Christians, says, "This is love, that we walk after His commandments. This is the commandment that as we have heard from the beginning ye should walk in it" (2 John 5, 6); and again, his own love to those whom he calls his children he describes as "love in the truth and for the truth's sake." He knows no love which is not founded on the truth, for Christ, from whom it proceeds, is "the truth" and the Spirit of God is "the Spirit of truth." On this account, and because the Church is "the house of God, and the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15, 16), it is indispensable that all principles -- subversive of the truth and corresponding associations should -- be relinquished, in order to entitle one who has been intelligently in such associations to a place where the true ground of the Church of God is recognized and maintained.

divine presence was what was dearest to me, making me feel their emptiness. If this presence of God was to be found anywhere on earth, and was recognized as the object to be sought after, there I desired to be, and that seemed everything to me. With whatever sense of weakness and failure, my heart clings to the same now; I cannot afford to give it up, whatever advantages of Christian intercourse and usefulness you may hold out as an inducement. You remember the feeling of Moses when God said He could not go up in the midst of Israel, nothing else could compensate, all was gone if that blessed presence which he loved was wanting, "If thy presence go not (with us), carry us not up hence, for wherein shall it be known here that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth" (Ex. 33:15, 16). It is this separation to God that must characterize His people, where His presence is known and prized as the alone secret of blessing.

**A.** I confess I am rather tired of defending evil.

**B.** And well you may be; but it is forced upon you by the position and principles of those you are in union with. They would not effectually resist evil, nor allow us to do it either, and thus their association has, after earnest remonstrance, and knowing what it would cost, been definitely committed to the indignity or wrong done to the person of Christ at Bethesda and elsewhere; along with this the principles avowed, which I have cited, both from public documents and individual statements, combine to show that your community is virtually "a Society for the toleration of evil in saints."

**A.** Do you think that this conflict will always continue?

**B.** God alone knows. He may give in His mercy clearer light to many who are now in the wrong path, but who once were foremost in their adherence to the blessed name of Christ alone, in the face of all opposition and evil. I cannot but trust that He will restore some of them at least to the place of true testimony again and I wait on Him for it. But whilst principles of truth remain the same, there can be no change of action, though there may be more grace, patience, and tenderness shown to individuals, in explaining these things to them. We all must learn practically our dependence on God to this end; but I can never consent to surrender one of the precious and sacred rights of Christ the Head of the Church, and the Savior of the body, redeemed by His precious blood, for all the saints in Christendom or for teachers however otherwise respected and honorable. The saints are not called now to martyrdom or the sufferings endured by some in earlier ages, but in a day of general laxity as regards truth, its claims, and those of God Himself, He is testing His people, their faith, single-heartedness, and discernment, so as to prove their respect for Him and His glory at whatever cost to themselves. God must be everything to us and sufficient for us, and man and his worth and influence nought. As for continuance, it is only to be found in God's ways; and results, where there is faith to wait on Him and keep His way, may safely be left in His

hands.

For right is right since God is God, and right the day  
must win;  
To doubt would be disloyalty, to falter would be sin.

## Appendix

### *A Summary of Mr. B. W. Newton's Doctrines on the Person of Christ, with Extracts from his Writings.*

Mr. Newton, whilst denying that there was sin in the human nature of Christ, put our blessed Lord under the *consequences* of the sin of others, in two ways:

**first**, as to His soul -- in its relationship with God; and,

**secondly**, as to His body -- in making Him subject to death.

Both these he stated to be the result of His being a man and an Israelite, or born of a woman, that is, that the condition of His birth entailed these things as a consequence of *association*. This principle is the opposite of *substitution*, or His taking sin upon Himself in grace for us, as He did upon the cross. He was thus, according to Mr. Newton, associated with the inconceivably fearful distance of man from God, and dealt with by God accordingly; and had the experiences which we ought to have had in our unconverted state, through rightly apprehending the wretchedness of this distance from God -- the sense of wrath and judicial visitation. He formed "a part of that which was exposed to the judgments of God's heavy hand," and was "obnoxious to all the penalties due to man as man, and Israel as Israel," and "to the sentence of death which had fallen on man because of Adam's transgression." It is no wonder that some have said that Mr. Newton's Christ must want a Savior for Himself! Indeed, Mr. Newton made John the Baptist Christ's deliverer, who brought relief and the sound of grace to His ears, though it is not apparent how he could deliver Him from such partnership in the ruin of man, when once involved in it, or how He could otherwise escape from it, as Mr. Newton, of course, says He did.

Mr. Newton is said to have renounced these doctrines, but this is not the case, for his *Acknowledgment* only admits that he was mistaken in placing our Lord under Adam as a federal head, but that is all. He says in it:

I should have stated that the connection of the Lord Jesus with the consequences of Adam's transgression was in virtue of His having been "made of a woman," and thus having brought Himself into association with a race on whom those penalties were resting.

[He adds] I was right in stating that the Lord Jesus partook of certain consequences of Adam's sin, of which the being possessed of a mortal body was one.

So that the two main branches of false doctrine are adhered to in the only concession he has ever made; and this latter point has formed the subject of a series of tracts published

since his *Acknowledgment*, elaborately attempting to prove, not only that our blessed Lord was able to die, but mortal and corruptible, as we are; and as man (in the form He adopts), under the same "necessity of dying."

For our own part, we have reason to know from private sources that Mr. Newton entirely denies "that he ever taught anything that could be called heresy," and that not long since he propounded the same sentiments which are contained in his tracts in his own chapel; but public attention having been called to them, and great scandal having been occasioned to the minds of many Christians, especially by the first part of this false doctrine, that has been for the most part dropped out of sight. Nor could we believe that if Mr. Newton had been convinced of the deep dishonor and injury which he has done to the person of the Son of God by promulgating these views, that he could be so inconceivably base as not to make the only reparation in his power, however insufficient, viz., a full, frank, and heartbroken confession.

***Extracts from Mr. Newton's Writings Touching the Soul of our Lord, and its Relation to God.***

Sinai marked the relation of *God to Israel* when Jesus came, and the worship of the golden calf may be taken as marking *their relationship to God* . . . The Lord Jesus was caused to appreciate to the full the relation in which Israel (and *Himself because of Israel*) was standing before God.

(*Observations*, p. 29).

The thing more than any else distinctive of these sufferings of Jesus of which I speak, that God pressed the . . . terrors of that mountain with the fire and darkness and tempest . . . upon the apprehension of His soul, according to His own power and holiness, and caused Him to feel *as a part* of that which was exposed to the judgments of His heavy band.

(*Remarks*, p. 14).

He was made to feel that *His association* with those thus standing in the *fearfulness of their distance* from God was *a real thing*, and that it was so regarded by God.

(*Observations*, p. 36).

The exercises of soul which His elect, *in their unconverted state*, ought to have, and which they would have, if it were possible for them to know and feel everything rightly according to God, *such exercises*, yet without sin, Jesus had.

(*Observations*, p. 26).

Jesus as man was associated with *this place of distance in which man in the flesh was*, and He had, through obedience, to find His way to that point where God could meet Him.

He stood in a place dispensationally lower than that into which He has now brought us His Church.

(*Remarks*, p. 31).

If, then, the soul of Jesus realized -- *experimentally* realized, and that too under the hand of God, and to a degree we little think of -- the fearful condition of Israel [and as we have seen Himself because of Israel] . . . How joyful *to His soul* the sense of the introduction of new things and new everlasting

blessings [in baptism] (p. 22).

The difference between Sinal the mountain of blackness, and Zion the place of light and grace and blessing, the place of the Church of the firstborn, might be used to illustrate the difference between the two dispensational positions *held by the Lord Jesus* in the midst of Israel previous to His baptism and that which He dispensationally and ministerially took when anointed by the Holy Ghost.

And if it be asked, "Was, then, the Lord Jesus subjected during His life to all the inflictions that were due to man as man, and to Israel as Israel," I answer, No . . . His faith, His prayer, His obedience, all contributed to preserve Him from many things to which *He was by His relative position exposed*, and by which He was threatened.

(*Remarks*, p. 8).

Since He was not, until the cross, punished substitutionally, why was it that He was *chastened* at all? How could it be but because He was made *experimentally* to prove the reality of that condition into which others, but more especially Israel, had sunk themselves by their disobedience to God's holy law, a condition out of which He was able to *extricate* Himself and from which He proved that He could extricate Himself by His own perfect obedience.

(*Remarks*, p. 12).

There are only three ways in which suffering from God can reach any of His servants here . . . either because of personal transgression -- or substitutionally -- or because of association with others who are under chastisement, can we be at any loss to say to which of these classes we assign the living sufferings of the Lord Jesus? We agree (?) in saying they were *not substitutional*, neither were they because of personal sin; if therefore they existed at all, and the scripture I have just quoted proves that they did exist, it must have been because of *association or connection* with others. These afflictions were not vicarious.

(*Observations*, pp. 22, 23).

***Extracts from Mr. Newton's Writings Relative to the Body of our blessed Lord and His Asserted Natural Subjection to Death.***

He was exposed for example because of His *relation to Adam*, to that *sentence of death* that had been pronounced on the whole family of man . . . And if He was exposed *to the doom of man*, was He not equally exposed to all the sinless penalties that had fallen upon Israel as dwelling under Sinai?

(*Observations*, p. 9).

All that pertained to man's nature in Mary pertained to Jesus -- its weakness, its dishonor -- sin only was excepted. He was in the likeness of sinful flesh; *penalties therefore of the fall were connected even with the constitution of His human nature.*

(*Observations*, p. 34, note).

My loins thou hast filled with burning heat or dryness would show that *in body as well as in soul* He felt Himself as the green ear *scorched by the fire.*

(*Remarks*, p. 17, note).

He had *in His nature* not only a possibility and aptitude, but even a *necessity* of dying.

(*A Letter<sup>9</sup> on Subjects adopted from another writer*, p. 19).

The characteristics of the humanity of Adam *after he had fallen*, were, through His mother, transmitted to the Lord Jesus, but without sin, either communicated or imputed.

(*Letter*, p. 33).

It was determined . . . that He should commence His course of suffering by taking (not in Paradise) a weak humanity, like in everything excepting sin, *the humanity of Mary His mother, and exposed to ALL the sinless consequences of Adam's sin*.

(p. 9).

All His sufferings were in consequence of His having assumed a *relative position*, that is one in which He consented to forego that which was due to His own individual position and to subject Himself to sufferings *due to the position of those to whom He stood related by voluntary association*.

(*Brief Statements* by Mr. Newton).

And even as His humanity had *all sinless infirmities*, so also was it mortal.

(*Ancient Truths*, by Mr. Newton, p. 10).

We mean by ascribing mortality to Him that His humanity was so constituted, that the vital conjunctions of His soul with His body would, under certain supposed circumstances [which we omit be cause the supposition is so painfully irreverent], necessarily cease, unless a miracle was wrought to prevent it.

(*Ancient Truths*, p. 15).

It should be remarked that the expression “sinless penalties” is illusive, for no penalties inflicted by the hand of God could be anything but righteous, whether temporal wrath, death, or final damnation; also, that whilst every Christian believes that Christ was mortal, in the sense of being able to die, the idea of inherent mortality is entirely subversive of the glory of His person, opposed to the statements of Scripture, and unfits Him for dying as a sacrifice, for a life already attained {tainted} could not be offered to the justice of God for others. The word of God tells us expressly that death can only come by sin, either inherited or imputed (Rom. 5:12; 6:23); and the miraculous action of the Holy Ghost in the conception of our Lord, removed not only the sinfulness of nature, but the seed of physical corruption and decay which exists in all others, so that in this sense we can discern the meaning of the words “that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Various old writers, such as Hawker, &c., have regarded our blessed Lord as suffering penally before the cross, but,

9. This “Letter,” and the extracts from other publications which follow, are all of later date than the *Statement and Acknowledgment*, and in this “Letter” the principles of the two former tracts, *Remarks* and *Observations*, from which we have quoted, are fully justified, and the author disdains “any shrinking from the explanation or defense of more minute statements in the tracts.” One statement more we may add from it respecting the Lord, which confirms all he has said before:

He forewent the title of His personal position the moment He took flesh; He then assumed a relative position, and resolved to abide therein (p. 25).

If this was the case, His personal glory as the Son of God could not save Him from any consequences of the fall of man. Of course we have no Scripture, nothing but assertion, for all this.

however mistaken in this, they looked upon Him as a substitute throughout, and *never* as a *part*, by birth or association, of that which was exposed to the judgments of God.

As space does not admit, and it is not our object to enlarge upon these doctrines, that having been done by others at the time they were first published. we only subjoin a few passages showing the true position of our Lord.

1. In the nation of Israel, as heir of the promises made to Abraham and David, and King of the Jews: Matt. 1:1; Luke 1:32, 68, 69, 72, 73; Matt. 2:2, 6, 9; Isa. 9:7.
2. As bringing relief, light, and salvation, to deliver them out of their wretched condition, instead of being identified with it: Luke 2:77-79; 2:11, 30-32.
3. The relation of His birth to man and to the Gentiles: Luke 2:14, 32.
4. His relation as man to God: Luke 2:40-52; John 8:29; 1:41, 42; 15:10, 11; Psa. 22:9, 10.
5. His relation to John the Baptist: Luke 1:17; 3:16, 17; John 1:7, 27, 29.
6. His position relative to death: John 10:17, 18; 12:24; 6:47-51; 11:25; Heb. 2:9.

#### *List of Mr. Newton's Tracts here quoted.*

1. *Remarks on the Sufferings of the Lord Jesus*, B. W. Newton, Campbell, 1, Warwick Square, London; Tract Depot, Cornwall Street, Plymouth, 1847.
2. *Observations on a Tract Entitled, The Sufferings of Christ*, &c. B. W. Newton, same publisher, 1847.
3. *A Statement and Acknowledgment respecting certain doctrinal errors*, B. W. Newton, Plymouth, November 26, 1847.
4. *Brief Statements*, B. W. Newton, July 11, 1848.
5. *A Letter on Subjects Connected with the Lord's Humanity*, B. W. Newton, Jenkyn Thomas, 9, Cornwall Street, Plymouth.
6. *A Letter to a Friend on a Tract Recently Published at Cork*, B. W. Newton, Houlston and Stoneman, Paternoster Row, London, August, 1850.
7. *Ancient Truths Respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus*, B. W. Newton, Houlston and Wright, Paternoster Row, London, 1857.



*The Teaching of Scripture*  
*on the Subject of*  
*Spiritual Life and*  
*the Sealing of the Holy*  
*Ghost*  
*with Examination of*  
**Mr. F. W. Grant's Views**

The apostle Jude would have preferred to write of the common salvation, but he had to turn aside from this purpose, to exhort the saints "earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered" to them. All the apostles warn us of the dangers of the last days, and it seems, in connection with them, that the Lord calls upon his saints, to hold fast that which they have already till He come. For, exposed as we are, to the attack of the enemy whilst in this world, he, above all, seeks to take from us that which is of God, and which He has given us, in His grace, to be the safeguard and blessing of His own.

These considerations have led to these pages being written, for God appears to be testing us, on both sides of the Atlantic, as to what value we attach to His precious truth; and if the teacher who substitutes the error of his own mind for the truth which makes free, has stood high among us, the test, no doubt, is more severe, especially if accompanied by mistakes on the part of those who undertake its defense. But God is more than man, nor can we weigh what He gives as revealing Himself, in the same balance with considerations of human importance. "If any man *will* [wishes to] *do his will*, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God" (John 7:17). Hence only those who give God His place, and have the desire to do His will at all cost, can expect to be led to a right judgment in divine truth.

Appealed to from various quarters, the effort is here made to help souls to rightly weigh before God, by the light of His word, what has been brought before them. May He give the uprightness of soul needful for it!

Mr. F. W. G. {Grant} has been justly valued as a teacher and an eminent controversialist, though, of late years, some of his expositions have not inspired confidence that his intellect has been kept in subjection, in dealing with the precious word of God, nor that he shared the self-distrust which marked even an apostle, the great apostle of the Gentiles, when he "communicated privately" to others the gospel he preached, lest, by any means he had run, or should

run, in vain.

A difference about Rom. 7, and its application, would not so seriously have troubled us, nor even a brother not being clear as to the sealing of the Spirit; defective views on these points, surely, may have been tolerated amongst us, but we are now called to face a determined, persistent attack on the truth connected with and illustrating the blessed effects and results of Christ's work -- which has been used of God for blessing all over the world.

To take advantage of the forbearance which has been rightly exercised -- and especially towards one who has been highly esteemed among saints for his labor and service -- to assume that such an onslaught as this should be suffered, would be a grievous wrong to the church of God, and a handle to the enemy.

Are saints in Canada and the United States not aware of the serious words addressed to Mr. Grant by our beloved brother, Mr. Darby, at the Croydon meeting of American brethren on this very subject, and that to the same cause is due the writing and publishing of the last, considerable pamphlet, *On the Sealing of the Spirit*, put forth by that honored servant of God to whom we all owe so much?

The deep importance of the subject rested much upon his heart, and he has insisted upon it everywhere in his labors throughout Europe, Australia, and America; to see then a brother rising up to undermine and set aside what he so elaborately taught and established, and trying, with his adherents, to claim at least the sanction of his name or countenance to such a course, is painful in the extreme even were there not the deeper sorrow of the word of God being tampered with, and the injury to souls.

Those of us who can look back forty years ago, will remember the same sort of vehement antagonism, to the special privileges given by the presence of the Holy Ghost, as the result of redemption, in the teaching of Mr. B. W. Newton, and the same effort to exalt the position of Old

Testament saints. Although this seemed unaccountable at the time it appeared afterwards that these views formed the basis of his doctrinal errors as regards the Person of Christ; and, though no one accuses Mr. Grant of *these* errors, yet he has been led to the assertion of the same unsound views, in identifying saints with the Father and the Son before incarnation and redemption, as will be shown in the sequel.

But what is there at stake in the subject itself and what are we offered in exchange for the truth which has been the means of setting at liberty and establishing, the souls of myriads of saints?

Some forty-five years since, the ground universally rested upon by evangelical Christians for peace and acceptance was, conversion, or the work of the Spirit in the soul, and such shifting, variable evidences of that work as they could discern in themselves. The publication of the *Operations of the Spirit of God*,<sup>1</sup> with the general teaching of brethren, threw a new light on the subject, presenting the perfect, blessed work of Christ on the cross, as the true and proper basis of the souls confidence before God. This opened the far brighter and richer effects of the presence of the Holy Ghost in the soul, Himself a divine Person, come to abide there as the consequence of the infinite efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ, and the glorious position taken by Him on high as Man, as the result of it. The wondrous presence and indwelling of a divine Person, as the grand distinguishing feature and glory of this dispensation, contrasted with what preceded or will follow it, was brought to light with the joy and blessedness of that presence, and all the advantages and privileges into which it introduced the believer.

The consequence of all this unfolding of truth, through those who have now mostly gone to their rest, was to change, far and wide, the whole ground of Christian confidence, putting it on its only true and real footing, in the presence of a holy God. So that, instead of a life spent in fear and uncertainty, a settled and cloudless peace resulted to numberless souls, whilst complete deliverance was experienced by those whose life had been only an anxious struggle with sin, as a still further effect of the knowledge of their title and place in Christ before God.

We have now a distinctly retrograde movement before us, and we are invited to adopt another system, elaborately worked out, which throws the whole subject into confusion and uncertainty.

It is taught in this system that a man may, if quickened, be justified, and not know it; have peace, and not know it; forgiveness, and not know it; a standing in Christ, and not know it, and even be sealed with the Spirit, and have no certainty of that either, For all these blessings, excepting the last, we are told, "go with life" and new birth. The practical result will be, souls will again seek to discover whether they have life, as their title to all these blessings, and be landed

just in that quagmire of self-examination and doubt, from which God has, in His signal mercy, extricated them, by the very truth now called in question.

{The following quotations are from F. W. Grant's *Life and the Spirit*.}

The question (says Mr. Grant) is, Do the forgiveness of sins, justification, and acceptance in Christ, go with new birth -- with life -- or with the gift of the Holy Ghost? (*Life and the Spirit*, p. 1).

This surely teaches that forgiveness accompanies life. (p. 6).

This quickening . . . is then itself as it were our justification." (p. 6).

All quickened are justified then; and of course from the first moment of quickening. (p. 7).

Always it is faith in the Lord's Person that is emphasized. Intelligent apprehension of atonement by the cross is *never put as necessary*, either for forgiveness of sins or for the reception of the Holy Ghost. (p. 15).

All Christians are dead to sin -- dead to the law by the body Christ: how many are yet in practical experience in bondage under it? (p. 4).

How is it that those who have *assured* [!] peace fail to recognize their freedom? that so many mourn, over a state in which the good that they would they do not, and the evil that they would not, that they do? They will not be persuaded that this is an experience they have done with, and that *they are rejoicing* [!] in a liberty of which they know not the first terms. (p. 13).

If the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, does it follow that that witness can by no conduct of ours be grieved into silence; or does not the contrary rather follow?

{The rest of these quotations are from F. W. Grant's *Life in Christ and the Sealing of the Spirit*.}

Yet while the quickened man possesses these things necessarily -- and *possesses, not is in the purpose of God to possess them* merely, they have nevertheless to be ministered to them by the gospel, an received in the divine way and order, so that the holiness of God and his own blessing have to be considered (*Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit*. {p. 7}.

While it is surely true that the Spirit is the witness to us of *sonship*, and of the *place in Christ*, as He is of all our blessing, even after attainment, { . . . } *they are still capable of being lost*, if the walk is not with God, though the Spirit still, however grieved, abides. (pp. 7, 8).

Ask them what the Lord means by saying to His disciples, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them" (John 20:23), they will tell you that it refers to the preaching of the gospel. Now it should be plain that that is just the opposite we have in the Lord's word. (p. 38).

The proclamation of Christ as Lord, of remission of sins through His name, administrative, baptismal remission, as he (Peter) proclaims it on the day of Pentecost -- these things are what we find in the opening of the Acts. (p. 34).

One could not say that one upon whom the Spirit of God fell was necessarily sealed or indwelt. On the contrary, it was possible for him to be an unsaved man. (p. 34).

1. {By J. N. Darby, published in the *Christian Witness*, in 1837.}



So far we go with the Romanist, but it is but a little way; for what kind of remission is this which men are authorized thus to convey to men? Such as to make them fit for heaven, so that the “keys” shall be the “keys of heaven”? [!] forgiveness in absolute grace, plenary and unconditional? Surely not: this could in no way be put into the hands of man; the keys are not the keys of heaven, but the “keys of heaven’s kingdom upon earth; forgiveness administrative, governmental, conditional only. Take the parable of the kingdom of heaven in Matt. 18, and you have the Lord’s own illustration of it. The one there forgiven all his debt, but not manifesting the spirit of forgiveness, *forfeits what he has received*.

(p. 38).

Remission of sins then in Acts 2:38, is by baptism, the authoritative assurance to the soul of this, if only the bowing to the authority of the Lord be real, – if it be truthful discipleship. We have seen that if life be there, forgiveness is its necessary accompaniment.

(p. 40).

Here [in 1 Pet. 4 and Acts 2] then comes in the work of the cross. It could not be left out where forgiveness of sins is ministered.<sup>2</sup>

(p. 43).

The *work* which saves is *not yet declared*, but they are called to receive as Lord and Christ (Messiah) the crucified, dead, risen and exalted Jesus. (p. 37).

Peter, guided of God in a manner evidently beyond his own intelligence, has omitted to speak of baptism as a prerequisite to its reception. No doubt he would have gone on to it, from the account he gives at Jerusalem; he says: “And as I *began* to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning.” (p. 49).

These extracts will suffice to show the nature of the system, for which we are invited to abandon that which we have previously learned from God and His word, and which has been fully accepted among us for so many years. Can my readers receive all this dreary speculation as of God? What is there to give rest or satisfaction to the soul in it? What certain basis for faith? What is there fixed and definite to be found in it? except the strongly pronounced antagonism to views of brethren generally, especially those of Mr. Darby, in his tract on sealing, which must, whatever the cost, be overthrown and got rid of. Can we be sure of anything, according to the doctrine of these tracts? The Christian is invited to put his foot, on what is averred to be better and firmer ground, and finds nothing but a quicksand. First the believer possesses all the special Christian blessings, without being aware that he possesses them, then “after being made good to us, they are capable of being lost,” though the Spirit still abides, but is silenced, so that there is no witness at all of His being there (*Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit* pp. 7, 8, Introduction). And no wonder, if they are thus connected with life, instead of with the full apprehension of the blessed work of Christ, which alone can assure the soul before God. What, we may ask, is the worth of a seal

if it be not more positive and distinctive in its character than this? Justification and adoption as sons, the giving a place or standing in Christ, and sealing according to scripture, definite *acts of God* in His dealings with the soul, are all rendered vague or nullified by this doctrine, as well as the exercises connected with them; and above all, the contact of the soul with God, and His character in the revelation of Himself to it, is lost entirely. An administration of forgiveness, peace, justification, &c., is indeed admitted in the second tract, but by baptism and other human instrumentality, not on God’s part, for He has bestowed them already; and the sweetness and blessedness of His making Himself and the fullness of Christ known, in meeting the need of the soul, all disappear and are even excluded in this heartless system, where there is no room for God nor for the experimental effects of His action on the soul in leading it to know Himself likewise. For Mr. Grant objects, that to bring in experiences, is to “supplement Christ in a legal way.”

Infinite indeed, is the importance of the soul’s first awakening to a sense of its *distance from God*, and its *sinfulness*, accompanied with the desire to know and to possess Christ and salvation in Him, for these feelings are the results of the Spirit’s operation in quickening, through the action of the word in the heart and conscience. But the first sign of life in almost all cases is the sense of pain, in itself the witness of life out of death (not merely on account of the danger of hell, that may be where there is no life at all), but, on account of the soul’s discovered relation to God and the need of being at peace with Him. This is seen in the case of the prodigal {Luke 15}, when he came to himself and reflected on his own condition. He said: “I will arise and go to my father”; and he started on his road back to his father; this was the action of life. His return to his father with the confession of sin on his lips, showed the work of the Spirit of God. Yet he did not know how he would be received, and thought of the place of a hired servant. The same thing may be seen, in those in the Acts, who accepted the testimony of God by the lips of the apostle Peter that they had been guilty of rejecting Christ, they were “pricked in their heart,” and cried out, “Men and brethren, what shall we do?” In the apostle Paul a similar action upon his soul expressed itself when he saw the Lord on the road to Damascus, by the words: “Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” {Acts 9} yet he was three days without sight and so great was his distress, that during these three days of special blindness inflicted on him, he neither did eat nor drink -- a state certainly incompatible with forgiveness, or the presence of the Holy Ghost, both which he subsequently received, though the words, “he prayeth,” mark the divine life and the earnest awakened condition of his soul. But these feelings with the sense oftentimes of being lost, awakened by the Spirit of God in souls, are emphatically the opposite of peace, or justification, or acceptance in Christ, which, yet we are told, we are to believe they had, but unconsciously. Why did not the apostle Peter tell this to his awakened listeners in Acts 2, instead of calling on them to repent and own Christ in a still further way and after a still deeper exercise? Those also in

2. This, and the accompanying remarks, are a contradiction to the next extract, and to what is elsewhere constantly stated; so also with reference to the Holy Ghost, sometimes His presence is said to be subsequent to life, sometimes to be necessarily included where it exists. But these contradictions characterize the system, as has been elsewhere shown.

the house of Cornelius were Gentile converts, in whom there had been long a work of grace, with the knowledge of the baptism of repentance and of divine dealings, as far as the life and testimony of Christ in Israel went (Acts 10:35-38). Hence the work of conviction had not now to be, wrought in them, but though quickened they had yet to receive salvation and forgiveness to which they were strangers, as the mission of Peter to them showed (Acts 10:43). This work of God, produced by the Spirit in the soul, through the action of the word, may vary in depth and character. In some it may relate more to sins which have been committed, in others to springs of evil in the nature; some may require more breaking down by the manifestation of what alarms the conscience, as the jailer, in others, like Lydia whose heart the Lord opened, we see the more gracious influence of the word; for in her, as in Cornelius and his household, there had been previous exercise and earnest cleaving to what was made known of God, in His ways in Judaism. In some again, there may be a deeper breaking down of self, and sense of sin and its condemning power, as in Rom. 7:4, 10, 11; but in all alike, the effect of the action of the Spirit of God, whilst showing enough of the grace of God to prevent despair, is to produce discovery of the ruined condition of man, both in nature and in practice; this is necessarily the very reverse of peace and acceptance, and renders it impossible to know either until the work of Christ is seen in its perfection, as adequate to meet all that God is in His holy nature and claims, and (where the soul is further advanced), that Christ has died and risen to clear it of all charge in God's sight and to give a new standing in His presence.

This brings us to the action of God, in justifying or giving forgiveness of sins and peace. "Whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified. Thus scripture makes it clear that justifying by God is not included in "calling" or awakening, which is as absolutely distinguished and separated from it, as "predestinating," "glorifying," though one act will certainly follow another, till the purpose of God be completed.

But how does the word of God present the subject of justification, that is, in the application of it to the soul? <sup>3</sup>

The Epistle to the Romans is the great doctrinal treatise of the apostle Paul on the subject of the gospel, as revealing the righteousness of God, for which reason he says, that it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

But if this righteousness of God is now manifested and declared, in the blood being put upon the mercy-seat -- where He estimated what was due to His own glory, and suitable to His own just and holy nature in its majesty when sin was in question -- it is so presented to be the resting-place of faith.

---

3. Mr. Grant again tells us that it is believing in Christ, that is, in His Person, that justifies (which no one questions) and refers to Gal. 2:16 for this, where the apostle Paul is contrasting the work of the law with faith in Christ, as the means of justification. But there also he connects it with the ground on which it rests: "I live by faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me . . . for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain" (Gal. 2:20, 21).

"Whom [that is, Christ] God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins." What is the great, we do not say exclusive, object of declaring and setting forth this righteousness, if it be not that faith might have God's estimate, in its measure of sin, of God's answer to it, and of the manner in which He deals with it and puts it away?

The Holy Ghost here distinctly unites faith in the Person and work of Christ, as the ground on which God acts, for they cannot be separated. There is "faith in his blood," and "believing in Jesus," and God is the Justifier of such an one. This is not believing in your own justification, but in the value of that blood on the mercy-seat, which enables God to take the attitude of a Justifier, and display His own righteousness in doing so (Rom. 3:25, 26).

Now, if God links the perception or apprehension by faith of the ground on which He acts, with His justifying the soul, is it for us to separate them, and to declare that this is not His way; because we can conceive of cases in which, through human feebleness, this is scarcely discernible? The apostle goes on in Rom. 4 to connect this faith with the further act of God in raising Christ from the dead, and he moreover explains the bearing of that action in the mind of God, for it is the coming in of divine power acting on our behalf, after all question of our sins had been settled, and death and judgment had been passed through for us by Christ, as our representative; hence it had a special value as a declarative act, "raised again for our justification," and as a statement quoted by Mr. Grant says, "We have what we are to believe, and the effect of it stated together," {*Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit*, p. 57} and this is interpreted by Mr. G., to be believing in your own blessedness, or your own justification <sup>4</sup> (p 58). It is nothing of the kind, but certainly faith does own that God raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, otherwise, where is the ground for its confidence, or indeed for any faith at all? If it apprehended the full bearing of the act on God's part it would be still clearer, but it is beyond question that there is the understanding of what the object and meaning of His death was: "He was delivered for our offences," and God's act in not leaving Him in death, but taking Him out of it, this is "what we are to believe," and the effect of this faith is also

---

4. It is a very serious misrepresentation to attempt to make out, as Mr. G. does, that those whom he is opposing, teach that a man is justified by the assurance of his own justification. None of the passages he quotes *on justification* so express it, and this is the more inexcusable, as he cites just before (pp. 55, 56) Mr. Darby's statement, that the Reformers held, that if a man had not the assurance of his own salvation he was not justified at all, which is *not* his [Mr. D.'s] belief. In *How to Get Peace*, from which Mr. Grant quotes, it is put plainly enough, that what is to be believed is, that God is satisfied with the work of His Son, as everywhere in Mr. D.'s writings. One of the worst features of Mr. G.'s tracts is that you can never trust his statements of the views of those that differ from him. They teach, we are told, that God marries souls to the law (Mr. D.), Life possessed in the Son before the Cross, that God seals not the person but the faith. We are not told who is the author of this solitary passage quoted (p. 29), which implies this kind of reflex belief. It is in this way by citing passages without giving the authors' names, Mr. Grant throws the odium upon his brethren, of views that they do not hold, and which he then proceeds to expose.

stated, that righteousness is imputed to us, and it is added: therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Relationship with God is established in blessing, His love shed abroad in the heart, and the Holy Ghost given to the believer, the first place in this Epistle as has been observed, that the Holy Ghost is spoken of as indwelling.

The parable of the prodigal son {Luke 15} throws much light upon the work of God in the soul, and the ways of God in dealing with it. The prodigal had not met his father, and did not know the reception that awaited him when he set out from the far country. He could not, nor can the awakened sinner either, know the nature of this reception beforehand. He seeks for something he can bring to God, he looks for some evidence of good in himself, that may be a ground of righteousness or means of procuring His favor, reasoning from what he is, not from what God is, and thinks of serving God in some way. “Make me one of thy hired servants.” Here it is that the father meets him, as God does the sinner, though still a great way off, with the gift of His son; revealing Himself in perfect love in so doing, and he learns that God is love, and has provided for his sins and moral distance from Himself, by sending His Son to be the propitiation for his sins. The best robe and the ring (the righteousness of God in Christ and the Holy Ghost), are then, not before, conferred upon him! He now knows the God who has met him in love, and that the Son of God has carried out the thoughts and purposes of that love in His death, as the apostle says, “The Son of God loved me, and gave himself for me.” Thus Christ is known, to the soul as He could not otherwise be, and the Holy Ghost is the power and joy of this blessed portion. “For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”

It had been pointed out in Mr. Darby’s tract *On Sealing* that all these blessings figured in the robe, the ring, the shoes, &c., were *not* in any sense possessed by the prodigal until he met his father, but the whole resolved by Mr. G. into a question of the prodigal’s consciousness. We give his own words:

It is human consciousness -- apprehension -- that is all through in question. In this sense, until he had met his father, “he had not got” the best robe<sup>5</sup> {*Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit*, p. 61}.

That is to say, he already had it, but unconsciously.

Surely it should be clear also that, from first to last, we have the *human side* of these things, and *not the divine* {p.61}.

5. If it had been said that the Father had those gifts in reserve, the robe, and shoes, and the ring among His treasure, or even that it was in His purpose to give them (though this last is scarcely within the scope of the parable), no one could have objected, but they were neither “bestowed” by the Father, nor “possessed” by the prodigal, until they met. Indeed, the great point of the scene, is, that he possessed nothing but his rags, his filth, and his beggary, when the Father met him, so that his *only resource* was the grace in which he was met. It was his utter destitution that cast him on this alone, and made it indispensable.

In the kiss of love, the Father’s embrace, and all He bestows, and even His own heart’s delight in it all, awakening the answering joy of heaven, we are told we have the human side, and not the divine. Such is what the most lovely picture of grace to be found in the divine record, is reduced to. Could Scripture, in its most blessed and touching features, or the manifestation of God to the soul, be (to use Mr. G.’s expression) more completely “evacuated”?

The remark had been made respecting peace, that, “though Christ has made peace by the blood of His cross, we have it not till we are justified by faith. . . Indeed, to say that we have peace with God, and are not conscious of it, is nonsense.” On this Mr. Grant thus comments:

Of course, if conscious having is meant, there can be no dispute, but is it really impossible to possess what we are not conscious of possessing? If peace with God be a feeling in the soul, of course conscious possessing is the only possible possession. But was it a feeling in the soul that Christ made by the blood of His cross? Surely it would be impossible to maintain that! Is it not possible, in itself that God may in reality have nothing against one who may yet fear His having something, and who may himself be yet no longer at enmity, or in rebellion against Him? {*Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit*, p.60}.

What does the reader think of this piece of sophistical reasoning, in which the ground or terms of peace and the acceptance of them are confused, carefully as they are distinguished in scripture? “Having *made peace* by the blood of his cross; you that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.” Were they at peace with God, then, before they were reconciled to Him? Undoubtedly the basis of peace is found in the cross, but the reconciliation effected subsequently, when all is settled between it and God, with respect to which He has been dealing with and exercising it, and then only has it peace with God, as the words, “*Now* hath he reconciled,” show plainly enough. The same distinction between making peace,” and afterwards preaching peace (for its reception) to them which were far off and to them which were nigh, is found in Eph. 2, where, as in the passage in Rom. 5, the apostle declares “peace with God” to be the result of the faith that justifies.<sup>6</sup>

6. To weaken the effect of this, we are told by Mr. Grant, on Gen. 15, that God “imputed faith to Abraham for righteousness, on account of what He foresaw it *would be*” in chapter 17. Let the reader turn to the passage (Gen. 15), comparing it with Rom. 4:1-5, and see if such an interpretation will stand. Abraham having complained that he had no seed, God told him, “He that shall come forth out of thine own loins” shall be thine heir, and then, taking him forth, showed him all the stars of heaven, and said unto him, “So shall thy seed be.” “He believed God,” says the apostle, “and it was counted to him for righteousness” (Rom. 4:22). It is true that he interweaves chapter 17, where all was explained to him, and his confidence in that chapter with the faith he displayed in chapter 15, as having the same character as that which he had exhibited fourteen years previously, but to take advantage of the breakdown in Gen. 16, which introduced Hagar and Ishmael, to reason that he had not the faith spoken of in chapter 15, when the word explicitly states the contrary, is to set aside the Holy Ghost’s

(ὁδοῖα ÷ Ἰαῶναι...)

In the Old Testament we have these truths presented in types or figures, which confirm and illustrate the direct statement of the New. In the consecration of the priests we have, first, the figure of the new birth (born of water and of the Spirit) in the sons of Aaron being washed with water *at the door* of the tabernacle of the congregation, and afterwards laying their hands upon the offerings -- the sin-offering, the burnt-offering, and the peace-offering -- to identify them with the value of the work of Christ, in all its varied aspects. Then the blood was put upon the ear, the thumb, and the foot of each, and after that they were sprinkled with oil (figure of the Holy Ghost's presence), mingled with the blood which was upon the altar (see Lev. 8:30). So careful is scripture to connect the presence of the Spirit with the special value of the sacrifice of Christ, from which Mr. Grant so labors to separate it. The same may be seen in the case of the cleansing of the leper, where the oil, as directed by God, was to be put "upon the blood of the trespass-offering." Were these views true, we should have to conclude, that the washing embraced everything, the blood, the oil, and indeed all the subsequent process; that when the children of Israel were shielded from judgment by the blood on the door-posts, though they were terrified by Pharaoh and the Egyptian hosts, they had, in reality, crossed the Red Sea (figure of death and resurrection, and of our standing in Christ), and had seen all the Egyptians dead upon the seashore, and beheld the salvation of God in His deliverance of them through the waters of death and judgment. We know that they were His people, and that He purposed to do all this for them; but we learn in such scriptures that Satan's power is real, and that the soul needs to be experimentally brought to know, how it is set free by the death of Christ, who bore the judgment of God for its sin, and that there is an application of these divine realities to the soul, often accompanied by serious conflict, in which both God and Satan have their place, far other than this barren theory would admit of.<sup>7</sup>

In Mr. Grant's explanation of the Acts, we have other results of his doctrine apparent, and of the severance which he makes between the soul's "apprehension of the work<sup>8</sup> of Christ," and the sealing of the Spirit. He will not admit that the apostle Peter preached the work of Christ, but {rather, says Mr. Grant} the forgiveness of sins, founded on that work; these were Paul's themes, but only the baptismal administration of forgiveness which was "conditional" -- could be lost or "forfeited" and the submission to Christ's

(...ooiÜ÷âéa)

reasoning for his own. Who but Mr. Grant would have ventured to inform us (p. 69) "that Abraham's faith had not yet acquired the strength" which the apostle stamps on its whole character, and on which the Holy Ghost declares he was justified by God, in Gen. 15?

7. There is no foundation whatever in Scripture, for making the pillar of cloud and fire, out of which Jehovah, looked, and troubled the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, a figure of the Holy Ghost's presence. Such action is totally inconsistent with the supposition.

8. {The sealing of the Spirit is consequent upon belief in the Person and finished work of Christ for the knowledge of the forgiveness of sins; i.e., that one is in a forgiven position before God.}

"authority," not to His" work" "that is not yet declared" (p.37) in Acts 2, nor justification nor righteousness either (pp. 50, 51). "The righteousness of God, in the cross, for men, is unknown, and therefore, in the proper Pauline sense, salvation" {says Mr. Grant}. Nor are we sure of sealing or indwelling, for we could not say that one upon whom the Spirit of God fell was necessarily sealed, or indwelt; on the contrary, it was possible for him to be an unsaved man. Peter {says Mr. Grant} taught the same doctrine in his epistle -- "administration of salvation { . . . by} Baptism {which} puts us where, if we are really disciples, salvation is ours" (p. 43). Even in Acts 10, his address to the house of Cornelius, "he would have gone on to speak of baptism as a prerequisite to the reception of the Holy Ghost (p. 49), but was guided by God beyond his own intelligence to omit it. Even with the apostle Paul, who "teaches the work of atonement it is applied to sinners in the symbol of baptism" (p. 47-49). Again in p. 56,

As to forgiveness of sins, we have already examined the scripture doctrine. Apart from the knowledge of justification, of the place in Christ, and of deliverance from the law, it might be questioned how far baptismal remission of sins carried possessors of it.

When the question of righteousness and its attainment is raised in the soul, it is to lead it to the discovery of its total absence, and yet the absolute necessity of it in connection with a righteous God, that the soul may seek and find it in the blood and finished work of Christ, where God Himself has provided it. To place it thus in an ordinance {baptism, in this case}, apart from any knowledge and apprehension of the work of Christ, *is* the essential principle of Romanism; and is in direct opposition to what the apostle calls "submitting to the righteousness of God, for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to *every one* that believeth." In that chapter (Rom. 10) the righteousness which is of faith is expressly contrasted with *doing*, which the law demanded, taking up what God has done in providing righteousness by Christ, and in the acceptance of His work shown in raising Him from the dead, "for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation": and this is in contrast with the folly of Israel, and the blindness of those who stumbled at, instead of believing in (Rom. 9:33) God's foundation, who, "going about to establish their own, had not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God." Was nothing of all this known, as Mr. Grant would have us believe, until the Epistle to the Romans was written, and so to speak, published? We do not say, that all the varied display of divine righteousness, in the full way it is brought out by the apostle Paul, was understood; but was there not the apprehension of Christ, as the end of the law for righteousness, of His death having met the claims of God respecting sin, so that the soul's resting-place was *not* merely "mercy or forgiveness," which we are told "is in a certain sense the *very opposite* to justification"! <sup>9</sup> Here Mr. Grant is again at issue with the apostle Paul, who identifies

9. This is really the delusive notion of the unconverted man and the opposite of what the Cross teaches.

forgiveness and justification, when used in the forensic sense of clearing from a charge of guilt. David, he says, “describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven whose sins are covered.” It should be remembered that the apostle applies the same principle to God’s dealings with the Jew as with the Gentile, in Rom. 3 and 10, stating that “there is no difference,” both in the common condition and manner of the reception. Is it a gospel at all where the element of “righteousness” is wanting? Well may Mr. G. say it “does not get its completeness, and man’s full need is not met,” for where the character of Christ’s work is not revealed, where forgiveness is administered in an ordinance {baptism, in this case}, God’s character is falsified, and souls are led astray; what meets the need of conscience also when exercised in God’s presence, as to what is due to His holy and righteous character, is all obliterated in this exposition of the ground on which believers in Judea, Galilee, and Samaria were placed, indeed, all those converted by other ministry than that of the apostle Paul and his fellow-laborers.

That apostle tells us, that the righteousness of God now declared in the gospel, was “witnessed” or testified to, both “by the law and the prophets (Rom. 3:21). Had the blood of the paschal lamb upon the door-posts, meeting the just judgment of God, or the constant sacrifices of the Jewish ritual especially that offered on the great day of atonement -- now that the Holy Ghost had come, and given their meaning -- no voice as regards the righteous demands of God respecting sin? The prophets distinctly foretell that Christ was to suffer and make His soul an offering for sin, and that “with his stripes we are healed” (Isa. 53); also that God would be revealed as “a just God and a Savior,” by whom “all the ends of the earth should be saved,” and “in whom all the seed of Israel shall be justified, and shall glory” (Isa. 45:21-25). So also the Psalm, “Mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other. “Again, “They shall come, and shall declare his righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that he hath done this” (Psa. 22:31); that is, the sufferings of Christ and the blessings consequent thereon to man.

Even John the Baptist, though he may (speaking as a prophet) not have understood all that he uttered, had testified of the Lamb of God, and of His bearing sin, and the apostle John instructs us, that the display of love is in God sending His Son, to be the propitiatory sacrifice for our sins.<sup>10</sup> But above all, the apostle Peter, who is set forth as the especial proclaimer of the baptismal Gospel, declares to the circumcision, to whom he wrote as the apostle of the circumcision, that they were “redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish, and without

spot; and that “Christ suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God.” Thus we have the groundwork of the soul’s relation to God laid in righteousness in the death of Christ, and even the substitutionary character of that work in 1 Pet 2:24: “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.”<sup>11</sup>

It would be very strange indeed, if the apostles had forgotten what the Holy Ghost had come to bring to their remembrance, and what had been so recently unfolded to them by the Lord Himself, that is, the absolute necessity of His death, as what was due to God in righteousness for man’s sin. “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up”; and in Luke 24, we have the testimony of the Lord, explaining to them the scripture on this very point, and the selfsame divine necessity of His death insisted on, as the teaching of the law, the Psalms, and the prophets, to which we have just alluded, and which they ought to have understood. “Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations beginning at Jerusalem” (Luke 24:7, 26, 27, 45, 47). Did He open their understandings in vain, or bring out to no purpose in this wonderful way which so acted on their hearts, the purpose and object of His sufferings for them, so that they could lose sight of them, or keep them back in their addresses after His ascension? What is the meaning of repentance and remission of sins being preached in His name -- founded on what the scripture taught of the indispensable necessity of His death and sufferings -- if it be not that the value of those sufferings was now available for man, and therefore could be offered freely on His behalf to man, and that His name carried all the worth of what He accomplished before God with it, as a name on a cheque does at a bank, whoever presents it?

The disciples were to ask “in His name,” which they had not done before; the Father would send the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, “in His name.” Was all this, characterizing as it did, the testimony of the apostle Peter in the early chapters of the Acts only the recognition of the authority or Lordship of Christ (as Mr. Grant would persuade us) -- and which, though right in itself, by no means meets the necessities of the soul? The case he makes so much of in Acts 2 illustrates this, for those who were pricked in their heart, showed the effect of the reception of the testimony, that God had made the same Jesus whom they crucified, both Lord and Christ; and they are then directed to the power and worth of His name before God for the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to the scripture quoted by the apostle: “Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved.” It is those who “gladly

10. {While it is not doubted that Christ rendered a propitiatory sacrifice, the way the matter is spoken of in Scripture is that “He is the propitiation for our sins”; i.e., this means that the value of the work has all the value of His person imparted to it.}

11. Mr. Grant says (p. 50), “propitiation perhaps” “was revealed,” “but not substitution.” Just think of nothing more than a “perhaps,” for souls to rest upon in the work of Christ. But even this is not left to them, for we are told in *Help and Food*, pp. 240-251, “Propitiation is only substitution, and only for those for whom substitution is, and for no other!”

received his word, “who were baptized, showing faith and perception of the reality of what the word expressed -- a great deal more than administration by an ordinance {baptism, in this case}, though there may have been that in addition. “And they continued steadfastly in the apostle’s *doctrine* and fellowship.”

In the subsequent chapters, we find that Jesus is exalted by the right hand of God to be a Prince and a Savior, *to give repentance and remission of sins*. He is the Prince or Source of life; the name of Jesus, and also His death and sufferings are dwelt upon, and forgiveness of sins when accompanied with *repentance and conversion* (Acts 3:17-21); but not a word of this baptismal teaching, asserted to be all that was known. “Those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that the Christ should suffer; he hath so fulfilled. Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.” In Acts 4 when before the council, he say, “This is the stone set at nought of you builders, which has become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” That precious, wondrous Name, was now given for salvation among men, and made known in all its infinite power, for the rejected stone had become the foundation which God had laid, the rock on which the church was being built; this the apostle Peter fully declares in his first Epistle (1 Pet. 2:4-8), and the apostle Paul adds also his testimony, that though God may employ various workmen or laborers, “Other foundation can *no man* lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 3:11; cp. Eph. 2:20). Yet we are told that “*salvation* was unknown in the proper Pauline sense” (pp. 50, 51).

It was known at any rate in the *divine* sense as everywhere else, in the instruction given by the Holy Ghost after Pentecost, and it is to this salvation that the same apostle witnesses when sent to the house of Cornelius, as he informs those at Jerusalem to tell them “*words* whereby both he and his house- hold should be saved” (Acts 15:14); evidence enough for anyone but Mr. Grant, of his full understanding of the object for which he was sent, accomplished in unfolding the testimony concerning Jesus and His death and resurrection, with the witness of all the prophets, that *through His name*, “whosoever believeth in him, should receive remission of sins”<sup>12</sup> (Acts 10:43; 11:14).

No one of course questions the value of baptism as an outward recognition of the name of Christ where its inward value had first been felt, nor that a man should not be owned as a Christian and in the enjoyment of Christian privileges,

who should neglect that acknowledgment of the blessed Lord, and the outward confirmation which it gave. But it should be remembered that the sign is often put for the thing signified, as we see in Rom. 6, where the apostle speaks of our death and burial *in the ordinance*, just as we are said to partake of the body and blood of the Lord, in the supper, *commemorative* of His death. To make more of ordinances than this is throwing the whole truth into confusion, and undermining the simple faith of souls, as well as playing into the hands of Romanists, with whom Mr. Grant admits he goes, what he calls “*a little way*”! As to the apostle Paul, it would appear from what is stated in Acts 9 by Ananias, that Jesus had sent him, that Saul might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. It was through the hand of Ananias that this blessing came, when the scales fell from his eyes, and not through baptism subsequently administered as in Acts 10; figure as we know by an external washing, of what is accomplished in reality, by means of the death of Christ (John 3:5; Heb. 10:22; 1 John 5:6). The gift of the Holy Ghost is connected sometimes with the work of Christ, sometimes with His resurrection, and sometimes with the place He has taken as Man on high, only as the two last are the fruit and consequence of His work (besides the intrinsic glory of His Person), the presence of the Holy Ghost in all cases throws light on the value of that work, and has its distinct connection with it. John, in his First Epistle (chap. 5:6-8), tells us that Jesus came (as to the object of His manifestation), not by water only, but water and blood, that there are three that bear witness to the necessity and effect of that death, “the Spirit and the water and the blood,” and that “these three agree in one.” It is as come down from heaven, present here on earth, that the Holy Ghost bears this testimony, and it is a united or combined witness to the full sufficiency of the work of expiation, and life in Christ (vv. 9-11) for sinners, now that His blood avails for perfect removal of guilt, as well as the power shown in the purification of the soul morally. But for this, He could neither bear testimony needful for man’s condition, nor come to do it.

What witness could be more perfect than the presence of a divine Person, that not a spot or stain remains on the believer? God cannot suffer sin, or rest where it is found, or is still imputed; but when the blood of Christ bears witness that it is entirely gone, and that it is replaced in the soul by the eternal, indefeasible title which that blood gives before God, there the Spirit of God can abide. To procure this best of gifts, the death and resurrection of the Lord was requisite. Hence He says, “If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart, I will send him unto you” (John 16:7). But this introduces what is most excellent, and indeed magnificent, in this subject; that is, that righteous, *in this dispensation*, is not a mere acquittal, or justification, of the sinner before the throne of God, but is founded on God’s own action, and the display of His own character, in all that He has done, both in dealing with sin on the cross, and in setting Christ at His own right hand in the heavenlies.

12. This announcement and the apostle’s whole testimony, is quite at variance with what we are informed by Mr. G. our Lord gave him in Matt. 16, and that it was “beyond his own intelligence” which would have led him “to speak of baptism.” I leave to my readers’ reflection this slight upon the Apostle’s inspiration, upon the gospel which he preached, upon the whole condition of those early saints and the Holy Ghost’s ministry amongst them. Again, “Apart from the knowledge of justification, of the place in Christ, and of deliverance from the law, it might be questioned how far the baptismal remission of sins carried possessors of it (p. 56).

The apostle Paul establishes the connection between divine righteousness and Christ's exaltation; first, in the imputation of sin to Him on the cross, where it was judged to the uttermost; and then in God's righteously raising and exalting Christ, and the result in blessing to us, as that in which we share through Christ, and His being blessed in God's own presence on high -- for "He hath made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be made [or become, γινώμεθα -- cp. John 1:14]] the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21). Then he connects the ministration of this righteousness from Christ on high with the glory in which He now stands. This righteousness is only measured by Christ's present position and glory, of which, in its application to us, the Holy Ghost is the witness, coming, as He does, from Christ as Lord, in whom this glory shines. "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious. For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness *exceed in glory*" (2 Cor. 4:9, 10). Hence the statement of our Lord that the Holy Ghost would, when come, testify of sin and judgment in the world, but righteousness in Him alone in the presence of God. For the glory is only the righteous answer, on God's part, to His having been glorified in the work of His Son; so that it was really due to Him on this ground, and we therefore rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

It must be remembered that the glory of God now rests on a foundation which it never had before and that foundation is in the cross (John 13:31, 32). No one but His Son, according to the majesty of His Person, by dying as Man, could so vindicate the rights of God before the universe, manifest His character and recover His glory from every aspersion which man's sin and Satan's craft had thrown upon it. The cross was the highest exaltation of righteousness and the strictest manifestation of His truth, the complete establishment of His Majesty, which sin had affronted, as well as the full exhibition of His love to the sinner, and the very means through which that love could flow forth freely, the whole being accomplished by Him who is the Son of God. The apostle, connecting the glory with our blessing, says, "He was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father," that "we also should walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). Thus the gospel becomes the knowledge "of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," which, shining in His face, bears the triumphant, justifying, and transforming character of the source from which it emanates, as well as the grace of His blessed countenance, whence it flows. What freedom of soul in the presence of God, the Holy Ghost must produce, who comes from Christ in glory in that presence, and in the righteousness and the glory He enjoys there, in both of which we are called to share, the Holy Ghost communicating the liberty and joy of that heavenly place and scene. On this account it is added, that "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 3:17). Indeed, it seems the delight of Scripture to connect the descent of the Holy Ghost, as well as His gifts, with the humiliation of Christ in death and His present glory, for they are correlative. "He hath ascended up on high, he hath led captivity captive, and received gifts for men. Now that He ascended, what is it but

that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended, is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things" (Eph. 4:8-10). For His taking the highest place as Man, and filling all things, is due to His having taken the lowest place in death for the glory of God. In the well-known passage, where the Holy Ghost is described as rivers of living water, enjoyed and flowing out through believing on Jesus on high, the apostle adds, "This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet (given), because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7:39-39).

The narrative given in the Acts is not inconsistent with this divine testimony on the subject, though it is presented there *historically, not doctrinally*. The chosen moment for the descent of the Holy Ghost is related thus: "When the day of Pentecost had fully come." The type, of which this was the long anticipated fulfillment, shows us the Pentecostal offering, not only having its date from the wave-sheaf (figure of the resurrection of Christ, with its accompanying burnt-offering itself), but linked, in the fullest way (Lev. 23:15-19), with the sacrifices, sin-offering, burnt-offering and peace-offering -- all representing the varied aspects of His work. Then the apostle Peter explains the great and wondrous fact which had excited the amazement of the Jews collected at Jerusalem from various parts of the world. He tells them that Jesus, "having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." For "God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ" (i.e. anointed). Throughout the Acts it is the name of Jesus Christ in which repentance and remission of sins was to be preached, being owned to which this blessing attaches. The disciples at Ephesus, who, previously, did not know that the Holy Ghost was come, {Acts 19} were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, only in this case, as at Samaria, the gift came through the apostles' hands; but in each case, as in that of Cornelius and his house, we have additional evidence that a man may be converted, and not have received the Holy Ghost.<sup>13</sup> In the address of the apostle to the house of Cornelius, it is, as has been remarked, when the apostle comes to the full value of the name of Christ, and remission of sins flowing from it, that "the Holy Ghost fell upon all them that heard the word." This corresponds with the doctrinal statement of the apostle in the Epistle to the Ephesians, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, *the gospel of your salvation*." It was that full gospel of salvation, not *merely* the first operations of grace in

---

13. Here, again, we have the opposition between Mr. Grant's statements and those of scripture.

Thus the one born of God *can never be in the flesh*, and thus we obtain additional confirmation of the truth of our interpretation of Romans 8:9: "If you are not in the Spirit, you are in the flesh, you are none of his." This must be taken in the largest sense -- you are not His at all. {J. N. Darby's translation has, "not of him," i.e., not of Him as having the Spirit of sonship, and thus not in the proper Christian position -- which a soul in the Rom. 7 condition is}.

the conviction of sin, but, as at Cesarea, the words of salvation, that were received, and with the same result -- "in whom also, having believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13).

In Rom. 5, it is the great display of the love of God in the death of His Son, which He commends to us, and which *the Holy Ghost*, given to us, sheds abroad in our hearts.

In 1 Cor. 6 also, the presence of the Holy Ghost dwelling in the believer, and making his body the temple of God, is also linked with the fact that he is "bought with a price," and hence the Holy Ghost takes possession for God of the individual till the day of glory of which His presence is the earnest (2 Cor. 5:5). Thus we see that when scripture is allowed to speak for itself, we have a uniform consistent witness to the presence of the Holy Ghost being connected, either directly with the atoning death of Christ, or with what results from it, or is founded on it in the exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God; and this is not only in the mind of God but in the apprehension of the believer on whom this gift is bestowed. The Holy Ghost acts therefore in the soul in accordance with this blessed fact that His presence is due not to our faithfulness -- a variable and inconstant quality -- but to what Christ has done. He is God's seal that the believer belongs eternally to Him and "bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God. Our Lord says: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you *forever*." He is so entitled to ask because of that work, and to bestow this blessing as an eternal gift (Acts 2:33), God's own broad seal upon the receiver.

What a wondrous testimony on God's part is this seal, the witness of His favor and of the soul's acceptance by the presence of a divine Person resting on the believer and dwelling in him; it is a testimony so real, so emphatic, so powerful in its effects, and so entirely from God in its assuring nature in the soul, that it is suitably called the seal, as expressive of its nature, meaning, and object. Were His presence and witness contingent on our faithfulness, He could not stay with us an hour, but if it is for the sake of what Christ has done, He can "abide with us for ever." But as the evidence of the reception of the Spirit is rendered indistinct and hazy by the teaching we are opposing, for you may have the Spirit and not know it, "for there is practically no middle class that have not received it" (pp. 25, 27), so also as a consequence of the separation of this gift from the soul's apprehension of the work of Christ, we find it taught that you may

slip, not surely out of the possession, but out of the knowledge of the possession, of the Spirit (*Life and the Spirit*, p. 5).

Thus the seal, or witness, of God is virtually rendered null and void,

for error in doctrine, or unholiness may, almost to any extent, hinder His witness, and our realization (p. 53 {*Life in Christ and Sealing with the Spirit*}).

The word of God teaches, on the contrary, that the Holy

Ghost never can thus deny what Christ has done; He is the Witness of the eternal efficacy of the value of the blood of Christ in the sight of God, and that sin is no more imputed. He could not have come, nor have sealed us, otherwise, and that is the reason He was never given to dwell in man before redemption. Hence the apostle says, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 4:30). He does not cease to make His presence felt, nor do we lose the consciousness of it, if we fail; though it is felt in a painful way, and as a reprover, rather than a comforter. He lets us know that He has been grieved by practical inconsistency with what Christ has done, and with that nearness to God in the light, into which that work has introduced us, and of which the presence of the Spirit is the witness, and it is by this place of privilege that the sin is measured.

What is felt in failure is, therefore, a sensible effect of the Holy Spirit's presence, so true and faithful both to God and to us, that He cannot pass over what is evil in us; and we are to listen the more to the grief He expresses, because He is a Friend who will never leave us. How could He act otherwise without denying Himself or falsifying the very ground on which He has come to dwell with us as the Seal of God, "till the day of redemption"? "The Spirit lusts against the flesh, and the flesh against the Spirit, and these are contrary the one to the other," says the apostle (Gal. 5:17); but no such thought as the silence of the Spirit and ceasing to be conscious of His presence, an idea destructive of the very nature of a seal altogether. To support this view, however, Mr. Grant quotes, "He that drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst" (John 4:14). One would suppose that this passage taught plainly the contrary, that is, that the effects of the presence of the Spirit were abiding and not transient;

but who would argue from this, that if a man ever thirsted he had never received the Holy Ghost? (p. 63).

Could Scripture be used in a sense more opposite to that for which the Lord spoke it? It is really reasoning away Scripture, and destroying its effect to support a theory.

The important subject of the life of God in the soul remains to be examined. That life, coming from God as it does, has certain invariable characteristics, which mark its divine origin. Faith, repentance, desire after God, obedience and dependence always accompany it; yet these spiritual effects of it are, in their manifestation, modified by the nature of the revelation God makes of Himself, and by His dispensational dealings. If God revealed Himself as a Moral Governor [Jehovah], in covenant relation with a people on earth, giving them also the law, they were then servants, not sons, (see Gal. 4:15-17) and apprehended not eternal salvation, but His favor on earth; and as His earthly people representing His right's in government they had enemies to fight with, and could even rejoice in their overthrow, and be used in their extermination. Earthly blessings also were their portion, from the hand of Jehovah. Through fear of death, from which they were not delivered, they were all their lifetime subject to bondage; for death had not been



conquered, and though sometimes they had glimpses of things beyond death, the heavenly things had not been declared (John 3: 12, 13, 31, 32); though the glory of the millennial kingdom had been foretold by the prophets.

While our blessed Lord was upon earth, the disciples owned Him as the Messiah, the Heir of the promises, by virtue of the divine life which they had received; yet they had their thoughts all connected with the earthly kingdom, and the fulfillment of the promise made to the nation as God's chosen people, trusting that Christ was He who should have redeemed Israel. Indeed, when sent forth by the Lord Himself, they are directed not to go in the way of the Gentiles, nor into any city of the Samaritans; and they were to own the scribes and Pharisees, as sitting in Moses' seat. They could not even understand His death; it seemed to contradict all their hopes. John the Baptist, so far from apprehending heavenly things, though he might allude to them prophetically, says that he is of the earth, earthly, and speaketh of the earth. Indeed he was stumbled at the Lord's rejection and his own, so that he sent the well-known message to Him, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. 11:31) and the Lord tells us, that great as John's position as His forerunner was, and faithful as he had been in it, "the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he."

The inconsistency of all this, with {Old Testament} saints being in the Son and *in the Father*, is evident; and still more the whole character of life in the millennium; yet in His conversation with Nicodemus, the Lord says that regeneration, or the new birth, is absolutely needful to the enjoyment of the earthly kingdom. "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" {John 3:12}. We see again in the Psalms and in the Revelation, life in connection with Christ's earthly kingdom and government, so that vengeance is sought on His enemies and their own by Jewish believers; for without judgment that kingdom cannot be established, and the Jewish saints are themselves employed, subsequently to Christ's manifestation in glory, to cut off His enemies (Zech. 9:13-15; 10:5). The knowledge of the Father and the Son implies grace and its divine manifestation (John 1:14), and an order of life entirely heavenly. When the Gentiles, who have the blessings of the earthly kingdom and a place in eternal life, are addressed by the Lord, He does not speak of God as their Father, but says, "Come, ye blessed of *my Father*"; though He owns the Jews who have been rejected and persecuted as His messengers as His brethren. For the distinction of Jew and Gentile reappears in the millennial kingdom, when there is no entrance within the veil as now (Psa. 149).

Mr. Grant objects to the idea that saints of old {Old Testament saints} were as plants, having each a distinct life of its own but this alone is consistent with a national unity, not characterized by life, but by ordinances in flesh, which excluded the Gentile, even though converted, as profane and not to be eaten with. This divine life is always spoken of in scripture; not as an emanation of deity, but as derived *from*

God through the action of the word, by the power of the Spirit on man. "Born of water [that is, the word, compare John 15:3] and of the Spirit." "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life"; that is, spiritual in their nature and the means of life when so used by the Spirit of God. The word is invariably the effectual instrument which the Holy Ghost employs. No doubt, coming from God, it has the moral characteristics of the divine nature, hence it is called by the apostle John, "the seed of God." "The seed of God abideth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God," that is, it carries with it the stamp and character of its divine origin.

Again, the apostle Peter says, "There are given to us exceeding great and precious promises, that by *these* ye might be partakers of the divine nature" (2 Pet. 1:4). It has been observed this is not θεότης or essential Deity, as in Col. 2:9, but θειότης, that is, divine quality; exceedingly blessed, because expressive of what God is, as the word of man expresses what he is, his ways, character, and mind, and much more so with God; but this is not the communication of "the essential life" of God before incarnation or redemption, which, if true, as asserted by Mr. G., would be simply deifying saints. Even in the Old Testament, where this life, as we have seen, took an earthy form or mold, it is spoken of as produced by the reception of the word in the soul. "This is my comfort in my affliction, for thy word hath quickened me"; and again, "I will never forget thy precepts, for with them thou hast quickened me (Psa. 119:50, 93).

The Gospels give the same testimony, that the word is the means always employed by God in quickening. "The sower soweth the word," "The seed is the word of God"; nor can any other construction be put upon the language used; in every case it is scripture, or the word spoken by prophets, or by Christ Himself and His apostles that is referred to: "*The words that I speak unto you*," says the Lord in John 6; "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever . . . And *this is the word* which by the gospel is preached unto you" (1 Pet. 1:23-25); and so in James 1:18 it is "*the word of truth*," by which we are begotten (cp. Eph. 1:13).

Sometimes the Spirit is spoken of as the Quickener, as we have seen, sometimes the Father, sometimes the Son (John 5:21-25); but until after the death and resurrection of Christ, life is stated in scripture to be only *from* the Son, never *in* or *with* Him. It is hearing His word or His voice that can minister life (John 5); and this life is only spoken of as "eternal life" after the incarnation or the manifestation of the Son, or subsequent to His death with the revelation of the Father. "Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee"; and this is explained to be by His giving eternal life, which is through the knowledge of the "Father, the only true God, and Jesus Christ *as sent*" by Him. No one who now knows what spiritual life is, doubts that it was abiding in its nature, but it was reserved as a distinction in which the

glory of the Person and work of the Son should be seen, that it should only come out as "life," eternal life, through Him. Like silver, which is precious in itself as every one knows, it is only as gone through the process of stamping in the royal mint with the queen's head and the royal arms, that it becomes current coin of the realm, or of recognized value as a legal tender. Indeed, it is first spoken of in John 3 in connection *with*, *not* the new birth or the work of the Spirit, but with the Son of man being lifted up, and the gift of God's Son, the fruit of His love to the world, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." So the Lord, even when speaking of Himself, as the living bread which came down from heaven (that is, His incarnation), and "If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever," adds, to give effect to this for souls, "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." To show that it is needful there should be the apprehension of the meaning and value of His death by the believer, He continues, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you" (John 6). Only after His death could the streams of life and love that were in His heart flow freely forth. "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." It is undeniable that in the Old Testament life is not thus spoken of. For life and incorruptibility have only been brought to light by the gospel, so that it was not known as life before, still less as eternal life.<sup>14</sup>

But the question has also arisen, whether we do not enjoy life in an altogether new way since Christ arose, and in a way which gives a nearness to Himself and the Father never known before, and of which we find no trace either in millennial times. The Lord says, He is come that we may have life, and have it more abundantly; if it is to be possessed in special connection with Himself, and in a new position taken by Him, this is easily understood.

In John 12, we have the distinct statement of our Lord, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone, but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." This product of the corn of wheat does not refer to the mere bestowment of life by Him, either before or after His incarnation, which life existed in those who surrounded Him at that very moment; but it is an express declaration that there could be no association or identification in life with Him before His death, for until then He abode absolutely *alone*. The spiritual instinct of any saint ought to tell him that until the flesh was judicially put an end to, any such connection with Him could not exist. In the cross also, man as such is judged and set aside before God, and the world

likewise.<sup>15</sup>

The old creation must be brought, to its true issue in death and judgment, before the foundation of the new could be laid in Him, who is the beginning, the Firstborn from the dead. When once the point of death has been reached, and expiation made, we can be said to be "quickened *together* with Christ, raised *together*, and made to sit *together* in heavenly places *in* Christ Jesus" {Eph. 2:6}. But to return to the passage before us. "If it [the corn of wheat] die, it bringeth forth much fruit." It is as rising from the ground that it is multiplied, and bears within itself all the fruit, and yet is but one plant; and the whole shares in the same air, the same sunshine, the same showers, as well as having the same life. Hence the Lord, referring to this, says (John 14:19), "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me, *because I live*, ye shall live also." This was after His death, when the world saw Him no more; then the disciples could not only have life, but have it in connection with Himself as risen; and hence it would be *in* and *with* Himself, as a consequence of, and in continuance with, His own, because beyond the reach of the effects of sin, death, and judgment. This life would be indissoluble and eternal, and He adds, "In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you" (John 14:20); that is, after this life was given, which He then distinctly speaks of as in the future. This accords fully with the message the Lord sends to His disciples after His resurrection (John 20:17): "Go, tell my brethren, I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God"; and then, standing in the midst of them, "He breathed on them," and says, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." He had indeed revealed the Father in all His character and ways, but never before does He call them His brethren, for He is "the firstborn among many brethren"; never before does He link them with Himself in these blessed words -- mine and yours. It is His life, His position, His nearness of relationship, in which they are called to participate. He had taken this new place as the risen Man before God, Head, or beginning, of the new creation, victorious over death, the grave, and Satan's power, and for the first time these words, marking association, are used -- mine and yours -- and His own life is given with the Holy Ghost as the power to enjoy it.<sup>16</sup>

On the cross, when the hour of His being forsaken is over, and the distance and darkness are past, and the judgment of sin ended in Ps. 22., and He is heard from the horns of the unicorn, He says, "I will declare thy name unto

14. Mr. Trench in the August number of *Words of Faith*, 1884, which remains unanswered by Mr. Grant, save in a minor point or two, has shown that "eternal life is not connected in scripture with quickening or with life as received by saints before the manifestation of Christ. He adds, "I earnestly press that it is not so, *that scripture presents it*"; but Mr. Grant, alas! cannot so much as understand the importance of this: "Why may he not" speak otherwise? he asks.

15. Those who have sought to make out union of saints with Christ, previous to death and resurrection, have either destroyed the possibility of atonement, by making Christ part of a fallen, ruined humanity, or as in the present case, deifying saints by bringing them into what is essentially divine.

16. This, in result, brings into heaven, both in our place and relationship, Christ being gone up there, as He says, "I *ascend* to my Father, and your Father" (John 20:17). His place as Man, and relationship, being both heavenly, ours is so also. It is on this ground that the apostle commences, in Eph. 1, with, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

my brethren" (Psa. 22:22). It is His own breath of life that He breathes into His disciples, as the risen Lord, a quickening Spirit {John 20:22}; nor could it be enjoyed or realized without the Holy Ghost also, the spring and power of it, though not yet come as at Pentecost, in a distinct and personal way, and for testimony to the world.

Nowhere else do we find anything resembling this wondrous action of the Lord since God created Adam, communicating natural life, by which he was distinguished from the creation around which was subject to him.<sup>17</sup>

Mr. Darby holds distinctly enough an addition of life given in resurrection, of a new character, order, and power.

Just as God breathed into Adam's nostrils, so the resurrection Son of God breathes into them the power of the life He gives them as risen {John 20:22}. In Acts 1 you get the sending of the Holy Ghost, not the breathing on them, not the power of life, but the Holy Ghost received anew for others from the Father by the Son, and then by Him shed forth" (*Collected Writings, Expository* 4:451).

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 baptized 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

17. Mr. Grant explains all this away, and declares, notwithstanding the Lord's action in this solemn and blessed moment, that He gave them *nothing at all*, for this alone would harmonize with Mr. G.'s system.

But is there any necessity for supposing that when the Lord, breathing upon them, says, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," any actual gift was then communicated? The breathing implied the communication of life, yet *life was not then given*; and "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," words which everywhere else refer to the Pentecostal gift, may do no more than *empower them for the reception of this* in its due time (*Life and the Spirit*, p. 11).

We would not charge Mr. G. with *intentional* irreverence, for he evidently does not so mean it, but what can we think of a theory which, to be consistent with itself, involves such a handling of scripture? It is for saying that life is here given afresh, that he pours such a flood of scorn and contempt upon Lord A. P. C. {Cecil}, in his {Mr. Grant's} tract on *Double Quickenings*, and both there and elsewhere tries to frighten his readers against what he terms this 'grotesque folly.' We have Webster's Dictionary and 'Physiological Dissertations,' and even Lord A. P. C.'s 'Wise Looks'(!) brought forward, to scare us from the plain statements of scripture. But the soul who reveres the word of God will not be affected by all this mere storm of words. The fact is, it is a question of the use of terms, and whether scripture applies the term, quickening, to a fresh accession of life. In the Psalms we have it constantly so presented, and those who have been already quickened by the word, say, 'Quicken us, and we will call upon thy name' (Psa. 80:18). And again, 'My soul cleaveth unto the dust, quicken thou me according to thy word' (Psa. 119:25, 40.) Even naturally there is a distinction between quickening and birth, though the operations of nature are hidden and mysterious in their origin. The apostle, however, goes farther than Lord A. P. C. when he says to the Galatians, 'My little children, of whom I *travail in birth again*, until Christ be formed in you' (Gal. 4:19). Had Mr. Grant been one of the apostle's Galatian opposers, how would he have scorned this as a 'burlesque extravagance' but natural things, though they may illustrate, are not meant to govern the spiritual mysteries which the word of God unfolds, still less to override what it positively teaches.

in Him" (*Collected Writings, Doctrinal* 3:552).

By this means we are brought in the nearest and most intimate way to taste what is divine, but only through the link of Christ's manhood in this new position and association.

Christ introduces [us] into the enjoyment of that which is His own -- of His own position before the Father. This is blessedly true in every respect, except of course essential Godhead and oneness with the Father: in that He remains divinely alone. But all He has as man, and *as Son in manhood*, He introduces [us] into. "My Father and your Father, my God and your God." His peace, His joy, the words the Father gave to Him, He has given to us; with the love wherewith the Father has loved Him we are loved (*Synopsis* (John), p. 541).

But this is not all. The Holy Ghost dwelling in us, we know that we are in Christ. "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you." This is individual, not the union of the members of the body with Christ; nor is union indeed an exact term for it. We are *in Him*. This is more than union, but not the same thing. It is nature and life, and position in it, our place in that nature and life. When He was upon earth and they had not the Holy Ghost, they would have known that He was in the Father, and the Father in Him. When He was in heaven, and they had the Holy Ghost, they would know they were in Him, and He in them (*Synopsis* (John), p. 536).

If the passages which speak of these highest privileges which we enjoy as individuals, and which are specially brought out in the apostle John's writings are examined, we shall find that they are all expressed in terms which assume incarnation and redemption. "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth *in me and I in him*" (John 5:56).

They should dwell in Him (v. 56) -- should be in Him before God according to all His acceptance before God -- all the efficacy of His work in dying. And Christ should dwell in them according to the power and grace of that life in which He had gained the victory over death, and which, having gained it, He now lives (*Synopsis* (John), p. 481).

In John 17, the Lord requests for those who shall believe on Him through the word to be preached by the apostles: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me (John 17:21); all future to the time when He was speaking, and as a result of His work (v. 4). The commandment which has now a new character "is true, *in him and in us*, because the darkness is past and the true light now shineth," that is, the full light of Christianity, resulting from the death of the Son of God (1 John 2:7, 8). We are to abide *in Him* through the teaching of the anointing, the Holy Ghost, which we have received of Him (v. 29). If we are "*in Him*" that is true, in His Son Jesus Christ, it is through the Son of God *having come* and having given us an understanding to know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ, His name *as Man* (1 John 5:20). This power of divine apprehension {in us} existed only after His resurrection (Luke 24:45; 1 Cor. 2:10, 16).

It is evident that the knowledge of what it is to be "in

Christ" is of the highest importance. This subject is so fully treated in the writings of the apostle Paul; not so much in connection with life and nature as in John's writings, but more on the side of the position or standing before God, which is thus acquired for us, and the end of the flesh which it assumes, with the experimental introduction of the soul into it. The death of Christ ended the whole scene for the apostle, and all that man is in it, for whom He died. "If one died for all, then have all died." His death was the verdict or sentence passed upon all without exception, and upon the whole nature of man as such. "Therefore, henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Cor. 5:16). And this is the more striking because all that was in Him when here below, was absolutely and supremely perfect. Even had he known Christ after the flesh, he would know Him no more in that connection, that is, with those old links which pertain to associations which He had now quitted for ever. It was all over with Judaism, a system connected with the flesh, man and the world, of which the moral stamp and character were shown in the cross. Now the whole value of the victory of Christ as man, with the history of man in eternal relation to God begun anew in the Firstborn from the dead, and all that it opened, whether present or future, comes before him: "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation, old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new, and all things are of God" (2 Cor. 5:17). Later on in the same epistle {2 Cor. 12:1}, he speaks of "*A man in Christ* caught up into the third heaven," as if it was the proper place and portion of such an one, and he adds: "Of such an one will I glory"; as well he may, for there is but the one man now before God; and there is no measure for our place and position, but what He is and conformity to Him, in heavenly glory, for, "As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly." "And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (1 Cor. 15:48, 49). Hence the object of the apostle's labor and of the gift of Christ also, that each "may grow up unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13).

This position acquired for us by Christ, needs however to be spiritually apprehended, and this is through an experimental process described in Rom. 7. How many souls there are, who, though having some sense of divine grace and blessing, yet live a life in which the flesh and the world play the greater part, and there is no liberty before God nor conviction of the truth that "the flesh profiteth nothing." In some way or other this lesson must be learnt, in order that what God "has been working out" for four thousand years, and expressed so perfectly in the cross, may be experimentally realized as true in the individual history of the believer; and that thus the resources of life and power which are to be found in Christ before God, may be practically made his own.

Now Rom. 7 is the only place in the word of God where this conflict is described, and the means of deliverance shown. It is therefore no light offence against the truth and

the profit of souls, were there nothing else objectionable in Mr. G.'s teaching, to attempt thus to deprive them of this light in a dark place, and of the steps divinely given to bring them out of this slough of despond, and throw them back into the confusion, which formerly existed almost universally {in even evangelical circles}. For he will have no "middle" or "intermediate" place where the Holy Ghost is not given; though forced, in spite of himself, to admit that, in the Acts such was the case in converts who had life, but had not received the Spirit of God (Acts 8, 19).

{In Rom. 7} We have the figure of the two husbands, the impossibility of being in relationship with both at the same time, and that death severs the connection with the one [the law] in order to admit of relationship to the other [Christ]. Then the apostle traces out the practical accomplishment of this in the soul, by the action of the law, introducing the sense of death in the conscience, and the discovery at the same time of its powerlessness, and that there is no good in the flesh. Here also the spirituality of the law is seen, for it detects and judges sin in the nature, the principle of lust, which the law cannot but condemn, and which nevertheless holds the soul in captivity, so that the extreme point of misery is reached. Here are the desires and the discernment of life, the awakened conviction of what sin is in its principle, as in opposition to what God has enjoined; but it ends in the sentence of death taken into the soul; and when it is brought to despair of itself, it looks outward and upward, ("O, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?") a ray of light enters, and it perceives that God has wrought deliverance for it in Christ. As Moses said when the children of Israel cried out: "Because there were no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness"; "Fear ye not, *stand still*, and *see* the salvation of the Lord, which he will show you today, for the Egyptians whom ye have seen today, ye shall see them again no more for ever" (Ex. 14:11, 13).

The flesh which is irremediably bad, and because of which the law gave the deep feeling of condemnation, has already been judged by God in the cross, "For 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" (Rom. 8:3); so that the believer is freed from it. God Himself has taken the part of the poor and needy one, which the law, because of its nature, could not do, and He has given His Son, so that the sin in the nature, the power and principle of evil which had sway over the soul, has been *already* condemned by God beforehand, and "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). It is all past, the soul lives and breathes a new atmosphere, for life and resurrection in Christ are known, by what God has Himself wrought, carrying us into another region where Christ is everything, and of this the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus is the witness and spring: "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

But how unmistakable is the fact, that in all this exercise passed through under the law, the old husband has his claim,

and enforces it also with tremendous effect, even “unto death” -- an absolute proof that the connection with the new husband -- Christ -- is not known until death has practically passed upon the soul.<sup>18</sup> The Spirit of God is not mentioned in all this conflict, nor till we come to the new position taken by Christ Himself for the believer, and the apprehension of it, for, “Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty” (2 Cor. 3:17; Gal. 5:18). No, all this is bondage, the soul being in “captivity to the law of sin in its members.” The two natures, and the law, make up entirely the moral elements at work in this warfare {in Rom. 7}; God and Christ and the Spirit only are found in the blessed and characteristic action at the close of it, and in the next chapter, and all are alike for us. Christ -- beyond the reach of sin, death, and judgment, which He went through on our behalf; God -- in all He has done in giving His Son, and raising Him from the dead; the Holy Ghost -- as liberty and power of life, bursting the bonds of the soul, which now can celebrate God’s deliverance, like Israel on the banks of the Red Sea, when they saw what God had wrought for them, and all their enemies overthrown.

The law being the measure of creature responsibility, is used by God to teach this lesson; “for,” says the apostle, “by the law is the knowledge of sin” (not of sins); and, “Know ye not (for I speak to them that know the law) that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?” so that, “When we were in the flesh” looks at the condition described in Rom. 7:7-24, and answers to the expression, “I am carnal, sold under sin,” where the state was characterized by the flesh and its workings, notwithstanding desires which could not exist without spiritual life. “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not of him”; not that he is not quickened, but he is not in that new relationship to Christ expressed in verse 4, and in the whole of Rom. 8; when he is no longer under *the dominion of the law*, having died to it. Compare Gal. 2:19. “I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God,” so also in Gal. 5., “If ye be led of the Spirit ye are *not under the law*”; as the man emphatically is in Rom. 7. How different is the condition depicted in Rom. 8, when the believer is no longer in the flesh, when the Spirit of God is the source of the soul’s life and activity, and of power, producing all that is of God, and judging all the rest! Here comes the proper responsibility of

the Christian as to walk: “If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.” For all the life ought to be now, the expression of the Spirit of God.

The fact is admitted that there are some individuals to whom, in the stage of experience arrived at, it is difficult to assign a definite place; sometimes they speak as if they had the Spirit, and could say, “Abba, Father”; at other times all seems uncertain. The same may be remarked of some who once appeared to be true Christians and to have the evidence of the Spirit; such as those of whom the apostle Peter speaks who had forgotten that they were purged from their old sins: if indeed the passage does not mean, as we say, “you forgot you were a child of God when you so acted.” But we are not to make human inconsistency the criterion of divine truth, but the reverse. “Yea, let God be true, and every man a liar,” is the apostle’s doctrine. Mr. Darby and all admit that there are these exceptional cases; Mr. Grant makes them the rule by which to judge of the whole structure of divine truth, and uses this admission to overthrow Mr. D.’s teaching, as if inconsistent with itself (pp. 61-63), calling them “the differences and inconsistencies of an untenable position,” afterwards claiming that (letter dated Montreal, Dec. 19th, 1884), “as to justification, and that one may have the Holy Ghost, and be in bondage,” “J. N. D. is again in accord with” him, that is, as well as respecting life in the Son.

Our brother C. S. thus describes this teaching {of FW}:

As to sealing, this is mere dust as another has said. It serves to hide the leveling down, which would gradually rob us of all we have in Christ risen from the dead . . . We can only bow with shame, that one of ourselves should be capable of attacking our *departed* brother {i.e., J. N. Darby} in this shameful way -- portions of his valuable writings on Romans 7 are quoted to show their contradiction; when one is describing true Christian experience, and the other, the experience a Christian may get into through the bad teaching of these last days: both most profitable to be understood.

One word more: Is it not plain that all this strife and determined party-making in America springs from the fatal mistake of going beyond scripture -- really coming under the error of 2 John 9? It is stated -- *the root-statement* -- that the Old Testament saints had eternal life IN THE SON.<sup>19</sup>

These views of life in the Son before incarnation remain to be noticed. There can be no question that they are not only unscriptural, but an unwarrantable intrusion into the divine nature and glory.

Life in the Son means {says Mr. Grant} in the Son of God as such, *the life* as truly said, of a *divine Person*; therefore divine life in communion with its source, place excluded, for we could not have *the place* of a divine Person.

This implies that we have all that is divine, except place!

To say, therefore, it is wholly in the Son, become Man, is erroneous (*Double Quickening*, p. 10).

18. Can any reasonable person accept the statement that the believer here is not only sealed, but

in the enjoyment of a liberty of which he knows not the first terms.

In this connection Mr. G. says,

But what then, if it be, as it is in Christ Jesus that I live to God? Then there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.

This is reversing the order of scripture, and tends to destroy all proper Christian confidence. Where is Mr. G. drifting to? It corresponds however with other similar statements, which betray the miserable Arminianism of the whole system. {He says:}

Sonship and the place in Christ, even after attainment, are still capable of being lost, if the walk is not with God, though the Spirit still, however grieved, abides.

19. {Does not the teaching that O. T. Saints had eternal life *in* the Son mean participation in deity? -- for we have eternal life in the Son in connection with His risen manhood.}

“At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:20). Clearly these are *parallel* thoughts: He in the Father, and we in him (*Life and the Spirit*, p. 8).

Community of nature, *realized in dependence*, and manifested in community of word and work: this is what such words imply. Such things do they imply also as to our relationship to Him (wonderful to say), when He turns to *us*, and says, “Ye in me, and I in you” (p. 9).

Scripture is surely clear that “life in the Son,” which is nothing else than eternal life, is, and ever was, the possession of every one born of God, from the beginning of the world (p. 10).<sup>20</sup>

We have thus the essential, divine life -- for there was no other -- as that which was given to saints before incarnation. Here the Person of Christ also is lowered, for it was the intrinsic glory, proper to Himself as the Son, that shone forth in Him alone. “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father” (John 1:14). And what He had, and has, as one with and in the Father in essential nature, “He in the Father, and the Father in him,” and what saints share with Him, are said to be “*parallel* thoughts,” and “imply community of word and work.” What poor, low thoughts Mr. Grant must have fallen into of the wondrous unity of the divine nature! Jesus alone could say, “He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?” (John 14:9, 10).

Works, may, indeed, be done *in the name of Christ*, and by the power of the Holy Ghost descended from heaven, even wider in extent, but *community* of word and work is proper only to a divine person. Thus saints are exalted {by Mr. Grant} into what is absolutely divine, whilst the Son is spoken of in a way that does not give Him His place as displaying what He is in Himself in all that is essentially divine. Where does scripture speak of community of nature between the Father and the Son as “*realized in dependence*”? That Christ as man received all from the Father in the place and mission in which He stood and acted here below, is blessedly true; but to attempt to define the way in which community of nature, which is essential, was realized between the Father and the Son is an unwarrantable intrusion of wretched human thoughts, into a subject of which we know nothing, and ground on which, as elsewhere, Mr. G. should never have ventured. How serious are the consequences, already perceptible, of his doctrine, which, as brought out by himself, we must mark as a warning, for no one can tell where these views may ultimately lead. It will be enough for simple souls that he has himself shown us their character and tendency.

We have already seen how Mr. Darby speaks of the way

in which we take part in what is divine; that is, through the risen manhood of Christ, and what we can partake of in that manhood,<sup>21</sup> a ground easily intelligible to a spiritual mind, and which preserves from what would take us out of our proper place of lowly dependence, though bringing us into infinite blessing.

What then are we to think of the effort to enlist J. N. D. also in favor of these views? his {JND's} whole system and teaching really excluding, as it does, all unity or association with Christ before His resurrection. Passages almost innumerable in his writings might be cited, to prove this. Amongst others, the reader may refer to *Collected Writings*, *Doctrinal* 8:339, 341; “Christological Pantheism.”

Nevertheless, Mr. Grant, who objects (*Double Quickening*, p. 1) to taking an isolated passage, because it bears against his views, out of the *Collected Writings*, selects one solitary passage from the “Notes on the Epistles,” which were often published without any revision by the author, as evidence that J. N. D. maintains the same doctrine as to life in the Son before redemption. We give the passage in full.

We have a dead Christ, now alive for evermore, and next we have the Holy Ghost dwelling in us. But this is all as belonging to a new world. “There are three that bear witness -- the Spirit, the water, and the blood” {1 John 5:6-8}. We have three witnesses, the Spirit bearing testimony; the water, the cleansing power, and the blood the expiatory power; and these all agree in one. There is no cleansing of the old nature, but there is a new nature given. “God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” It is no mending of the old Adam, but it is a gift of the new. “He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.” There is no life belonging to the old man, it is a rejected thing, and there will not be two Adams in heaven. Here is the Son and those that have life in the Son. God began working out this in the fall, but the full truth of it was brought out when Christ was risen (*Collected Writings* 28:302, 303).

Detached as this passage is from its context, which shows that present Christian condition is before the writer's mind (“We have the Holy Ghost dwelling in us, but this is all as belonging to a new world”), yet it in no way teaches what is sought to be made out of it. It is the testimony of the three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood, that is referred to, witnessing the total ruin or corruption of the old nature, which is “a rejected thing.” “Here *is* [not *was*] the Son” and “those that have [not *had*] life in Him,” says Mr. Darby; the word “*here*” and the use of the present tense, show plainly enough that it is the present witness and consequent blessing of eternal life in the Son that is alluded to. It is the problem of the depravity of man which God has been “working out” since the fall, not the communication of life. “Working out life” conveys no intelligible idea. He had not to *work* out life, which would not be sense, and would

20. The time which elapsed between the date of publication of these two tracts -- September 1883 and November 1884, and the re-assertion of the same doctrine in the latter, after it had been challenged, shows that it cannot be regarded merely as unweighed expressions hastily uttered, but the deliberate adherence to very serious errors, which Mr. Darby in his controversy with Mr. Newton pronounces “frightful,” if really held.

21. It is the refusal of this view, and his determination to disallow it in every way, that has thrown M. G. into these very dangerous errors, by accounting in his own way for divine expressions, and making links of his own with what is divine, because he will not have it as God has taught it, and as others have explained it.

deny His own quickening power. The attempt to make more of this passage is very discreditable to its author. All Christians believe that life was in the Son and that He quickened souls in all dispensations, but not that they *shared* this divine life in Him, or could be said to be in Him either. They received life *from* Him, but that is quite another matter.

Some extracts are subjoined from Mr. Darby's writings in reply to Mr. B. W. Newton, who had put forth similar views as to the Person of Christ, and saints partaking of that which is essentially divine.

"Union with the Person of the Son of God {wrote BWN} is the great characteristic blessing of the whole family of redeemed." Where in scripture? That they have all life from Him is undoubtedly true. But where is union spoken of with the Son of God as characterizing the saints on earth during the millennium?

The truth is, "Union with the Person of the Son of God," is an idea as unscriptural as the words, "We are in Him and He in us." We are also said to dwell in God, and God in us; but we do not speak of union with God. Again, of whom is it said, "We have received of his fullness, grace for grace"? Of the Word *made flesh*, He dwelt among us, full of grace and truth. Before that it had been said, "in him was life," but now the Word becomes flesh, and we talk of fullness" (*Examination of Thoughts on the Apocalypse*, pp. 68-70).

But not only is scriptural language departed from, but while professing to instruct all his brethren, and to be the guardian of "*The Truth*," the author has fallen into the grossest errors; . . . He has really confounded the possession of the divine nature, by which Christ could take the incommunicable name of God, with the *life in us* which flows from this fullness. Whatever union we may have with Christ: -- yea, though it may be said that we dwell in God, and God in us, yet essential life can be attributed in its very nature to God only. That this was by the mystery of the incarnation, in the man Jesus every saint owns. But to talk of this being heavenly life, in the sense in which we possess it, is the grossest confusion, and would be frightful if it were not mere confusion (p. 25).

A man is no Christian at all, that does not believe in the nature and Person of Christ. But does the author mean to confound this divine Person, with the life in us derived from Him?

We have life, but we *are not* eternal life, nor have we it properly or essentially in ourselves. "God has given to us eternal life, and that life is *in the Son*." "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

Now, I believe it to be only confusion, but there is the most complete confusion between the Person of the Son of God, the divine being and existence, and the life communicated to the saints which flows from it.

When eternal life as such, is spoken of as *here*, "That eternal life which was with the Father," then all that is said is "*was manifested*," *not communicated*. When, on the other hand, eternal life is spoken of as being given to us, it is carefully added, "and that life is in the Son." "He that hath the Son hath life." Christ had life in Himself, yea, "in him was life." If it be said, He lived by the Father, yet it is not said He has life, because He hath the Father. He and the Father were

one. But, as I have already remarked, union with the Person of the Son of God is not scriptural.

"Our life is hid with Christ in God, and when Christ our life shall appear," &c. Here Christ is spoken of as being our life. So we are said to "dwell in him and he in us" -- the strongest expressions these, that can be. But this is just what makes the difference with Christ, and shows the life is not essential in us. *He* is our life, *He* dwells in us. But it is not essential life in us -- that is the prerogative of a divine person. I can say Christ is our life, but I could not say *the Father is Christ's life*: it would take away at once from what He was in His nature and being (Original Edition, *Answer to Second Letter*, pp. 26, 28, 80).

Compare this with Mr. G.'s statement:

He upon earth, a man, *has life in the Father*, in community of nature, but in dependence (*Life and the Spirit*, p. 8).

The reader has now before him the doctrines to which he is invited to give his confidence, instead of those which he has learned and heard from God as the truth. "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth" (1 John 2:21). If it is not the truth, it is, however unconscious Mr. Grant may be of it, the effort of the enemy of souls to lead away from it. He tells us, the danger that we are in just now is, "that of building upon traditions, the freshness of which is departing, and substituting a creed for the living power of the Holy Ghost." This only proves that he has lost the freshness and power of that which God has given to His church in these last days, or he would scarcely call it "a creed and traditions"; but the truth of God is always the same, though to Mr. Grant it may be merely tradition. The effort thus to undermine its influence and power in the soul, to lead it to trust in his own shifting and barren speculations as "*the living power of the Holy Ghost*," is too transparent for any who know what blessing God has given them in the path in which He has led them, to induce them to venture on such a dangerous shoal. It is appalling to think of soul's being subject to their influence. "A stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers."

It is evident that the schism which is now effected in Canada, is founded on the doctrines taught by Mr. Grant, for the statements put forth by those who met in Craig Street, Montreal, identifies their position with these views as "truth, long recognized as such among us"; so that all those who accept this as the Table of the Lord and others in association with it, are linked with these false doctrines, and make themselves responsible for them and for all their injury to souls. "Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks; walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have of mine hand; ye shall lie down in sorrow" (Isa. 50:11).

## Appendix

Since the above was written a paper of Mr. Grant's on

Eternal

Life has come to hand, referring to statements of Mr. Darby's in reply to Mr. Newton, which had not before been noticed.

Some of these he quotes,, but as he leaves out important passages concerning his views, which are in juxtaposition to those he cites, the deficiency is here supplied.

He [Mr. Newton] holds now that there was the same life essentially in all of them. With this I fully agree. It was true then of John the Baptist. Why then, if it is necessarily to be called heavenly because it came down from heaven, as in the Person of Christ, does John contrast himself with Christ, and say -- He that cometh from above is above all -- He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all.

There is a very deeply and *fundamentally false principle* running through all the author's reasonings on this point. I mean this, that if life be there, inasmuch as it is always of God, or divine life, it is always essentially the same, whatever official distinctions there may be as to dispensation. Now, as to the possession of life by man, it must be holy in the principle of its nature, obedient, and have God for its object. *So far, it must be fundamentally the same.* But this makes man the end and essential object of all this. Then these things, man having life, may be termed "official" distinctions -- (though even so, it is most sad to say that those things by which God acts peculiarly on His saints are mere official differences). I do not think a spiritual, holy mind, that loves Christ, can help being shocked at being told that that possession of the Comforter, which made it expedient that Christ should go away -- which guides him into all truth -- *gives him communion with the Father and the Son* -- which is an unction by which he knows all things, the things freely given to him of God, yea, the deep things of God -- which enables him to cry, Abba Father -- by which the love of God is shed abroad in his heart, and by which he knows that *he is one with Christ, in Him, and He in him*; that *all this* is a mere official distinction. But, the truth is, this principle shuts God out of the matter, in making the difference as to man the end. These differences of dispensation *are the displays of God's glory*; and therefore of all importance, and most essential, because a positive part of His glory. The law maintained His majesty, and title to claim obedience, as the gospel displayed His grace, and gave the obedience of a child. Besides, the difference is very great as to man, indeed. *It is everything as to his present affections, as to his life.* Because God puts forth power, power too which works in man through faith, according to the display He makes of Himself. And ~~therefore, when He is working in us, and God is made manifest to us,~~

And this is the field of responsibility too. Thus, if God reveals Himself to Abraham as Almighty, Abraham is to live and walk in the power of that name. And so of the promises given to him. Israel is to dwell in the land as the redeemed people of the Lord, -- their affections, ways, responsibility, and happiness, flowing from what God was to them as having placed them there. So to us. *The presence of the Holy Ghost Himself being the great distinguishing fact, with the knowledge He affords.* Because all this is what faith ought to act upon, and the life which we live in the flesh we live by faith, for the just shall *live* by faith. Hence the Lord does not hesitate to say, *this is* life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. That could not have been the life of those {O.T. saints} before.

Had they then not life? Nay, but it could not be stated in that way -- their life was not that; and to undo these differences, is to make a life without affections, character, responsibility, in a word, without faith. You cannot do it -- for to us, to believe is to live. *The more you succeed in leveling them to one thing, the more you succeed in stifling divine affections and active human responsibility -- destroying, as far as may be, divine communion, and frustrating divine grace, -- the more the glory and energy of faith is null, and hence God's glory in us.*

It will be seen that as set forth above, Mr. Darby holds that spiritual life has in all dispensations, characteristics essentially the same in some respects, but essentially different in others. This is not Mr. Grant's view, as he would have us believe, for in this same paper on Eternal Life, he says that the life we now have, we are yet said to wait for the full manifestation of, and that the case of the Old Testament saints was "precisely" similar, possessing a life not fully entered upon; but this is incorrect, for the life we have now is the same *in all respects*, that we shall enjoy, when fully developed hereafter.

With reference to Mr. Darby's remark on the same essential life in all saints, Mr. Grant remarks:

*This is all that has ever been contended for.*

The reader is left to judge for himself, after the perusal of these pages, how far such a statement, as well as his other efforts to link Mr. Darby's views with his own, is consistent with the truth.

**The italics in the Extracts are mostly those of the Author of this pamphlet.**



## *The Christian's Heavenly Position & Portion*

### *With a Review of C. E. S.'s Pamphlets on "Christian Standing and Condition"*

**The anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and . . . as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him (1 John 2:27).**

#### *Introductory Remarks*

Having been asked to put in writing comments which had been made on the pamphlet, entitled, "Christian Standing and Condition," {by C. E. Stuart} I have reluctantly consented to do so. Many considerations would have made me prefer to keep silence. Feelings of deep regard and friendship for the author. The thought, too, that he has been in some instances charged with what he did not hold, through a want of due care and consideration, occasioned me much pain and long prevented my touching the subject. Had not the pamphlet been republished -- without any apparent sense of the distress and offence which his views have caused to his brethren, after being entreated to withdraw it, evincing such insensibility to the confusion and the injurious effects everywhere threatened among saints by their circulation -- I should not have felt called upon to notice it. But this gives a more serious aspect to the question, and the minds of saints are evidently being affected by them, and in every case, so far as I have seen, to the weakening, or loss, of the heavenly side of truth. Many, indeed, have felt this who could not dissect or point out what are the errors

contained in these pamphlets, yet the strong feeling of resistance which they have aroused, arises, I doubt not, from a sense of the importance of heavenly truth, even where the attempt to controvert them has not been free from mistakes. These mistakes have tended to confirm the author and his adherents in these views, and to confuse the simple, who are thus led to suppose that the writer has been misunderstood, or that those who have tried to confute them are just as much in error themselves; whereas these mistakes in the interpretation or application of scripture are wholly different from an attempt to introduce a system of teaching at variance with what has been hitherto received amongst us, and which, if imbibed, will be found unconsciously to have undermined in the soul the heavenly place which God has given His saints. Mr. Stuart, I am sure, is far from intending this, and, probably, is quite unaware of any such effect, but I cannot conceal from myself that the enemy is using his views to the subversion of

the truth and to the decided injury of souls, hence it becomes a duty, for his sake and theirs, to speak plainly, and to expose what is a serious danger for the church of God. God only knows the deep exercise of soul and conflict produced by esteem for the writer, and recollection of so many excellencies which the heart lingers over on the one hand, and the paramount importance of the truth of God and the welfare of souls on the other.

The reader will have to weigh for himself what heavenly truth is worth to him, and whether he received it of God, and can now afford to relinquish it for a barren theory which is wholly inconsistent and cannot be held along with it; and he is entreated to give his earnest and impartial attention, and to seek light and help from God, whilst these views are brought to the test of the word of God, which is what indeed has been publicly and repeatedly invited by Mr. S. and those who uphold his teaching.

It has been supposed by many that all that is in question, is a different use of the word *standing* and other terms, but it will be seen that this is a very superficial idea, and that different words convey very important differences of *thought*; nor is Mr. Stuart, we are well assured, by the way he writes, under any such mistaken impression.

A great cause of the danger to souls by this system is its deceptive and specious appearance, arising from the fact that it uses the same terms of scripture as others, but with a different meaning. Hence spiritual susceptibilities that have been rightly aroused, by the meagerness and poverty of what has been assumed to be the Christian standing, but which is, as has been remarked, nothing but Jewish standing, have been allayed, by the mistaken supposition, that what is subtracted from the Christian's standing, is given back to him in another way by Mr. S., when treating of Christian condition or being "in Christ," and there seems reason to think this is Mr. Stuart's own impression. But if it should appear that when Mr. S. speaks of being in Christ, he means something wholly different from what his brethren hold and what scripture teaches on this subject, and that the depravation of scripture and reduction of Christian position

down to Jewish is still greater on this head, there will be loss of divine truth every way, notwithstanding the plausible and somewhat taking plea of greater accuracy. This ought to arouse those who are not wholly blinded by self-will and party spirit to discern the snare of the enemy and awaken jealousy for the Lord and His truth, and the welfare of His saints. At least we may hope this of those who have run well and desired the glory of the Lord, but who have had their minds temporarily beclouded by the darkening mists, raised by the enemy of souls. May the unsuspecting author of them, through the mercy of God, have his eyes opened to discern them, and become by self-judgment the occasion of glory to God, and joy, to the hearts of his brethren.

It is remarkable that at the present moment, we should have to resist a double attack on the special privileges of the saints in this dispensation; Mr. Grant bringing us down, by what he teaches as to life and sealing, to the level of *Old Testament* saints, Mr. Stuart to the level of *Millennial saints*, as will appear in the following pages; each using for this purpose some of the same arguments as Mr. B. W. Newton when he made a strenuous effort to overthrow all dispensational truth, and thus fell into heresy. His assertion was that all saints were saved alike by the blood or work of Christ, and that to make a difference of heavenly position was to depreciate the value of that blood. Mr. S. uses the same argument, not to deny such difference, but practically to bring all down to a common level.

## Chapter 1

### *Is Standing Before The Throne Christian Position?*

The two main subjects which apparently occupy so large a place in Mr. Stuart's mind and teaching; and which he considers of such importance, as to warrant his bringing them forward and republishing them in a second edition, and an elaborate reply to Mr. Stoney -- are thus stated by himself.

We will now consider scripture teaching about the *believer's standing* and about his *condition as being in Christ* (page 5).

Our standing then before the throne is seen in Romans to be complete before one word is said of our being in Christ (page 9).

He (who was unrighteous) is henceforth by God *reckoned* righteous, and *so* can stand before His throne (page 11).

The being in Christ forms no part of scripture teaching as to the believer's perfect standing, *or justification*, before the throne of God (page 12).

We stand before the throne of God, we repeat it, simply and solely by virtue of the abiding value of the sacrifice of Christ for us, and our standing there is viewed as settled, before one word is said about being *in Christ* (page 53).

The blood of the bullock and that of the goat were treated in the same way and sprinkled on the same places; so the standing of Aaron and his house, typical of Christians, and that of Israel, *was the same* (*Letter to D. S.*).

It will be seen from these statements that this standing is spoken of as equivalent to "justification" or being "reckoned righteous" and that it is common to all saints of all dispensations without exception. Compare pages 16, 17, *Is it the Truth of the Gospel?*

These two subjects Mr. Stuart so handles, as to do away with the proper position of saints in this dispensation, and the divine estimate of heavenly truth, so far as that position is concerned. By this means the liberty of the soul in its relation to God, and communion with Him founded upon it, are also seriously affected. All this will be apparent as we proceed to examine these subjects.

In this system of thought, as presented to us by Mr. Stuart for our acceptance -- of God, or the fruit of a mind astray from God and His word and the guidance of His Spirit, having lost its way through following and depending on its own reasoning powers. The mind of man is never an adequate measure of divine truth, and when it sets up to be can only fall into confusion, darkness, and error. Distrust

of ourselves and deep dependence upon God can alone keep the soul in the discernment of *His mind*, which is really what is in question when we touch His truth. Oh for unshod feet to tread where all, though oft forgotten, is holy ground.

The first topic which occupies the foremost place in Mr. Stuart's pamphlets is -- a standing before the throne of God; this, which he supposes all believers to have alike in all dispensations, he thus defines (*Is it the Truth of the Gospel*, p. 17):

By standing is meant, the title and ability through grace for a fallen and once guilty creature to be before the throne of God without judgment overtaking him.

This standing he takes as the measure or gauge of divine blessings bestowed upon us, not merely as guilty creatures, but as saints.

No higher position can *the saint* have than the standing before that throne; for there is no higher position except to be on the throne of God, a place or position which of course no mere creature can ever have. Many of course are the blessings that we possess through grace besides that of justification by faith. We are God's children, His sons too, His heirs likewise, and joint heirs with Christ. God's purpose too is, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love. Yet none of these, *nor all of them together*, nor the being in Christ, who is the beginning of the new creation of God, the Head of a new race, can give us a higher position before God, than the standing before His throne which is ours now, in consequence of the death and resurrection of His Son (*Christian Standing and Condition*, pp. 8, 9).

These statements are very serious in their character. If Mr. Stuart is correct in making them, we have all been grievously mistaken in our belief, and in the teaching current, by those most approved of God in bringing out the truth among us, during the last fifty years; and the instructions gained, the lessons learned, the experience acquired, have all to be reversed or read backwards. If this standing before the throne, supposing it for a moment to be scriptural, which we are far from believing, equals the blessings which we have regarded as special and distinctive, and among those marked by the Lord as having that character (above those enjoyed in millennial days under His government), the words addressed to Thomas -- "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed, blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed" -- have lost their meaning; and those who have been recognized as pioneers or guides in truth among us, have, in common with those they taught, been living in a state of illusion.



judgment and another of grace? Would not the mercy-seat have been to Aaron a throne of judgment in a most solemn way, had he approached it in an unauthorized way?

Does God vacate His throne?

Is He not always on it . . . where God must only and *always sit*? (*Is it the Truth*, &c. p. 33).

God is, and *always* will be, on the throne, but the throne is not always viewed as the judgment seat.

That is, he admits that there is government as well as judgment connected with it. "There is the throne as well as the bench." But if he means that God is always presented in that relation to us, it is a very serious mistake. True, God never surrenders His rights as Supreme Governor, for heaven is His throne and earth His footstool; but if we compare the great white throne, before which heaven and earth flee away, and the dead stand, and that of the Ancient of Days (Dan. 7) sitting to judge the kingdoms of the earth, whose throne was like the fiery flame, and its wheels as burning fire (which are exclusively judicial), with His throne of government in Israel of old and in the millennium, we see the difference brought out. In the Revelation the ark of the covenant with the mercy-seat is the pledge, when His judgment is executed, of His unfailing connection with His people, for God dwelt between the cherubim (Psa. 89:14; 80:1; 99:1). "Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, *shine forth* . . . before Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh [whose position was in immediate connection with the ark and the sanctuary], stir up thy strength and *come*, and *save us*" (Psa. 80:1, 2).

We shall see how widely "different" is this aspect of the throne in "judgment" and in "grace," as well as God's action from it. Mr. Stuart's remark as to Aaron, confounds the difference which existed between the past and the present, the type and the antitype, when God had only before Him the blood of bulls and goats, and not that precious blood which adequately meets and measures His majesty and glory. Doubtless, "judgment would have overtaken" Aaron, had he not attended to the prescribed order of approach, but our failures, whilst drawing near to the mercy-seat or throne of grace, though they have to be judged before God, according to what He is, are met in a very different way. In Rom. 3 -- in which Mr. Stuart says, "Man is viewed as a responsible, guilty creature, *who needs a standing before the throne*," and "is henceforth by God declared *righteous*, and so can stand before His throne justified" -- whilst it is true that man, and indeed the whole world, is looked at as charged and brought in *guilty before God*, and having come short of *His glory*; the throne is by no means brought into the prominence which Mr. Stuart gives it,<sup>2</sup> but God's nature and glory, rather than His government, and His attitude in relation to man as a

*Justifier* from the blood-sprinkled mercy-seat. Not to question that the mercy-seat had the character of a throne, but having been sprinkled with blood, not of bulls and goats, but of Christ Himself, it has put on a different aspect, and from it God declares His righteousness towards all.

In Revelation, lightnings and thunderings and voices proceed from it, but here (Rom. 3) it is a blessed and privileged mercy-seat, where God sits in order to *display* His righteousness in justifying, before He sits on the throne of judgment to arraign and pass sentence on the guilty, manifesting then, His righteousness in judgment. The veil also having been rent that the righteousness of God may be revealed, through sin having been dealt with in a manner due to the claims of His divine majesty, we never read of standing before the mercy-seat, as we do of saints, other than ourselves, before the throne. Even of old it was intended to be a place of privileged access. "There will I meet with thee and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony (Ex. 25:22). So in the Hebrews: the way having been opened into the holiest of all, and the blood carried in there, and sprinkled by our great high Priest on the mercy-seat, (Ex. 9:11, 12), this becomes the blessed and constant place of holy intercourse and worship for us. A throne of grace to which we *draw near with boldness*, and which we are invited to approach with full assurance, for God is acting in *sovereign grace* and blessing toward us, but there is no such idea in the whole Epistle, as has been imported into it, of this standing before it. The whole of this teaching in fact carries us, only as far as the brass of the tabernacle, of which the elements of worship in the court were composed, signifying God's requirement of righteousness from man and in man, in contrast with the gold, which was the display of *Divine* righteousness; and where we, as priests, draw near, in contrast with the people, whose place of approach was the door of the tabernacle. This setting forth of divine righteousness and display of the character God, in relation to His own glory in the work of Christ, and the infinite worth of that work -- though it includes the justification of the sinner, is far more than a standing before the throne without judgment overtaking him; which is very much what characterized evangelical teaching, before the righteousness of God was brought out or the value of Christ's resurrection known, and still less the believer's position in righteousness and glory in Christ on high and all connected with it.

2. Indeed the throne is not mentioned or presented as such, but what God is, and what He displays Himself to be, whether in His glory as Creator (Rom. 1), or judging according to His holy nature (Rom. 2), or justifying according to His righteousness (Rom. 3); the propitiatory or mercy-seat is brought forward once, to bring out the manifestation of God in righteousness, and it is Jesus Christ whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation "through faith in his blood." But there is not a syllable nor a thought of standing before it like a throne. Standing in grace, taken simply in its context, has quite another meaning.



## Chapter 2

### *What is the Scriptural Estimate of Height Conferred by God on His Saints?*

This standing before the throne is insisted on, not simply as our introduction, or means of entrance, into blessing, in which sense, if limited to justification, it might be allowed to pass, but as our proper and constant position here and hereafter; and, above all, it is taken as the standard by which to measure all our highest blessings. Not only are we told that there is nothing higher than this imaginary standing; but it is weighed in the scale by Mr. S. against them all, and in his estimate it equals "all of them together."<sup>3</sup> Again we reply, that Mr. S. gives us no authority but his own fallible judgment for such a sweeping and all-important statement. Now he affirms that both Old and New Testament and Millennial saints have this standing before the throne, therefore it is only what everyone out of hell must certainly have, or be eternally lost, though he has none of the high privileges pertaining to saints in this dispensation; so that Mr. Stuart has reduced these exalted privileges to the millennial or Judaic level. This is his estimate of them taken separately, or "all together." We know by this one statement to what point his system of leveling down has brought him.

Mr. S.'s comparison does not seem a happy one, that is, using height in this way in the things of God, for where all is so great and so blessed, even what appears to be lowest in the scale, is wondrous grace toward man; but if it be allowable to speak of height, in judging of our blessings, it is evidently rank or dignity or elevation of position *in nearness to God*, that is in question.

For the true heart will find with thankfulness that as God's word presents it, height and nearness are inseparable, because that height is a fruit of His love and special favor towards us, and is always so expressed in scripture; and though, the Revelation being a scene of government, this does not come out in the same way there as in the Ephesians, it is clearly discernible, when the saints on earth render their praise to Him who *loves* them and washed them from their sins in His own blood and made them *kings and priests to God and His Father* (Rev. 1:5, 6).

We will proceed to examine the evidence of scripture on this

subject.

What is the meaning of our being quickened, raised, and seated in heavenly places if it be not height {Eph. 2:6}? It is not merely resurrection that is in view, but *ascension* and *heavenly places* as our present position, and where we have our present portion. "The heaven for height," we are told in the Proverbs. God has conferred blessing upon men on earth, and will do so again; but He is pleased, according to eternal counsels, to bless saints in this dispensation "with every spiritual blessing in *heavenly places* in Christ," and this is by the manifestation of Himself in His blessed nature and in relationship, according to the place He has given Christ. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we are looked upon as identified with Christ in His presence, for "He has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame, before him in love." We have also the place of sonship, and are in all this, to the praise of *the glory* of His grace, of which we are favored recipients in the Beloved.

There is no mention of a throne here; it is the display of God's nature in blessing of the highest order; the throne is not alluded to in this Epistle, any more than in the Epistles of John, where it would be quite out of place: to introduce it, would mar the whole teaching of the Spirit of God in these Epistles.<sup>4</sup>

It is what God is, as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; what He is towards Him as such, as He Himself said, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." The blessing with which He blesses Him as man, not as on the throne, but as "before him in love" in all that flows out as divine, as well as from the name of Father, is unfolded in *the richest way*. God has His nature and character -- relationship as a Father -- quite apart from His formal position as Sovereign sitting on a throne. This is true even of an earthly monarch in relation to his family and household. Does he sit on a throne in his home? Was the Father on it when he "ran and fell on the prodigal's neck and kissed him"? Has Mr. Stuart lost the sense of this and of its blessedness, or what becomes of his statement that "God is ever and always on the throne"?

3. Mr. S. objects (p. 27) but without reason, that he has been misrepresented as saying that this standing is our *highest* blessing, whereas he said, there is none higher than this. But if we put this blessing into one scale and all the rest into the other, and find it equals "*all of them together*," surely in its nature it must be more or higher than any of them taken singly.

4. It is remarkable, indeed, that after the Gospels, the throne occurs *nowhere* in the New Testament except in Hebrews and the Revelation.

We have it added, "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches [not the glory] of his grace"; but this, all-important as it and corresponding with justification (see Rom. 3:24) is here -- the door by which we enter into the heavenly blessings. Are we to say that Christ then has no place as man, but a standing justified before the throne without fear of judgment overtaking Him, excepting of course His place on the throne which is exclusively His own? What is being "in Christ," seated, favored, holy, and without blame, and blessed in Him, if it be not our having His position as man before God, in the precious life which He communicated? And yet we are told that to be "in Christ" is no higher position than this standing before the throne, common to all saints as justified (pages 8, 9).

Mr. Stuart admits "nearness" as proper to our place as sons, and this he also speaks of as relationship rather than standing, to which no objection can be taken; but does sonship give no dignity, or height of position, or rank? Is there no standing arising from relationship? Have not the children of the sovereign a rank and position as such? Are not hereditary honors recognized both in scripture and the world, as well as those conferred for services rendered or the distinguished conduct? "If children," says the apostle, "then heirs, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:17). "I will make him, my firstborn, *higher* than the kings of the earth": as regards ourselves, "Then shall the righteous shine forth *as the sun* in the kingdom of *their Father*" (Matt. 13:43). So exalted is the position in which we are seen as the children of God. Thus what Mr. Stuart speaks of as high, scripture does not so speak of, and those things he weighs in the scale against this standing -- as only equal to it "all together," and therefore, of course, outweighed by it taken singly -- are precisely what scripture does magnify, and exalt as positions of especial honor and high in connection with God, and the dignity He confers, and above all other creatures. That is, Mr. Stuart's weights and measures are not only unknown to scripture, but directly the reverse of it.

This standing before the throne, also, is said to be owing to the value of the sacrifice of Christ; and anything that would give us the value of the position of Christ is excluded in a double way; not only because our being in Christ is denied to be "position," but in the following terms.

Further, the great importance of keeping this clear will be apparent, when it is seen that the making the truth of being *in Christ* to be an essential part of the believer's standing, would be really to *add* something to the value of the atoning sacrifice; namely, our receiving the Holy Ghost to perfect our standing before the throne. For it is by the indwelling of the Spirit that we come to be *in Christ*. Into this we will look presently. Meantime it will be sufficient to say, that in proportion as we add anything to that sacrifice to complete the ground of our standing, we necessarily detract from its value as God has set it forth. People may not be aware of this, yet that is the evil of it (page 12).

Could any system be more effectually devised for keeping us this side of death and resurrection for our place, standing, and position before God? We are told, that to bring our

being in Christ or the reception of the Holy Ghost, into our standing before God, is to add something to the value of the work of Christ or even to detract from its value; a statement not withdrawn but repeated in the second pamphlet (p. 28). This is stated in a very solemn way, and with all the authority of a judge laying down the law, in a case of which he is supreme arbiter.

Mr. Darby thus replies to the same objection as used by Mr. Newton:

There is another point connected with this, that I would not leave untouched; namely, that, making a difference of position in glory is setting aside the value of Christ's blood and *making our place on high depend on something else*. Now I meet this difficulty in the face, and I say there is a difference in glory; and that difference does not depend on the precious blood of Christ; and to say that it does, *takes away* value from that blood. . . . It is quite clear that the saints on earth during the millennium are redeemed by blood, and yet, as to glory, are much farther off than the crowned elders. . . . These differences of dispensation are the displays of God's glory; and therefore of all importance; and most essential, because a positive part of His glory. . . . The more you succeed in *leveling them to one thing*, the more you succeed in stifling divine affections, and active human responsibility -- destroying, as far as may be, divine communion, and frustrating divine grace -- the more the glory and energy of faith is null and hence God's glory in us (*Examination of Mr. Newton's Views*, pp. 32, 33).

But not one particle of scripture does the writer {C. E. S.} give for this astounding assertion, for such it really is. What makes this statement so dangerous and subversive of the truth of God, is that it severs "the indwelling of the Holy Ghost," and our position "in Christ" and all *consequent blessing* from their connection with the work of Christ, and denies their being an expression of its infinite value. How could we be "in Christ," or "receive the Holy Ghost," save by the value of the work of Christ, though as a distinct effect of it, higher and different in its nature from justification (Mr. S.'s standing), and giving a share in heavenly glory, which that does not give us, as we have seen? How can intelligent Christians allow of such statements, which show beyond question that the writer must have lost the heavenly results of the work of Christ and the position He has taken for us, or he could never have penned them. If a monument stands upon marble pillars or columns, how can it detract from their value that there should be a beautiful superstructure, crowned with an exquisite figure? It is just the proof, of the value and excellence of those pillars.

Now if anything has been inculcated and commonly received among us, with incalculable blessing to souls far and wide, it is that scripture teaches exactly the opposite, namely, that the position Christ has taken on high as man, and our place "in Him," are alike by virtue (not only of the excellence of His Person but) of the wonderful work, not only "for us" (Mr. S.'s constant limit of it), but in which He glorified God on the cross. In proof of this, we give some extracts from *Either in Adam or in Christ* {by J. N. Darby}.

The Holy Ghost the Comforter is therefore given us as



soon as Christ went up on high; and thus we know, not only that we are risen with Him, but that we are in Him and He in us. This sets our *standing, and consciously so, through the Holy Ghost in Christ; sitting in heavenly places in Him, accepted in the Beloved* (page 45).

We are *justified* through His *blood*. But there was a *value in Christ's work for God's own glory*, His righteousness, majesty, love, truth, all He is and according to purpose. This *done for us* (good and evil being known) and in the way of redemption, gives us a *righteous and blessed place* in perfect love in the presence of God and our Father, according to a life and nature and in a place which Adam innocent had not at all. Our place in heaven is founded *on the glorifying of God*. Ephesians 1 brings this fully out (pp. 45, 46).

His (the believer's) place before God is in Christ risen, not in Adam in the flesh. But as he is there by the death and resurrection of Christ, he is there according to *the value of what He has there wrought* (page 52).

In this work, wrought by Him as man, He has reestablished the glory of God before the universe, upon a sure and abiding basis; sin being dealt with in a way that all the rights of God, which had been infringed or trespassed on, have been reestablished in the death of that blessed One, and in the depths through which He passed for the glory of God; whose character is displayed in the way He dealt with it, when His Son took it on Himself, as it never otherwise could have been.

All this has given Him a claim on the divine glory, which has now righteously responded in placing Him on the throne of God, and soon will put all things under His feet, giving Him a title over the whole universe, as Head in blessing, for which He thus tasted death, gaining (as man) a title to have all things put under Him (Heb. 2:8). Inasmuch as this was done by Him as man, and for man, as well as for the glory of God, He has also received the title to associate others with Himself, in the position He has taken in life, righteousness, and glory.

The apostle tells us "He who knew no sin was made sin for us, that we might be made [or become] the righteousness of God in him" {2 Cor. 5:21}. Our place before God "in him" is thus distinctly stated to be the result of His having been "made sin *for us*" and is the display of God's righteousness in answer to His work -- not only in giving Him this place in divine righteousness, "Of righteousness because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more" (John 16:10) -- but in making us "the righteousness of God in him." He Himself tells us, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone" (John 12:24). This passage makes our association with Him, as risen, the distinct effect and result of His death, and the presence of the Holy Ghost in and with us, is constantly presented as another blessed consequence <sup>5</sup> of His death, and the title He has to share with us the blessings He

enjoys as man, having the unction of the Holy Ghost for the kingdom; "anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows" (Psa 45:7). It is *the same* oil of gladness in royal and priestly dignity; and He has *His fellows*, who are His companions, and partake with Him the joys and glory of that heavenly scene.

True indeed, that these wondrous results of His blessed work are not the same, as the value of His blood in clearing or justifying, in which all the redeemed participate; but though not the same in breadth or application, they throw in other ways a luster and glory on that work, and in the rights vested in Him as a consequence of it, and show how the eternal counsels of God repose on it for their fulfillment; counsels which existed in the mind of God before the world began and running on into eternal ages, "That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:7). "To him be glory in the church throughout all ages, world without end. Amen" (Eph. 3:21). That man can be in such heights of glory with Christ, linked to Him as His body, is what scripture again speaks of as height; the same power working in us, that has set Christ in this exalted position, giving Him a place over everything created, a place which the body enjoys as complement of the Head, not part of what is put under Him, but as part of Himself and sharing in His supremacy. <sup>6</sup>

Height and depth are also again predicated (Eph. 3:18), as belonging to this position, in which the church is placed with Christ; and not only so, but (Eph. 3:9, 10) as the means by which the most exalted beings are learning the admirable wisdom of God, in a way it never had been and could not be before unfolded, but was the deepest secret of His heart and mind hidden in the counsels of eternity. "That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man. That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, *and depth, and height*; and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye, might be filled with all the fullness of God" (Eph. 3:16-18).

It has been noticed by Mr. Darby, that salvation or

---

6. This also seems to be denied by Mr. Stuart, so far as we can understand from the following passage:

He as Head, because He is the Head, must always have a place and preeminence above those of whom He is the Head, whether it be Head of the race or Head of the body -- "that in all things he might have the preeminence," or first place (Col. 1:8). The body is the body to the Head, but it is not the Head, though it is the fullness, or complement, of Him who fills all in all. So of the race. *They have not the place which the Head has*, as Psalm 8 describes, and Heb. 2:8, and 1 Cor. 15:29 interpret it (*Christian Standing and Condition*, p. 24).

True, but this leaves out Eph. 1:22, and the way it is *there* interpreted.

---

5. See *The Teaching of Scripture on Spiritual Life and the Sealing of the Holy Ghost* (pp. 27-33 {pp. 24b-26, herein}).

justification by blood, that is, clearing away of our responsibilities as fallen creatures, is never spoken of in scripture as the subject of eternal counsel or purpose, as the old Calvinists supposed, but that these are founded on another aspect of the work of Christ, namely, that of the accomplished glory of God, and connected with a special place and glory, given to saints *with Christ*. This is confirmed by another difference observable in scripture, in treating of justification and those who are the subjects of it, and of purpose or blessing “in Christ” and those who are the subjects of it; namely, that the latter is always said to be *before* the foundation of the world, the former, as distinctly to be only *from* that event. And this is so often repeated in speaking of them, as to leave not the shadow of a doubt, that there is a divine meaning and intimation in it. Twice it is recorded of those who do not wonder at and will not worship the beast, that they are “written in the book of life”: the words of “the slain Lamb” are added in one instance, clearly denoting justification by His blood; but it is “*from the foundation of the world*” (Rev. 13:8; 17:8). These, moreover, are a special class who suffer for their faithfulness, and even have a share in the heavenly part of the kingdom (Matt. 24). Those also distinguished as the sheep in Matt. 25 are called to inherit the blessings of the earthly kingdom, but this also is “prepared for them *from the foundation of the world*.” Of those who are associated with Christ, on the contrary, it is said, they are “chosen in Him *before* the foundation of the world,” and His purpose and grace were “given us in Christ Jesus *before* the world began,” for we are predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He may be the Firstborn among many brethren (Eph. 1:4, 5, 11; 3:11; 2 Tim. 1:9; Rom. 8:29, 30). Now this purpose, involving conformity to Christ in glory, who

was the object of the Father’s love and delight before the world was, dates not from time, as with those who are only justified (“no higher blessing, as we are told”), but before time, and all that relates to it existed. For in eternity these special counsels of love were planned {so to speak}.

What affection and adoration should the thought of such grace awaken in our hearts, and what lowliness and self-renunciation, it should produce likewise. This is always the effect of nearness to God.

The more Thy glories strike mine eyes  
The lower I shall lie;  
Thus whilst I sink, my joy shall rise  
Immeasurably high.

The elders, quitting their thrones, take off their crowns, and cast them before the throne, whilst they prostrate themselves before Him who sits upon it; for the more they are honored, the more they delight to exalt Him who has conferred so much upon them, and to attribute all to Him and to His sovereign grace, in the sense of their nothingness and unworthiness. To bring souls, therefore, more into the consciousness of the presence of God and nearness to Him, is the way to produce true lowliness and self-emptiness with real self-judgment. Man seeks to effect all this in his own way; a Calvinist, by his ideas about the throne; the Arminian, fearing to rely upon grace, by retaining souls under the law. Both alike, as with this system, keep them in the place of distance, and hinder the glory of God in His saints, and the results which flow, both from the affections being engaged and the sense of responsibility, which is deepened according to the blessing conferred and the love displayed in it.

## Chapter 3

### *Standing and Position before God and Acceptance*

The right use of the word *standing* has to be examined. As a substantive (standing) it does not exist in the New Testament; as a verb, to stand (ἵστημι), it is frequently found, but never is it applied to ourselves, in the sense so often repeated by Mr. Stuart. Not only the idea of our standing before the throne is wanting, but the application of it to *our* justification, has no foundation in the word of God. We may have so used it, perhaps all have done so harmlessly in times past; but when it is attempted to construct a system of doctrine, out of a conventional meaning attached to a word, of a character injurious to the souls of saints, it becomes necessary to examine if scripture warrants such a use of the term, or whether it is merely human. With such a system of doctrine, so carefully and elaborately built, and stated so repeatedly, and with such positiveness and authority, as exclusively apostolic teaching, on the subject of "standing," we should have expected to find not a few clear definite statements of the word of God for its foundation. But all that Mr. Stuart can bring forward in support of a theory, of such moment as regards the truth, is one passage which he repeats in innumerable instances, but which, when carefully examined, as will appear, gives not the very slightest support to his cause.<sup>7</sup>

Before turning to Rom. 5, we shall cite other passages, where the word occurs as a verb. "Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou *standest* by faith" (Rom. 11:20). "Yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him *stand*" (Rom. 14:4). "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also you

have received, and wherein ye stand" (1 Cor. 15:1). "For by faith ye *stand*" (2 Cor. 1:24). "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to *stand* against the wiles of the devil." "Take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to *stand*, *Stand* therefore" (Eph. 6:11, 13, 14). "That ye may *stand* perfect and complete in all the will of God" (Col. 4:12). "Exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein we *stand*" (1 Peter 5:12). In all these passages there is no question of justification, nor of standing before the throne, but of the soul's adherence to, or stay upon the truth, or firmness in its position, or in conflict here in the world, or with Satan. We are looked at as believers, who stand in the revealed truth of the gospel, or by faith, or in grace, or as soldiers exposed to the attacks of evil, and having to hold our ground and to rest firmly upon the grace of God. Even of Satan, the Lord says, "He *stood* (ἵστηκεν) not in the truth" (John 8:44).

In the passage in 1 Peter 5, after speaking of the God all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, the apostle adds, "*This* is the true grace of God wherein ye stand"; for grace and peace flow to us, as we are constantly reminded, from God the Father, here moreover called "*The God of all grace*." It is in "*this*" grace the apostle calls upon us to stand, for it is what God is towards us, in His own blessed character till we reach the glory, and here there is no question of justification, but firmness in "*this* grace" is what alone enables us to stand. Does Rom. 5 differ from this, and from all other passages, in which the word to stand is used? By no means; it corresponds, as we shall find, with them all. "By whom also, we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Not only may it be questioned from the use of the same word in 1 Peter 5, whether "*this* grace" refers to something before, but the word "*also*" appears to specify something additional. The apostle is speaking, not, merely of grace that saves, but besides our other blessings, we enter by faith into this grace in which we have firm and constant repose, for it invariably flows out from God, and is exercised towards us, whatever the weakness, which constantly calls for its display, till glory be reached, for God gives grace and glory. Had this verse occurred in Romans 3, there might have been more reason for Mr. Stuart's asserting that our justification is intended by it, but coming as it does, after the

7. The misuse which has been made of the word "standing," has been very clearly pointed out in a letter, which having been much circulated in MS, we venture to quote. It came to hand since the above was written. Mr. S. {Stuart}:

confounds "standing" with a standing-place, and he assumes fitness is synonymous with standing, and that the highest position is before the throne. . . . This amounts to forgiveness and justification, and involves reconciliation. I underline title and ability, but neither nor both give standing. A page or prince may stand before the throne of our queen, but though having the same standing-place they have not the same standing. Both have title and ability to stand there, but the prince may be a son, and the page a servant in the household. . . . God is said to stand in the congregation of the mighty (Psa. 82), but that is not God's standing. It is far higher. Christ is said to stand at the door of Laodicea, but that is not His standing. So the dead, small and great, are said to stand before God, but that is not their standing. It is not words, but things we have to do with. In Rom. 5:2 we stand in grace. So in 1 Peter 5:12.

close of Romans 4, there is not the smallest ground for it. The apostle has got quite upon another part of divine truth -- the blessed force of the resurrection, as the witness how God is for us, and has acted for us in power, in raising Christ, after all question of sin and its judgment is passed, so that we are not here called upon to believe in Jesus or the blood, as in Rom. 3:26, but in God, "who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered for our offences and was *raised again for our justification*." Resurrection always brings us into a new region, and we can rejoice in the hope of the glory of God.

This is a distinct advance upon Rom. 3, and differs from it, as much as the position of the children of Israel in Egypt, sheltered by the blood on the door-post, did from that they occupied, when they raised their song of triumph on the other side of the Red Sea {Ex. 15}, in which God had taken their part, bringing them through it as on dry land, and Himself overthrowing all their enemies. For the Red Sea typifies, as is well known, the death and resurrection of Christ for us, in its blessed effect before God. This force of the resurrection of Christ, is constantly omitted by Mr. Stuart, indeed it is not consistent with his thought of standing before the throne without judgment overtaking the saint. Hence, when Mr. Stoney refers to acceptance in Christ, Mr. Stuart invariably returns to the acceptance of Christ's sacrifice, limiting to this our acceptance as well as our standing.

. . . We are accepted by virtue of His sacrifice" (page 19).

Souls are accepted on the ground of, and when identified with, the accepted sacrifice . . . My standing before God's throne, as accepted before Him, does not rest on my being in Christ, but on God's acceptance of His sacrifice on my behalf (*Is it the truth of the Gospel?* p. 35).

Mr. Stoney tells us, that he, as a believer, is placed by Christ in the same acceptance as Himself. Is not the acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ as our sacrifice the measure of every Christian's acceptance! Mr. Stoney tries to make a distinction *where there is no difference* (page 15).

Acceptance in Him is not scripture in Ephesians 1:6; nor does the word that I remember *ever so speak of acceptance* (*Answers to Inquiries*).

The sacrifice, blessed as it is, by no means gives what is found in Christ's resurrection, for it always supposes the man who is identified with it, to be alive in the flesh, whereas the resurrection, founded as it ever is on the value of this sacrifice, shows us Christ accepted *for us*, where sin never has existed and never can be found, in the infinite, eternal favor which that act of God displays, and in victory over death, the first-fruits in that new life of those that are His, and to be conformed to Him in glory. Hence, after the Passover (figure of justification and redemption by the sacrifice of Christ), in Lev. 23, we have the wave sheaf, which was to be waved by *the priest* "before the Lord" on the morrow after the Sabbath, "*to be accepted for you*." It is Christ as the risen Man before God accepted for us eternally, the offering being waved to show the delight of God, to have Him before Himself in resurrection; whilst the

meat-offering and the burnt-offering which accompanied the wave sheaf, tell us that He carries there all that was precious and acceptable in His life and death, "to be accepted for us."

In the mitre also of the High Priest (Ex. 28:36, 39), which he wore upon his forehead, with the face of blue, and the golden plate, with "holiness to the Lord" engraven on it, we learn how Christ bears the iniquity of our holy things now that He is exalted on high. This holiness is based upon divine righteousness (the golden plate), and connected with what is heavenly (the lace of blue). It was to be "always upon Aaron's forehead," that the children of Israel "*might be accepted before the Lord*." Thus, again, we have our acceptance secured in the Person of Christ in heaven, for it is there He exercises His priesthood. "For Christ is not entered into the 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" (Heb. 9:24). The Old Testament scriptures therefore connect our acceptance: first, with the burnt-offering (Lev. 1:4); secondly, with the wave sheaf; and, thirdly, with the position and office of the High Priest.

The fact is that acceptance is not taught, as a doctrine, in the New Testament, though many passages blessedly involve the truth of it. The same expression used of the Virgin Mary, "hail, thou that art *highly favored*," or much graced, translated by some, graciously accepted, is used concerning the saints in Eph. 1:6, much graced or favored<sup>8</sup> in the Beloved. This is not a doctrinal statement of it, but certainly implies that the person is accepted, who is so favored. So also when it is said that "as Christ is so are we in this world," this certainly includes the acceptance that He has; or, if we are "complete in him," we have everything in Him as to nearness to God -- position and favor -- that we could desire.

Sacrifice never goes so far as the death of the individual who offers it, whilst owning that he had incurred and deserved death, the life of the victim being substituted in his stead; this supposes him always to be a man living still in the flesh, for he lays his hand on the head of the victim which takes his place and is available for him, either in judgment or acceptance; but as the sacrifice never lives again, it cannot carry the offerer into resurrection, even in figure, nor bring in new creation. Israel will be accepted on this ground, as we see from Lev. 9, where the sin-offering, burnt-offering, and peace-offering, being offered for them, the glory appeared to them, but they have no place *in* the glory as we have, nor in Christ either, though blessed by Him as King

8. We give Mr. Darby's note on this passage:

ἐχαρίτωσεν, "taken us into his favor," "put us into a position of grace and favor." "Accepted us" is too formal a doctrine here, not so general as χαρίτω. But "shown us grace or favor" does not give the force of the word. 'In the Beloved' is then merely in an instrument; whereas it is in the Beloved that we enter into favor. If we accept ἡς, which seems to be the best attested reading, we should say "the favor or acceptance in grace, which he has freely bestowed upon us": χαρίτωσ ἡς (by attraction for ἡν) ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς. T. R. and Tisch. (7th ed. not 8th) read ἐν ἡ.

and Priest, when He comes out (ver. 23) in glory, the whole scene being typical of their future acceptance. This necessarily leaves creature position still existent, for the man as such still exists, though his responsibility may be met by the sacrifice. Hence Mr. S. does not see *creature* responsibility to be ended. "We are, and shall be whilst on earth, responsible *creatures* as regards walk and service, and we do well to remember this" (*Is it the Truth? &c.*, p. 20). For our freedom can only be realized when our position in Christ is apprehended. It is then, our new and higher responsibilities as in Christ, or as sons, commence; but these are founded on privilege, and are of an entirely different nature, for our responsibilities as creatures are held under the law and its requirements, but those which belong to us as in Christ throw us back upon what He is, and not what we are at all.

The statement is made that the

real standing of the people of Israel, as Lev. 16 portrays in type, was on blood-besprinkled ground *before the mercy-seat*, which was in the holiest of all. Now that is really where every individual Christian stands, formerly typically set forth, now fully declared. For what was true of them *nationally* is true of saints now individually. Much, of course, we have, which they had not. But if the teaching of Lev. 16, distinctly referred to in Heb. 9 and 10, is to instruct us, the standing *for all saints* before God's throne rests solely on the sacrifice of Christ" (page 16).

This is another instance of how scripture is strained to support a theory. "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the veil, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat. And he shall make an atonement *for the holy place*, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins, and so shall he do for *the tabernacle of the congregation that remaineth among them, in the midst of their uncleanness*. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement *for the holy place*, until he come out and have made an atonement for *himself* and for his *household*, and for *all the children of Israel*" (Lev. 16:15-17). It does not portray their standing nor anything of the kind, for they could not stand there at all, either "nationally" or individually, but it shows how God as a holy God could dwell in the midst of Israel, though He did not allow their approach beyond *the door* of the tabernacle, when He was not manifested, but hidden behind the veil.

Whilst we learn from Rom. 3 that God declares, now that the type *has been fulfilled*, in the blood being on the mercy-seat, how His own character has been justified and displayed in His dealings with sin, and not merely that of Israel, but of Old Testament saints since the fall -- that says nothing of their standing whatever, but shows the ground on which *He* could act toward them. This appears even more distinctly on referring to Ezek. 45:17-20, where the future reconciliation of Israel and of the sanctuary is given, by means of the same sacrifices; yet the blood is not brought into the holiest for them at all, but put upon the altar of burnt

offering and the posts of the house and of the court. The gold has been replaced by brass or wood (Ezek. 41:22). The ark, with the mercy-seat on it, has disappeared (Jer. 3:16, 17), and the most holy place is shut up with doors (Ezek. 41:1-4). So that this use of the blood-sprinkled mercy-seat as conveying "the real standing of all saints," as if all were upon one level, has no foundation whatever. As priests ourselves, we are looked upon as risen. The frequent repetition of the words "*with him*" (Lev. 8:20; Rev. 20:4, 6), shows how we are associated "*with Christ*," whether in His present priestly position within the veil, or in His manifestation in the future as Melchizedek, King and Priest, in public glory.

We have, strange to say, statements of Mr. Darby's brought forward referring to the blood put on the mercy-seat and its effect in display of the glory of God, and in bringing the saints of *this dispensation* into the holiest, as if this were the same as the ordinary justification of all saints, and rendered their standing identical. To mark in italics, the words which show the contrast, will be sufficient.

The bullock, whose blood was employed as one of them (referring to the goat's), is lost and set aside by Dr. W, and the *bringing us to God in the holiest* (not *merely clearing the world*) dropped -- the HIGHEST and ESPECIAL blessing of the saint; and this done, *not by forgiving His people*, but by presentation of the blood to God, by whom the excellency of this sacrifice in which He has been glorified in respect, yea, through the very means, of sin, is justly estimated (*Bible Witness and Review*, vol. 2, p. 22).

Again Mr. S. says:

The blood of the bullock and that of the goat were treated in the same way, and sprinkled on the same places, so the standing of Aaron and his house, typical of Christians, *and that of Israel was the same* . . . Hence all saints stand before God's throne on precisely the same ground.

Again Mr. Darby writes:

Finally, *the people were not represented* in the blood on the mercy-seat and holy place; their sins gave occasion to its being done, but the cleansing was of *God's dwelling-place*, that that should be fit for Him, and what He was, perfectly glorified by Christ's death -- to be ever before Him as eternal redemption (*Words of Faith*, 1884, p. 224).

In reality, if we use the word "standing" where scripture does not, and where its use is partly misleading, as a mere human notion always is, there can be no doubt that their national standing, or justification, dated, not at all from the day of atonement, but, as has been observed, from the blood of the paschal lamb put on the door-post, whilst they were yet in Egypt. After this, God could look on them as His *redeemed* people and go along with them in the pillar of cloud.



## Chapter 4

### *Headship of Race; Its Nature and Extent*

The second leading subject in *Christian Standing and Condition* is -- Headship of Race, and this which principally occupies the latter half of the tract, is thus presented:

It is a condition of saints that they are in Christ and Christ in them. And this is made the more apparent when we remember that, "in Christ," is used in contrast to being in Adam, the two heads of races under which those belonging to each are ranged" (p. 18).

Being in Christ and our being joined to Him, members of His body, are shown to be distinct by the use of the term "Christ's" when speaking of the former, and "the Christ" when speaking of the latter (p. 15).

Is not the truth of being in Christ sometimes, if not often, confounded with another truth -- the being united to Christ as members of His body? (p. 30).

We could not be in Christ without being there (in the heavenlies), for He is there. But, as members of His body, we are viewed now as being on earth, not in heaven, though united to the Head who is in heaven (p. 16).

It will be seen, that if the teaching of the tract, on the subject of our standing, lowers us to the level of the millennial position, Mr. Stuart's treatment of what he describes as our *condition* in Christ has just the same effect. He knows nothing, as his statements tell us, of our being in Christ, beyond Headship of race, for to this he limits the expression "in Christ," and he will not admit that it has any application to Christ's Headship of His body, the church.

I believe "in Christ" always speaks of race and Headship of race, never of the body (*Extract of letter from C. E. S. to D. S.*)

The consequence of this is that we have no present title or place in the heavenlies at all, for Headship of race could never put us there, and the disastrous effect of this view is clearly discernible, throughout the whole of the pamphlet. According to the result of Mr. Stuart's teaching, we have *now* neither heavenly standing, nor heavenly position of any kind.

Headship of race which is unfolded in Rom. 5, is the widest and most general term used in scripture, denoting connection, either with Adam or with Christ. It involves the unity of the human family, the members of which are of the same sort or kind, for "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth." Adam is thus presented as "*the figure of him that was to come*," affecting the condition of those connected with him

by an act exclusively his own, and hence becoming a fountain of death and ruin to his race (Rom. 5:12-14). Christ also, by His "one act of righteousness," is the author of life and righteousness to the many who come under Him as Head. It is descent or derivation that is in question, and the Head stands as the responsible representative of the race. "By one man" is used in contrast with the individual acts of each. This headship involves sin and death on the one hand, or grace reigning through righteousness and life on the other, the same position, in these respects, but not necessarily the same external condition; and more extensive effects follow which appear to go beyond, in their aspect or results, the race ranked under the Head (Rom. 5:17, 18). "He shall see his seed," and "He shall see the travail of his soul," is said of Christ in the millennium, but the millennial saints are not in the same glory with Christ. A man may sit in the House of Commons, but his children do not sit there with him, nor in him either, nor do those whom he represents in parliament; nor can a man be said, at least after he is born, to be in any sense in his father, though he has derived natural life from him. Hence the preposition *in* [ἐν] is never used, nor *with* [σύν] in Rom. 5, but always *through* [διὰ]. In Rom. 6 we have association with Christ, starting with being *identified with* Him in His death and burial (Rom. 6:4-8) and in life, "alive unto God in Christ Jesus risen" (Rom. 6:11, 23), which puts us on wholly other ground, and that which is distinctively Christian. The only passage which appears at first sight an exception to this, namely, 1 Cor. 15:22, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive" -- is not really so. For the preposition [ἐν] is constantly used for by. "By [ἐν] whom also he made the worlds." "By [ἐν] him all things consist," or to give Mr. Stuart's own translation of the word in another place, "The phrase means by, or in virtue of, the one . . . and by, or in virtue of the other."

Indeed, it appears to include the resurrection of the wicked also by the power of Christ, for in the preceding verse we have, "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead," {1 Cor. 15:21} that is, of *dead persons*; not the resurrection *from among the dead*, which is the way in which the resurrection of saints is invariably spoken of. The construction of the sentence also supports this thought; it is not all in Adam die and all in Christ shall be made alive, but "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive"; and the context shows the power of Christ running on in its display to the final overthrow of death, in the raising of the wicked out of it. (Compare vs.

25,

26, and Rev. 20:13). This would give the passage a range far beyond headship of race, extending the rights of Christ over all, and even death itself and the grave, by virtue of His having submitted to them as man, for the glory of God.

But if being in Christ involves our receiving the Holy Ghost, as Mr. Stuart says, that of itself shows that headship of race is a totally different thing, for the presence of the Holy Ghost is a glorious result of Christ's being on high, and of His own title as ascended there, whilst the connection of headship of race is through representation or impartation of life, and there is not an allusion to the special presence of the Holy Ghost to be found in connection with it. It is the Holy Ghost who brings us into all the special privileges belonging to this dispensation, for "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" {1 Cor. 6:17}.

Headship of race indeed includes all who are saved, Jews and Gentiles in the millennium, who certainly are "not in Christ" -- or the national distinctions, any more than those of male and female, or any other differences *in the flesh* could not exist. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither *Jew* nor *Greek*, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male

nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3:27, 28). "Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3:11; contrast Ezek. 44:9; Zech. 8:23). Nowhere do we find such a term {i.e., in Christ} used with reference to millennial saints, for the seed of Israel will regain their ancient preeminence above the Gentiles, as the prophets and the Psalms everywhere tell us. But the serious nature of this statement that we are in Christ only as Head of the race, becomes apparent when we remember, that if true, it would put all the millennial saints into heavenly glory as well as ourselves, whilst we shall be reigning over them, and they the subjects governed; we, in glorified bodies, with Christ and like Christ, they earthly, and suited to the earth in its new condition of blessing, as reigned over by Christ and His saints.

What confusion does the human mind introduce into scripture by the special pretension to accuracy of thought, and in seeking to make scripture bend to a scheme of its own, instead of bowing to its teaching in the sense of its own incompetency.



## Chapter 5

### What is Being “in Christ”? The New Man

In scripture, the term “in Christ” in its full signification as regards saints, is used in a double way.

First, as regards our position and condition in Christ, the risen Man, Firstborn from the dead, the beginning of the creation of God.

Secondly, as Head of His body, the church. And both these uses or significations put us into heaven in title and enjoyment, and give us our present place of privilege before God.

The first looks at us as individuals, in a common life by the Spirit, though associated with others; the second as in a corporate condition, and linked to the Head; the first is specifically the new man, and dates from the resurrection morning, when Christ appeared in the midst of His disciples, and breathed on them, communicating His own risen life in the Holy Ghost {John 20:22}. This was not conversion or the new nature, which they were partakers of already; nor was it union by the Holy Ghost in one body, but Christ as the risen corn of wheat {John 12:24}, bringing them into all that in which He then stood, as man before God and as Son of the Father, the Firstborn among many brethren. It is evident that when He says, “My God and your God” {John 20:17}, He speaks as man, and gives them the same place which He has in righteousness, life and blessing in the presence of God, and in nearness to Him; and though the Holy Ghost had to be given as power {Luke 24:49; Acts 2}, and in distinct personality, in order to bring out this place of privilege in its distinctness and fullness, yet it is important to see that this new and risen life and new creation-place date from this point, or the new man will not be clearly apprehended, nor the privileges connected with it, and in association with Christ as the risen corn of wheat either.

This figure {John 12:24} evidently represents Christ as man, including within Himself in resurrection, those that are so linked with Him in this new life. He had said, “Yet a little while and the world seeth me no more, but ye see me; because I live ye shall live also,” which is an evident indication this new character of life would be in an abiding connection with Himself, flowing from, and continuous with, His own. This He now fulfils. Of all the actions of our blessed Lord, when manifest here in flesh, this seems to be the most precious, tender, and significant. He had often touched them before (Matt. 14:31; 17:7; 1 John 1:1), and John had even rested in His bosom, but never had there been anything so sweet and tender as this breathing into them (ἐνεφυσῆσθαι) {John 20:22}, and giving His own life in the

power of the Holy Ghost, as the “Spirit of life in Christ Jesus” {Rom. 8:2}. Only in this way could we be “in Him and He in us,” and share His thoughts and feelings in the sympathy of a common life, enjoying thus what *He is*, and having the capacity also for enjoying what *He enjoys*, in a way that far surpasses the nearest of human ties, relationships, or kindred nature. But for this, even the full blessedness of the words “My Father and your Father, my God and your God” {John 20:17}, would not be fully understood or realized. If these words convey a sense of heavenly title, and of the intimacy of His relationship with the Father, this act introduces into the depth and reality of the whole, in a way which could not otherwise have been known. “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.” “In that day” they were to *know* that Jesus was, as the Son, in the Father, and not only that, but their own nearness also, “ye in me and I in you.” This corresponds with the “opened understanding” (“the mind of Christ,” though not power of testimony), described in Luke 24:36-40, evidently the same scene. In the Epistle to the Colossians also, as has been noticed, we have much more of the life of Christ developed, than of the distinct power and presence of the Spirit as in Ephesians, though as here we learn from the words, “your love in the Spirit,” that the Spirit of Christ is necessary to the activity of this life in us, which is really Christ, for “Christ is all and in all.”

In this we see what *partly accounts* for the defectiveness of Mr. Stuart's system. If Mr. Grant can see nothing given to the disciples personally when the Lord “breathes on them, and says, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,” {John 20:22} but only their public commission; Mr. Stuart only perceives here the ecclesiastical or collective position assigned to them, and nothing individual. Now we do not question that both these are included in this scene, and that the blessed act of Christ here described, whilst emphatically though not exclusively individual, characterizes along with His presence the whole scene, confirming also the message sent by Mary Magdalene which gathered His disciples together. Mr. Stuart's words, showing all that he apprehends in it, are as follows:

The breathing on the disciples in John 20 was, I believe, to give them His Spirit *to act for Him during His absence*, as He immediately says, “Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted,” &c. This gift the saints *collectively* share in still, and it is their authority for receiving into their midst. But it was not the giving them the gift of the Holy Ghost (see Acts 1:4). This last is given to each *individually*. God gives it. The power was bestowed on them *collectively*, *to act for*

*Him in His absence (Some Answers to Inquiries, Feb. 24th, 1885).*

With these views it is easy to see how impossible it is for Mr. Stuart to understand what the new man really is, or being in Christ either, which he connects only with the descent of the Holy Ghost. As an illustration of this, he seems quite unable to comprehend what Mr. Stoney means when he distinguishes the old man from the old nature, the new man from the new nature. We cite his words:

I have spoken of the need of keeping truths distinct, else confusion will arise. An instance of this is furnished us in the statement, "hence every believer who never had any *locus standi* in the old man." The *old* man, if scripture terms are to be used in a scriptural sense, is *in* us all, whether believer or not. It is our evil nature. We have not, nor could we, nor could any child of Adam, have a *locus standi* in the old man, nor be in the old man, for it is *inside of us* (p. 33).

Now a confusion is evident here between *the new man* created after God, which is *the new nature in us*, and new creation, which as in Christ, all believers are (p. 53).

The confusion here is in the mind of the objector, rather than in the one he corrects, for whilst he says that scripture terms are to be used in a scriptural sense, it will be seen that scripture *never* speaks in this way. Neither the old man nor the new man are ever said to be "*in us*"; the flesh is, but these terms, the old man and the new man, are always used in a general abstract sense, the old man as *put off*, and the new man as *put on*, by the believer in Christ. It is in this way exclusively that the word of God uses the term, "Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col. 3:9, 10). On this Mr. Stuart remarks:

Speaking of the truth connected with practice, saints are viewed as having put off (like a garment) the old man and having put on (as a garment) the new. This, of course, is descriptive of what our life and habits as Christians should display -- true Christian profession -- a different thought from that which Mr. Stoney expresses (p. 46).

You put off or put on a garment, and it is the same with the old and the new man, as Mr. S. justly says, yet you cannot have a garment inside of you; moreover, it is looked upon as a whole, a completed act, and as done for us in Christ. It is not merely "descriptive of what our life and habits as Christians should display, true Christian profession," words which again betoken the defectiveness of Mr. S.'s view, but far more, what has taken place before God in the death and resurrection of Christ, and our identification with Him in all this. It is when this has been realized in the soul, that Christian practice alone can follow, and it is on this the apostle founds, that which should be displayed in the Christian's life, who has to put off in detail what is inconsistent with the new man as seen in Christ, and to put on all that He manifested (Col. 3:8-12).

In page 7, Mr. S. insists:

That if *the new man* is not implied in the Romans, believers in the Lord Jesus Christ are not viewed as having *a new nature* at all, that is, that they are not viewed as born of God. . . . The new birth, on which the Lord insisted, must be a mistake; [and] We are shut up to these, must we not call them monstrous conclusions? if it be an error to teach that the new man is not implied in Romans.

We are not shut up to any such monstrous conclusions, for *the new man* did not exist when the Lord spoke of the necessity of the new birth. When it is said that no passage of scripture can be found which speaks of the new man being in us, it may perhaps be replied that Christ is emphatically the new man, and He is in us; the reply is obvious that the abstract idea of the new man is dropped when Christ is said to be in us, and what is personal in Christ Himself introduced.

This new man "in Christ" is variously represented. Sometimes it is viewed as giving us a new standing or position before God, as freed from all condemnation in Christ who is risen, after having borne, not only all our sins, but the judgment of sin in our nature, as in Rom. 8:1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." Sometimes it is looked at according to the blessed place of righteousness, life, and glory, which Christ now occupies, for we are "made the righteousness of God in him" (2 Cor. 5:21). In the Epistle to the Philippians -- which adds the actual conformity to Christ in glory, and makes the whole future, looking at us as here on earth until Christ comes, and salvation, righteousness, and glory, as all realized then -- it is to be found "in Christ," "having the righteousness of God," that is the object of the apostle's desire, and to gain "the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." This is that for which he regards all besides as worthless, for which he was apprehended of Christ Jesus. How inconsistent is this with the idea of seeking to attain to a place, in a race composed of all the redeemed, many of whom have only an earthly portion given by God to them. It involves a height so magnificent, a glory so exalted, a heavenly position so blessed, that he looked on earthly things as unworthy of a thought, and could only weep when he thought of such low things, occupying the minds of heavenly saints. When he relates what he saw of the blessings belonging to "a man in Christ" (2 Cor. 12:2), of which he was the witness and sample, as translated into *the third heaven*, he could only "glory" in the title and privileges which are attached to such an one. Again, he speaks of it as new creation, and that he only knows Christ now in these new and wondrous associations {2 Cor. 5:16, 17}; showing us distinctly the estimate he formed of the new and heavenly place that belonged to man, which Christ had now taken, not according to the place man once had on earth, but according to what Christ Himself is entitled to, and claims for us also, as the result of the work accomplished by Him on earth on our behalf. Thus, in John 17, after speaking of His work as finished, He says, "Father, *I will* that they also whom thou hast given me, be *with me where I am*."

In Eph. 1, being in Christ gives us, not righteousness and what is connected with it, but all the sweetness and depth of blessing bestowed on us, according to God's delight in Christ Himself, and our being before Him in love, holy and without blame. In *Notes and Comments on Scripture*, part 6, pp. 215-217, Mr. Darby thus puts it:

Salvation is essentially *in resurrection* -- of course, through Christ's death; no doubt, as regards the counsels of God, the raised are put in heavenly places, but resurrection is the new estate. He "hath quickened us together with him, by grace ye are saved"; then comes the fruit and accomplishment of counsels (Eph. 2). So in Romans we have justifying *and presenting in righteousness to God*. And the Lord could say, "I go to my Father and your Father, my God and your God." The counsels of God set us *individually* in heavenly places, and *besides that*, as members of the body of Christ; and Jew and Gentile are raised up together, so as, *de facto*, to involve the unity of the body (p. 216).

Hence, Christ's resurrection issues in *justification of life* in Romans, and quickening with Christ in Colossians and Ephesians; and resurrection *with Him* in Colossians involves, as part of that same plan and work, our *being blessed in heavenly places, and the body of Christ*.

But resurrection, after the effectual death of Christ, clears us, and puts us in a new place in a new life. It saves us. We have died to sin, and are alive to God . . . The συνεζωοποίησε (quickened together with) involves our being in the same glory further on.

The scripture last quoted shows that it is our position as saints, that is unequivocally in question. "*Before him*" is as certainly "position," as "seated in heavenly places." In the Gospel and Epistles of John, we have rather another aspect of this blessed truth; it is life and nature, and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in connection with life. "One as we," "One in us." "We are in him that is true, in his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 5:20); and again, "Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us because he hath given us of his Spirit." Now we are far from saying that Mr. Stuart denies all this, but his system is inconsistent with it, and practically excludes it. The making "in Christ" to be Headship of race, lowers it to the level which that admits of; it can rise no higher, and all that is precious in it is thus lost. Then we have the refusal to allow, that "in Christ" means position; it is only condition, and the new nature is confused with the new man; so much so, that Mr. Stoney having said that the new man is not found in Romans (?), is charged by Mr. Stuart with implying that it is the old nature which produces fruit for God.

If *the new man* is not implied in Romans, man in nature, then, can produce fruit well pleasing to God. So the ruin of man by the fall in that case is a myth, and the necessity for the new birth is all a mistake" (p. 59).

What are we to understand by "the complete newness of the man introduced by the Lord Jesus Christ? . . . If it means the *new man in the believer*, I am not aware that the Lord introduced that, though only in life *on earth*, have we the perfect manifestation of it (p. 18).

The Lord *did not bear the judgment of a nature*, but the judgment due to individuals. All those whose judgment He bore, will undoubtedly be saved. It will be joy indeed, when we are for ever freed from the presence of

sin within us -- the old man. It would subvert Christianity to teach that the old nature has been atoned for; we should never be freed from it then (p. 23).

Mr. Stoney writes, "It is a denial of the work of Christ, as to the annulling of the old man, to allege that we could be justified and retain it." It would be a denial of the truth of God's word, and of fact, and certainly a misconception of a very important section of the Gospel in the Romans, to teach that we have *got rid of the old man* (p. 37).

. . . Has not the man of Rom. 7 the new nature? Unquestionably. And this Mr. Stoney admits (see p. 49), where he calls it the divine nature (p. 58).

Mr. Stuart's system in all this is diametrically opposed to what most of us have learned from the word of God; so much so, that he cannot even comprehend that our Lord on the cross "bore the judgment of a nature," or "terminated the old man, *judicially or otherwise*," still less "the complete newness of the man introduced by the Lord Jesus." He inquires "if it means the new man in the believer," &c. He will not have a standing in the old man, nor in the new, nor position either, nor that the old man is "got rid of" in any sense.

What, then, is the meaning of our old man having been *crucified with Christ* {Rom. 6:6; Gal. 2:20}? If it was nailed to the cross, identified with Him there (and the Holy Ghost, by the apostle, so states it), and Christ has died, was buried, and is risen, surely *it was* judicially terminated. Certainly death brought it to its end in the cross of Christ; it cannot rise again out of His grave. So God regards it, and faith takes the same estimate of it as God does, and rejoices to do so. How many a believer has found freedom and liberty of soul in this very fact, denied by Mr. S.! No doubt, the flesh, or the old nature is in us, and practically we all have to watch against it, as every Christian knows; but scripture does speak of the nature being judged in the cross, for if the "old man" "is crucified," surely that is its judgment, and sin in the flesh has been condemned {Rom. 8:3}, that is, dealt with judicially -- not in our persons, but in the death of the Son of God. If we do not keep that in view -- as the place where its character was shown, and what was due to it, and God's own dealing with it, and making a full end of it there (where, so to speak, the battle was fought on our behalf), we shall never be free, for the battleground is transferred to the place of weakness and defeat, our own hearts or experience. This is not denying that evil has to be resisted within, but the power of God is seen, as for us, in the cross, even when dealing with sin in the flesh to the uttermost. It has had its full sentence, not only passed, but *executed* upon it there, and this apart from ourselves and our own efforts, and *therefore* the practical means of deliverance. "I am crucified with Christ," says the apostle, "nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20). Where else but in the cross has the "I" been judged, or "crucified," the old man been put off {Col. 3:9, 10; Eph. 4:22}, and, if put off, left, so to speak, in the grave of Christ? "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ" (Gal. 4:27); for baptism is death, and in it we are risen with Christ, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from

the dead; and so have put on Christ; and again, “*Putting off* the body of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ,” which is effected in His death (Col. 4:11, 12).

We have a remarkable figure of this judgment, both of the person and the nature, in the association of the stones taken out of Jordan, placed at Gilgal, with the circumcision of the people. These stones were set up by Joshua, *both in Jordan* and at Gilgal; the twelve stones evidently represented Israel, for their death and resurrection could only be in figure, but having passed through Jordan -- which was death -- they set up the witness of this at Gilgal, where they were circumcised, as having *put off* the body of the flesh, which, as we have seen, was judged on the cross, and annulled there for faith. Hence they always returned to Gilgal after their victories, and there the reproach of Egypt was rolled away. In the sight of God the flesh is gone, and only Christ is seen, otherwise the soul would never be clear from the distress produced by its actual presence, and the consciousness of what it is -- enmity against God {Rom. 8:7}. How, otherwise, could it be free from the responsibilities flowing from its existence in the flesh, or at liberty before God, if the old man were not “judicially terminated” in the cross, and so “put off”? We are not only dead, but buried also (Rom. 6; Col. 2), to show the end of the old man, and of all that we are by nature, that the body of sin {Rom. 6:6; cp. Col. 2:11}, that is, sin as a whole, might be brought to nought, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

But all this, (says Mr. S.) is spoken of Christians, not of their evil nature, which is anything but terminated, judicially or otherwise. We *are to be* dead to it, precisely because it is not dead. Now it is very important, if we are to be clear on such points, to keep distinct in our minds the difference between *person* and *nature*. Statements are made at times, as if the old man, our evil nature, derived from Adam by the fall, is dead and gone (p. 37).

Sometimes Mr. S. appears to admit what at others he denies on this head, namely, the condemnation of the old man. “If by judicial condemnation is meant its being condemned . . . I could quite accept it.” Why, then, find fault with it? -- to most minds that is exactly what the expression conveys, but though in the scripture, it does not agree with Mr. S.’s system, as is evident from the passages quoted above, and hence the contradiction. He adds,

Condemning the old man, or crucifying it, conveys to me a different thought from judicially terminating it. Such language distorts the gospel” (p. 36).

He crucified our old man with Christ. But Romans 6 treats of that which is to be made good experimentally in each one of us.

True, but we are brought down thus to experience, instead of *apprehending by faith* what God has done for us as the basis of all experience. How can Mr. S. say that it is “spoken of *Christians* that they have died”? It is certainly not the Christian as such, but looked at as in the flesh that the individual has died, and his old nature, position, and condition ended before God, and for faith. “The real question,” and “an important one, *Am I practically dead to*

*sin?*” (p. 37) -- Mr. Stuart’s great point -- is just confusing and perplexing souls when put in this way. We are declared to have died, and our old nature to be crucified, or dead and gone, and *that* is the “*real and important* question, according to divine teaching.” To make it thus consist in, “Am I practically dead to sin?” is to weaken and destroy the effect of the truth as God has brought it to us in His word, throwing the soul back upon its experimental state, instead of upon what God has wrought for it on the cross. No one but a rampant heretic would say, as to fact, that his evil nature was “dead and gone”; but to teach that our Lord did not bear, on the cross, “the judgment of a nature,” where scripture speaks of sin in the flesh as condemned {Rom. 8:3}, and our old man crucified with Christ {Rom. 6:6}, is very-serious denial of scripture truth. To imply, also, that this is the same as, or has even any resemblance to, “atoning for the old nature” (p. 23), is really throwing dust in the eyes. The former is a blessed truth, the latter a revolting absurdity.

The new man is seen in Christ Himself, and the “man in Christ,” subsequent to resurrection, for blessed and perfect as He ever was in every association or position, He is now no longer connected with earth as once in the days of His flesh, but has commenced life in a new order and character in resurrection power and condition, being raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, is no longer in any way accessible to temptation {testing} (Rom. 6:4, 9-11), having death and resurrection between Himself and it, which is true to faith of ourselves likewise. In Rom. 7 it is life, and the aspiration of for {sic} life, and to this Mr. Stoney refers, in contrast with our position in Christ, described in Rom. 8, though, no doubt, there experimentally realized. It is in Ephesians and Colossians we are said to have put off the old man, and put on the new man, but Christ *is all*, and in all {Col. 3:9, 10; Eph. 4:22}.

Thus, not only the position and existence of the new man, as an abstract thought of what we are in Christ, is wanting in Mr. S.’s scheme, but the fact that he makes the being in Christ to consist *exclusively* in the reception of the Holy Ghost, fully accounts for his being unable even to perceive, what is in question. Now we see these blessed realities in our Lord Himself, as presented in type, in the meat-offering. In the fine flour is depicted the pure and perfect humanity of Christ, *mingled* with oil, the type of the Holy Ghost in living energy, acting in and from His birth, but the *anointing* with oil followed, indicating the descent of the Holy Ghost (Lev. 2:5, 6) personally upon Him at His baptism. The same things, in measure, are true of us, but just as the fine flour, the growth of this earth, or the green ears of corn, and the wave-sheaf, set forth the perfect human nature of the Lord, which formed the foundation, in every case, of the offering, so, when the Lord speaks of Himself as the risen corn of wheat multiplied {John 12:24}, we have, in reality, the new man introduced by Christ, which gives the characteristic position of the believer, though it could not be known in its full power and *personal display* till Pentecost. We know, from Acts 1, that, through the Holy Ghost, He gave commandments to His disciples, after His resurrection,

proof of the action of the Holy Ghost in the new and risen Man before ascension, and its blessed and further results for us.

The apostle tells us that the object of his instruction, warning, labor, and conflict, was to "present every man perfect in *Christ Jesus*"; thus, indeed, we shall be presented, through grace, and we have to grow up to "a *perfect man*," "to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" {Eph. 4:13}. This looks onward to the future, and how we are to be presented before God, but whether it be the future or the present, this is "the ground on which He has set us in His presence" -- we are before Him in love. And again, "Of him are ye in *Christ Jesus*, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and *redemption*" (1 Cor. 1:30), the last having in view the complete accomplishment of all in glory, that "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." So that Christ is the measure of the Christian standing, in the place in which He is found *before God*, for this is not His exclusively personal place *on the throne*. When He says Himself, "My God, and your God" {John 20:17}, He speaks as *man*, and speaks of a place, or standing which He has acquired for us. We must either conclude that Christ has only representatively this standing, justified before the throne, or that the believer has no standing, or position, *in Christ* before God at all. Mr. Stuart may say, "I reject the latter" (p. 36), but what has he not lost? -- the true Christian position in Christ is entirely gone. Thus he himself declares:

We are told, "This Man's -- that is, the Lord Jesus Christ's -- standing determines the Christian's standing." Is this so? . . . We are accepted by virtue of His sacrifice. If we apply the word "standing" to Him, we must mean the ground on which He is for Himself in God's presence. His standing -- to use Mr. Stoney's term -- cannot of itself determine the Christian's standing. That would be, on the one hand, to ignore, or reject, our need of atonement; or, on the other hand, to teach that He had need of it also, which last would be blasphemy. It is His sacrifice which determines our standing (*Is it the Truth of the Gospel?* p. 19).

Without adopting the word "standing" as one to be preferred in speaking of our blessed Lord, the effect of this reasoning is evidently to shut out the vast range of what belongs to Him, and is conferred by God on Him as Man, in which we can have a part, according to the thoughts and counsels of His love, but which Mr. Stuart excludes by limiting us to the two alternatives, namely: the standing of the believer before the throne, justified, which *Christ could not have*; and, secondly, to that place on the throne which is absolutely and exclusively His own, and one, therefore, in which we could not share. He ignores, in all this, what it is hardly possible any one, who has been even slightly conversant with what has been elicited from scripture through the writings of brethren, can be ignorant of -- the fact that there is this middle place (if such an expression may be allowed) between these two, which the Lord has taken, because, as His love assures, He would not abide alone {John 12:24}. Now, to say that our Lord had a place in heaven by virtue of His own blood, would be to imply that He needed that blood (as we

do) to be there; but to say that in doing His (that wonderful) work, in which sin was put away, He, being what He was, so glorified God as Man, that He could take a new place as Man, and for man, in heaven, in which we share as men in Christ, is a totally different thing, though, to Mr. S., it seems impossible.<sup>9</sup>

It is impossible to have our standing in the righteousness of God. I cannot have a standing in God's consistency with His character; I can, however, have my standing in harmony with it, and I can be an illustration of it (p. 32).

Constantly, alas! does Mr. S. submit scripture, when it militates against his views, to this sort of intellectual puzzle, which needs to be dissected, or the meaning is lost to those who accept it. Now we read that we "cannot have a standing in God's consistency with His character." But it is God's *acts* in righteousness which are in question, both in dealing with sin in the cross, in giving Christ a place before Him, according to what He has done, and giving it to us in Him also, so that "we are made, or become, the righteousness of God in him"; and this is displaying divine righteousness; thus *we can* have a standing in this divine righteousness, Christ's own position, ours in Him being founded on it, expressed in these blessed but righteous acts; not only the wall, but "the street of the heavenly city, was pure gold, like unto clear glass." The next verse (2 Cor. 6:1), where the apostle beseeches that the grace of God should not be received in vain, shows that this position "in Christ" is a present one. Eph. 1:4, 5 are also relegated to one future, "as our calling, of which we are *now to know the hope*" (p. 24). "God's *purpose* is, too, *that we should be* holy and without blame before Him in love" (p. 8); thus again are we deprived of our present

---

9. As to the five counts which Mr. Stuart brings forward at the end of his pamphlet, *Is it the Truth of the Gospel?* in his indictment against Mr. Stoney, it need only be remarked, that, after his total misrepresentation of Mr. Stoney in them, Mr. Stuart can no longer complain of being misunderstood, nor that he is wrongfully charged with the conclusions of others, or holding what he does not believe.

- (1) If the new man is not implied in Romans -- man in nature then, can produce fruit well pleasing to God? So the ruin of man by the fall, in that case, is a myth.
- (2) If the Lord has borne the judgment of the first man, all men will assuredly be saved.
- (3) If our bodies are to be created anew, resurrection of the body is denied.
- (4) If God acquits a criminal, the truths of redemption, by blood and of substitution, must be struck out of the Christian man's creed.
- (5) If the Lord Jesus Christ's standing determines the Christian's standing . . . it would surrender the cardinal truth of atonement, and lower the Lord to a level with His saints.

Nos. 1, 5 have been already noticed as misconceptions of Mr. Stuart's. In No. 2 we read, "If the Lord bore the judgment of the first man, all men will assuredly be saved." But this is to confound the abstract man, or the first man, with the concrete, and it is evident that Mr. Stoney has no such idea as that ascribed to him. (No. 4), "God acquitting a criminal" through the death of Christ, is as easy to understand, as Mr. Stuart making use of the word, "acquiring" a standing through Christ. They may not be, perhaps, either of them exact expressions, but it is making a man an offender for a word, to apply a heterodox meaning to either. The answer to No. 3 will be found on page 87 {63, herein}.

blessings.

We find also three arguments on 1 John 4:17. The first is as follows:

Mr. Stoney finds fault with my writing, "By standing is meant the title and ability, through grace, for a fallen and once guilty creature to be before the throne of God without judgment overtaking him." Now he tells us the true standing is "as Christ is," I will quote the whole verse to which he refers us. "Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because as he is, even so are we in this world" (1 John 4:17). It is plain, then, if we get in this verse the true Christian standing, that it has some connection with the thought of the throne, since the Christian is to have boldness in the day of judgment by that which he knows is true of him now. Simple folk would probably conclude that, if this passage defines the true *Christian standing, connected*, as it certainly is, *with the thought of the day of judgment*, there can be nothing, after all, so radically wrong in that which I wrote, but to which Mr. S. here takes such exception (p. 28).

How far this is from the apostle's thought, that our standing has some *connection* with the throne or the day of judgment, will appear, by observing that he looks at the most solemn moment that can ever occur in the history of man, when the heaven and earth flee away, and *others*, even the wicked dead, are raised, to stand before the great white throne for judgment (the angels also, being reserved to the judgment of that day); and he says that love has wrought so wondrously for us even here, by making us, even now, as Christ is in this world, that we can have boldness in view of it. How destructive of the force of this most lovely passage, to make it teach that it is a question of ourselves, and extract from it the notion of *our* standing before the throne, because others then will do so in that most solemn day. What follows still further perplexes the passage.

Second argument:

I can say, *I have* a standing; I could not say, *I am* a standing. Now John here expresses what we *are*, not what we *have*.

But the apostle is speaking of what gives boldness, or confidence, and the excellence of that title in God's presence on which it rests. Now this title, though Mr. Stuart cannot see it, does consist in what Christ *is*, and we may, and do, stand before God in what He is, for His title to be in God's

presence, after having borne our sins, and the judgment of them, is now righteously ours. It should be observed, that the apostle has already given us divine life and the value of the sacrifice, the propitiation for our sins, as that which love has provided to meet our guilty condition. He then *proceeds further*, and speaks of love, further assuring us, in that God dwells in us, and we in Him; then to show how love is *made perfect*, he rises to the high and blessed thought of Christ's own place of righteousness, nearness, and acceptance, and says, "As he is, so are we in this world" {1 John 4:17}; that is, even though in the midst of sin and death. What I am, therefore, shows what I have, since it what He is, and has, as God's accepted One.

Third argument:

The apostle predicates something as true of the believer in *this world*. "As Christ is, so are we in *this world*." Now when we think of our standing before God, as scripture treats of it, we think of being before Him who sits enthroned in the highest heaven, not of what we *are* in this world, though our standing before Him in heaven is to be known by us whilst on earth.

Can anything exceed the poverty of spiritual vision to which this would-be exactitude of the human mind brings its author! Mr. Stuart, indeed, can only think of a standing before the throne, not merely as a title, as he has told us abundantly, but as a locality. The apostle John's spiritual apprehension, happily, has no such narrow limit, and though not occupied with position so much as the apostle Paul, yet, including this, he gives us here the range of our position, whatever may be in view with reference to the future, drawing his conclusion from what we now are, before we have the glorified bodies, which will witness, in another scene, to the perfection of the place already given us. For, *wherever* we may be, as Christ is, so are we in God's sight, and that, even now: all this is effaced by this narrow notion about the throne. How completely, alas! is the truth eclipsed on these all-important points of divine revelation, acceptance in Christ, and the nearness consequent on it, in what being in Christ consists, the position before God it gives us, the primary end of the old man, the putting on of the new, the very meaning of these terms, with the substitution of Headship of race for them, so that on each distinctive point the truth of God is subverted.

## Chapter 6

### “In Christ,” As Membership of His Body

Another great branch of the subject is the bearing of our position as members of the body of Christ. Mr. Stuart denies that we are in heaven as such, or that the term “in Christ” refers to this membership.

It is not easy to see the ground of Mr. Stuart's denial, in page 47, that he had taught that being in the heavenlies was *condition*.

Being “in Christ,” as the opposite to being ranged under Adam's headship, is state or condition, who can gainsay it? But being in the heavenlies was *never said by me to be condition*, as the reader may see by a reference to page 22. So now we are there, that is, the heavenlies; but as in Him, that is, in spirit -- not in person. In that region, in which the Head of the race actually is, all ranged under His headship are viewed as now being, but in Him; and the order in which this truth is expressed, “in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus,” is corrective of mistaken thoughts.

Contrast this with page 13, *Christian Standing and Condition*:

For there are two lights in which the sinner is viewed. In the one, he is seen as a responsible, guilty creature, who needs a standing before the throne, but has it not; in the other he is seen as one dead in sins, who needs quickening. Romans 1:11 treats of the former; Eph. 2:1-7, of the latter. Now, where being *dead in sins* and *quickenings* are treated of, *condition* or state, not standing before the throne, is the theme, and the truth of “in Christ” is then made prominent. This we see in *Ephesians*.

This seems to state plainly enough that our being in heavenly places in *Christ Jesus*, in Eph. 2:6, is condition, not position; besides which, in pages 17, 18, we have the condition of the divine Persons in the Godhead brought forward to prove that *in Christ Jesus cannot mean position*.

Could we speak of His [the Son's] *position* as in the Father?

Condition, then, or state (though we should scarcely like to use the word, state of the Father or of the Son) is the thought implied by being in Christ;

and this is stated without any exception in the first pamphlet. Of course the absurdity of denying our being “seated” to be position is obvious enough, but what then becomes of the theory that being in Christ is not position, which is an essential basis of this system? Yet Mr. S. himself finds it difficult enough to make this term, as applied to divine Persons and ourselves, identical; strangely as he endeavors

to force it, as an argument, upon his readers.

As members of the body, on the other hand, we are viewed as, and have a service, as such, to do upon earth. “Union” connects us with Christ in heaven, but does not now put us into heaven (pp. 48, 49).<sup>10</sup>

How important is the truth in question, whether the members are so connected with the Head, as to share in *His present place* in consequence, personally and consciously, the body of course excepted!

It has been already noticed that we are looked upon as *individually* in heaven in Christ in the early verses of Eph. 1, and collectively rather than corporately there in Eph. 2:5, 6, where we are said to be “quickened *together* with Christ,” “raised *together*” with Christ, and “made to sit *together* in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.” Now there is no such word as *together* in Eph. 1:1-6, thrice repeated in Eph. 2; nor are we *there* said to be “seated” in the heavenlies. We are, on the contrary, spoken of as “before him in love,” which is quite a different idea, that is, that of presentation and position before God, for which we were chosen as individuals before the world began; brought nigh to God in Christ, the risen man, and seen as accepted, or graced in His sight, in the Beloved -- but when it is said that we are “seated,” it can only be in Him as members of His body, sharing in the present rest, and exalted position of the Head. This is brought out at the end of Eph. 1, where the greatness of the power which God wrought in Christ *when He raised Him from the dead and set Him in the heavenly places*, is said to be the power exerted toward every one of us. “What is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ,” when He raised and exalted Him. This

10. Mr. Stuart connects personality with the body *only*, whilst the word of God does not so limit it, as the Lord's reply to the dying thief, “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise,” clearly shows. Hence he will have, that we are always personally on earth, but the apostle speaks otherwise: “If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world; why, as though *living in the world*, are ye subject to ordinances” (Col. 2:20). “If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above; for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. Mortify therefore *your members* which are *upon the earth*,” and again, “in which ye also walked sometime, when ye lived in them” (Col. 3:5-7). For the words “we” and “us” involve what is personal, and conscious enjoyment of both title and place in the power of the Holy Ghost, “for he that is joined to the Lord is one Spirit.” This gives very fully the blessed realization of what Christ is and has in heaven, “for what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him” (1 Cor. 2:11)? Having therefore the Spirit as well as the life of Christ in us, shows how complete this realization might be, if we walked more in the power of it.

power not only includes resurrection, but ascension, and, ultimately, exaltation over everything, as a part of the position of the body of which Christ is the Head. Moreover, the power is one and the same, beginning with its first manifestation in the grave, and carried on until its complete effect is seen in this glorious position given, whether now or in the future.

The connection of the next chapter, which further particularizes the natural condition of Jew and Gentile, and the way God came in in mercy, to meet it and give us this place in the heavenlies in Christ, even now is shown in the words, "*And you hath he quickened,*" &c. This quickening, *with Christ*, or, according to the power which He wrought *in Christ* when He raised Him, only spoken of in Ephesians and Colossians, appears to be special and distinctive of the members of the body, and commences with the point of death, where Christ, and those who are to be so linked with Him are found; Christ, through grace, coming into it, and we, through our natural state of ruin. Nowhere else is this power applied in like manner to ourselves with Christ; nor exaltation or position with Christ, whether now or in the future, so exactly described. It is all, moreover, according to the plan and purpose of God, for "the ages to come," in which we are to be distinguished from others by this wondrous association and position in which His special "kindness" and "riches of grace" are shown {Eph. 2:7}. It is also according to that great love which looked on us when in our natural condition of ruin and depravity, to link us *in every step* and *for eternity*, "together" with the object of His unutterable affection. The word seated implies, not only position, but conscious possession and enjoyment of all the blessings and advantages of that position, so much so, that the most exalted beings of God's creation, principalities and powers in heavenly places, are, by this means (that is, the place of the church as the body of Christ), learning, at the present time, the admirable wisdom of God (Eph. 3:9, 10), whilst, for the same reason, our conflict is with adverse principalities and powers, also in heavenly places {Eph. 6:12}. Were this only "Headship of race," all this special blessing for ages to come, as well as all that angels are "now" learning, would be made void or nullified.

Certainly Eph. 2:1-10 views us as Christian saints, and not there as members of the body, for the teaching about being in Christ is in question. The figures scripture uses are helpful, and the doctrine of the word about the Body, and about being in Christ proves it. Shall we say we are viewed in Ephesians 2:1-6 as the body of Christ? But the body had no existence till after the Lord had ascended. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. 12:13). Was the body dead in trespasses and sins? Saints were; we who are Christians were. To hold such a dogma, we must surrender distinctive teaching about the church of God. Besides, the being in Christ, as Galatians 3:29 teaches, brings us into association with Abraham -- we thus become his seed. Was Abraham a member of the body? (*Is it the Truth?* &c. p. 57).

The argument that all this in Eph. 2 cannot apply to anything more than Headship of race, because the Holy Ghost alone unites us to Christ as members of His body, is answered by

the fact, that the time when the individual members, most of whom were not even in existence when Christ was raised, are brought into this, is not in contemplation (any more than the moment of their faith or conversion, equally needful and subsequently spoken of), but the new creation-act and power of God, as a whole, towards those whom He makes members of Christ, from their death in sin, "quickening them together with him." The entire work is God's own; and if He quickens and seats them thus in heaven, He knows how to bring them individually, as members, into the enjoyment of it, according to what is wrought in *the soul* by His quickening power, and by the Holy Ghost personally. But here we have God's view of the whole work in its completeness, for "the ages to come" must include *the body* also, though not so stated, any more than the place of the Holy Ghost in the accomplishment of this purpose.

Another of the miserable arguments made use of to weaken the force of scripture teaching, in this passage and elsewhere, as to the identification of the members with the Head, and the use of the term "in Christ," here applied to them as such, is that the members of a man's body cannot be said to be "in the Head," nor the Head either in the members.

In Christ is *not* union with Him. The figures used in the word are instructive. No one ever saw a human body (for that is the figure) with its members in the head, but joined to the head<sup>11</sup> (*Answers to Inquiries*, by C. E. S., March 3rd, 1885).

Now the word of God does speak of the members being in Christ, and it is, as Mr. S. avows, "a perilous thing" to "contradict flatly" the word of God, even if he had the consent of all the Christian writers in the world to support him in it. The Holy Ghost, writing by the apostle, states, "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, are one body *in Christ* and every one members one of another" (Rom. 12:4, 5). No language can affirm more distinctly than this, that the members *are* looked upon as "*in Christ*." Nor is it true, as Mr. S. affirms that:

it is *commonly agreed* that we have not union of the body with Christ, contemplated in Romans; but the practical effect of union among ourselves is treated of (*Christian Standing and Condition*, p. 30).

It has indeed been truly said, that "being in Christ and the body, *though recognized as common Christian knowledge*, form no part of the teaching of the Epistle" ({*J. N. Darby*} *Notes and Comments*, part 6, p. 217); and the same remark

11. The attempt to make everything square with the literal exactness of the human mind is here most disastrous. Our union with Christ, as members of His body, is not of a physical or *material* nature, as this would make it, but by the Holy Ghost. "What man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him" {1 Cor. 2:11}? Besides being baptized *by the Spirit* into one body, we have been all made to *drink into* one Spirit {1 Cor. 12:12, 13}, and he that is joined to the Lord *is one Spirit* {1 Cor. 6:17}. This thought makes the association of the members with the Head in heaven very complete, and shows also how the word "in Christ" is suitably used for it in scripture, for the spirit of a man pervades the whole head and members united.



has been made as to the ascension of Christ. These subjects are not "treated of" in this Epistle; but to declare they are not "contemplated" is quite another thing. Mr. S. might as well say, that "Who is even at the right hand of God," did not mean Christ's present position, because it is only mentioned once, and not treated of in the Romans.

But the teaching of the Holy Ghost is constantly the opposite of Mr. Stuart's, for we have, "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 the Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized *into* one body" (1 Cor. 12:12, 13). Here Christ, or "the Christ," stands for the whole, and all are included in Him, and this is seen still more distinctly in Eph. 4:15. "But speaking the truth in love, may grow up *into* him in all things, which is the head, even Christ." Now, they must be in Him as members, to grow up into Him who is the Head. Again, in Colossians, where the apostle is showing that saints are, as united to Christ, above all ordinances in the flesh, and angels, and everything in a lower region than Christ Himself, in His nearness to God and place of exaltation, he says, "Ye are complete *in him* who is the head of all principality and power" {Col. 2:10}. It is not as *Head* of a race that He occupies this position, but as "Head over all things *in heaven* and earth" (Eph. 1:10, 19-23). Nor can we be *higher*, either as regards relation to God, creation, or heavenly powers; nor more blessed as to our relation to Christ Himself, the Head, for in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily {Col. 2:9}.<sup>12</sup>

So in Col. 1, He, by whom all things were created, who is before all things, and by whom all things consist, 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 preeminence," for all the fullness of Godhead was pleased to dwell in Him. Here we have the same relation of Head towards the body in His preeminence of position over all things, and personal, divine fullness, bringing the members into a place above the reach of the vain efforts of man to raise himself in his own way, and by his own speculations, which arose from "not holding the Head" {Col. 2:19}, in whom God has given us a place of blessing so wondrous, and who is "*in us*," the hope of glory.

Being "in Christ," therefore, does properly belong to, and is descriptive, not only of that which is connected with the new man, but of the members in their connection with Christ as Head; and though the members are not spoken of as in the Head, the Head being properly the distinctive appellation of Christ, in contrast with the body, they are spoken of as "in Christ," because the term "the Christ" stands for the whole mystic man, the Head and the members together. (1 Cor. 12:12). And all that the Head enjoys is necessarily partaken of by the members, though the body, in

its corporate character, as has been long accepted among us, is regarded as on earth; for when we speak of the body, we do so distinctively, as contrasting it with the Head, whilst the members have their existence and are certainly in the man, seen as a whole, and both together make up the complete man (Eph. 1:23). "Thus the bubble" (as Mr. S. expresses it), "for it is one, bursts at once."

But Gal. 3:29 is used to drag Abraham into Eph. 2:1-10, in order to dispose of the thought that this passage teaches union with Christ, because the apostle declares that being in Christ, "we thus become his [Abraham's] seed." "Was Abraham a member of the body?, it is asked. Now, it is being identified with Christ, and *in Him*, the new man before God, who is the true Isaac, or seed of Abraham, to whom the promises were made (Gal. 3:16), that we become the seed of Abraham. Those who have been baptized into Christ, *have put on Christ*, and thus come into His heirship, as the seed of Abraham (Gal. 3:27-29); but this is far from measuring what we have, as in Christ, who introduces us, as associated with Himself, into those heavenly blessings, which were never promised to Abraham at all, who was only "the heir of *the world*," and does not share in the other titles of Christ which we enjoy. Beyond all question, Abraham was not, and never could be, Abraham's seed, nor was he "in Christ," as we are, either. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" {Gal. 3:28}, is directly in contrast with distinctions, that had their commencement and foundation in Abraham's position. Nor is "of Christ," or belonging to Him, identical with being "in Christ," but far more general, as may be seen by reference to 1 Cor. 1:12 and 2 Cor. 10:7, though the two expressions may be used of the same persons and their connection with Christ. But all this is a painful illustration of Mr. Stuart's views and way of handling scripture. First, Gal. 3:27-29 is used to lower the term "in Christ" to the Abrahamic level, and then forced into Eph. 2:1-10 to reduce that beautiful passage also to the same standpoint, namely, headship of race.

The ruinous effect of this system will now be apparent, not only on the apprehension of our heavenly position and privileges, but on the vast amount of scripture affected by it. For it is again and again reiterated that "in Christ" and "Christ in us," refers to headship of race exclusively (*Christian Standing and Condition*, pp. 18, 30); so that wherever these terms are used -- Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans -- all is brought down to the millennial level, though those Epistles which present the heavenly side of truth, are most seriously affected by it, unless indeed we except the writings of the apostle John; for even in explaining John 14:20 -- "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you" -- and reasoning on it, in reference to the Persons in the Godhead, we find,

This passage then throws light on what being in a person, and that one reciprocally in him, must mean. It is a condition of Godhead, since there are plurality of Persons in the Godhead, that the Son should be in the Father, and the Father in the Son; it is a condition of

12. The reader who can refer to the original, will see the force and beauty of the word πληρωμα, in connection with the fullness of Christ, and His personal position, and our πεπληρωμενοι *completeness*, and the use of the same word as to the body in Eph. 1:23, the completeness, or complement, of Him that fills all in all.

saints through grace, that they are in Christ, and Christ in them. And this is made the more apparent, when we remember that in Christ is used in contrast to being in Adam -- *the two heads of races*, under which those belonging to each are ranged" (*Christian Standing and Condition*, p. 18).

So that this most blessed and divine association with Christ in life, nature, and communion, in the power of the Holy Ghost -- which has its analogy in the unity of the divine Persons, and even that unity itself -- we have deeply deteriorated by this headship of race; and this, of course, includes John 17 and the Epistle of John, where the expression "in Him" is so often made use of, for it is on the same ground as John 14:20, and the same truth is applicable, on which Mr. S. gives utterance to these miserable arguments about the divine Persons.

Where can Mr. Stuart have got to in his own soul? we feel constrained to ask, for his own sake, and for the sake of others. Alas! he lets us know, only too distinctly, to what extent injury may be done by allowing the human mind to work in its own way upon divine truth. Three passages from his writings will illustrate this.

It (the Bible) is a revelation from One who has not revealed all that He knows, but only all that is good for the creature to know. So in studying the written word, we are brought into intercourse with the thoughts of Him whose mind is not fathomed by the revelation He has vouchsafed, though He must always speak from the height of His own knowledge and purposes (p. 3).

How different this is from the language of the apostle, when speaking of the nature and extent of the revelation made to us, or the means and power of its communication and enjoyment, "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things [or depths] of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given to us of God" (1 Cor. 2:10-12). Again, the Lord tells His disciples, "When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into *all truth*. . . All things that the Father hath are mine, therefore, said I, that he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you" (John 14:12-14). And when, speaking of the place of confidence and intimacy into which He was introducing His disciples, and which the Holy Ghost would make known to them fully: "*Henceforth*, I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends: for *all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you*" (John 15:15). Mr. Stuart

has lost the true Christian place, and has got back into the place properly belonging to "the creature," or servant, the Jewish position as such, for the master communicates only "what is good for his servant to know." Was this the Son's place with the Father? This is the "creature's" place, but it is exactly the opposite of what the Lord states, and the apostle, when he quotes, "Who [that is, the creature] hath known the mind of the Lord? . . . But we" (he replies) "have the mind of Christ" {1 Cor. 2:16}, and the Holy Ghost knows the deep things of God, and reveals them, as the spirit of man the things of a man. Not, of course, that we cease to be creatures, but the place of intimacy and nearness and friendship we are taken into, Mr. S. has lost. "*All things* that I have heard of my Father" -- how different from, "All that is good for the creature to know"!

Again, Mr. S. writes:

We rejoice, too, in hope of the glory of God. The day of the display of God's glory, when the king shall come forth in power, and establish God's authority on earth by the execution of judgments, the saint no longer fears, but on the contrary, looks forward to it as a hope" (*Christian Standing and Condition*, p. 8).

This is (like the last passage) exactly the hope of the Jewish remnant: "Then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh" (Luke 21:28). Mr. S. tells us, "he did not say it was confined to this." No, doubtless, but the scripture tells us, "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh"; and if Mr. S. had not brought himself down to the level of a Jewish saint, he never could have penned such a comment on the apostle's beautiful statement of the joy flowing from a place in the divine glory, nor have added to the supremely blessed passage:

We joy also, or boast, in God -- knowing (too) that He will *listen to no charge* that may be brought against us, however true such a charge might be" (*Christian Standing and Condition*, p. 8).

The introduction of the word "too," *now that attention has been called* to the defectiveness of his apprehension of these blessings, will not suffice to conceal that all this is the natural outcome of his views, and may well serve as a warning to those whose spiritual sensibilities are awake, and who have learned to "try the things that differ." "Surely, in vain is the snare laid in the sight of any bird." Well may he say, "No higher place can a saint have than a standing before the throne," for it is evident he has nothing "higher," and knows of nothing "higher."

## Chapter 7

### New Creation

The last subject brought before us, of importance, is that of new creation. We have seen that Mr. Stuart's system corresponds with that of the old Puritans or early evangelicals, upon these great branches of their teaching, namely, justification by blood or by sacrifice only; headship of race, which was all they knew with reference to association with Christ and what they constantly and largely insisted on; and thirdly, we shall find very similar views touching new creation or a new creature – that being held by them to be exhibited in the regeneration of the believer, “or a *spiritual race*, different from everything that had been ever before produced,” so that, as Mr. Stuart says, “he looked on everything in a new light”; but they had no idea of any new material creation, or sphere, though, perhaps, they might not have gone to the length of denying it, as Mr. S. Thus Mr. S. expresses himself on this subject:

A complete *change* comes, as it were, *over the scene*, consequent on the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. The man who in Christ is a new creation, is still, as to his identity, the same person he was before *his conversion*. But things are to be *seen by him in a new light*.

So the old things can pass away and become new. Individuals are the same now as before. Things are the same, relationships are the same; but all are *viewed from a new standpoint*. The relationships which existed before exist still. . . . Hence new creation is not a place or region into which he [the believer] will one day enter . . . He [Christ] is the beginning of it, and each one in Him is a new creation. This creation then is spiritual, not material, like that of old (“New Creation,” *Voice to the Faithful*, May, 1879).

It was brought out by leading teachers among us, some forty or more years since, that the ordinary teaching on this subject was essentially defective, that Christ was foundation and Head of a new creation, which was the display of the power of God in heaven and earth; that it was a new sphere or region, as a result of the manifest power of God where “all things” were “of God” {2 Cor. 5:17, 18}. Well does the writer remember the first effect of realizing what it was to be brought into definite association with this new sphere of created existence, instead of the old view of being “a new creature”; and “viewing things in a new light,” and then looking within to see what corresponding effects of divine life were produced. Identified with a new system of power which was all of God, it seemed to lift the soul out of itself; whilst the unfolding of that system, entirely new to the mind in its grandeur and blessing as a fresh creation of God, gave additional interest, expansion of soul and spiritual strength being coupled with the apprehension of divine righteousness upon the same ground. A new “position,” and not merely a

new condition, or state of apprehension; for it is evident that the same principles are at work in what is denied here, as in other parts of Mr. Stuart's scheme.

First, as to the old creation, Mr. S. tells us that man was a creation of God, but that the earth “was not re-created for him,” but only “made,” for Mr. S.'s idea of creation is limited to what is brought into existence out of nothing, but he again gives us no authority for this but his own, though, as elsewhere, he states it as if there could be no possible question touching what he affirms, and no appeal from it. Scripture, on the contrary, constantly speaks of creation very differently, that is, not only of God calling matter into being that had no previous existence, but when He produces forms of organic life and beauty, whether animal or vegetable, out of dead, inert material, or introduces into matter already existing, a new kind of life and power.

Man was created on the sixth day after earth emerged, by divine fiat, from a state of chaos, into which, for causes unknown to us, it had been allowed to get, for God created it not a waste (Isa. 45:18). Was earth re-created for man? No. It was *made* in those six days for him, (Ex. 20:11), and he, a fresh creation of God, appeared on the scene, and found earth was the appointed sphere for him as man (Psa. 115:16.) Hence the *creation of a race* does not of necessity involve the recreation of a place or sphere in which that race is to find its home. As it was then, so it is now. *The one in Christ is a new creature*, and the heavenlies are the sphere in which that creation can find its home, and has its proper place according to God's appointment (*Christian Standing and Condition*, pp. 21, 22).

*Man* was “created” and the rest, we are told, in contrast, was “made,” because formed out of matter previously created; but this is completely upset by the express statement of scripture, that the peopling the waters with animal life, and the air also, was an act of creative power (Gen. 1:21), or we are shut up to the absurd conclusion, that whilst the fishes, and the birds of the air also, were created, the beasts of the field and cattle were only made.

The word of God, speaking of man's physical form in its origin, “*Male and female created he them*,” tells us that he, as well as the lower animals, was “made” (Gen. 1:26; 5:1) or “formed” out of pre-created material. “The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground” (Gen. 2:7), so that this notion of creation's being only applied to what is called into being out of nothing, would be equally destructive of the idea of man's creation, as applied to his body, concerning which the statement of scripture is absolute. Hence we see the very same language used concerning the *formation* of the animals as of man. “But out of the ground the Lord God

formed (Heb. יָצַר) every beast of the field and every fowl of the air" (Gen. 2:19). Thus scripture speaks of the whole scene formed and fashioned out of chaos, as creation, and that "God rested on the seventh day from all his work that he *created and made*" (or to make, Gen. 2:3); and it is added, "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth in the day they were *created*, in the day that the Lord God *made* the heavens and the earth" (Gen. 2:4). This evidently is not the original creation of matter, but the scene of life, order and beauty which God had caused to spring forth out of that chaotic state, by creative energy, as the connection of the verses, speaking of the rest of the seventh day, makes apparent, and the word "generation" (comp. Gen. 5:1), for here the inspired writer goes on to specify that this creation embraced every plant and every herb before it *grew* or was *in the ground*, as included in what was made or created (Gen. 2:5), which accords with what the apostle tells us, that "Every creature (κτίσμα) of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. 4:4).

The word created is mainly used, as we have said, for a new and special display of almighty power; thus Moses, in predicting the earthquake which swallowed up Korah and his company, says, "If the Lord make a new thing in the earth" -- the Hebrew, as in the margin, is, "create a creature" (Num. 16:30). Again "I have created the waster to destroy" (Isa. 44:16). "I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil" (Isa. 45:7). We have then destructive evil and darkness, when it did not previously exist, spoken of as created by God. Moral and spiritual effects and scenes of blessing are similarly described, where new life and power from God are in operation. "Create in me a clean heart, O God" (Psa. 51:10). "I create the fruit of the lips" (Isa. 58:19). "God will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of valleys; and make the wilderness a pool of water, and plant in the wilderness, the cedar, the shittah, the myrtle and the olive, that they may see and know that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath *created* it" (Isa. 41:18-20).

Sometimes moral and physical creation are brought together as corresponding effects of divine, creative power; and we have similar expressions -- "Life from the dead" (Rom. 11:15), "regeneration" (Matt. 19:28), and even resurrection itself in the figure of the dry bones (Ezek. 38) -- used as descriptive of the change that will ensue in the condition of Israel, and the whole moral state of things, now become the sphere of Christ's power and glory: "Be ye glad and rejoice *for ever* in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy." This is given as an illustration of the same power that will create the new heavens and the new earth. "Behold," God says, "I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind." This strong language, "that the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind," shows us plainly enough that the Spirit of God has the complete change in view, spoken of by the apostle Peter and in Rev. 21, when, the first heaven and the first earth being destroyed by fire, God "makes" or "creates," for both words are used as elsewhere, taking, it may be, the same material as the basis, a new scene for the abode of men and His

dwelling-place with man. Creative energy is even applied to the fresh putting forth of divine power in the ordinary operations of nature. "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are *created*, and thou renewest the face of the earth" (Psa. 104:30). "The people which shall be created shall praise the Lord" (Psa. 102:18). (Compare also Isa. 48:6,7).<sup>13</sup>

Creation is ascribed to each of the divine Persons, but specially to the Son. In Col. 1 He is thus spoken of as Creator of all things in heaven and earth, and by Him they are all to be reconciled, having been defiled by the presence of sin. He sustains them all, they also were created for Him -- but how does He take them? In the power of His resurrection and victory over death, thus introducing new-creation-life into the whole scene, for He is the ἀρχή, or beginning {Col. 1:18}, the Fountain-head of the whole scene of power, as *the Firstborn from the dead*, as well as the Firstborn of the whole creation. This is repeated in Rev. 3:14, where He is again called the ἀρχή, or *beginning* of the creation of God, which could not be said of the old creation, for it is His relation to it as Man, and as risen from the dead, that is in question. Certainly, in resurrection only, is He the foundation and source of this new creation; for, "though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet *now henceforth* know we him no more: therefore, if any man be in Christ, [there is] new creation" {2 Cor. 5:16, 17}. Here we may apply the apostle's word on another subject, "in that he saith, new, he hath made the first old" {Heb. 8:13}; and we have seen that this scene is called the regeneration {Matt. 19:28}, or birth again, for the whole state of things is morally new in the millennium, like the new-born joy of Jerusalem; and Christ takes it, and fills it with His mediatorial, life-giving power and glory, exalted as Man over all. "He that ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might *fill all things*" (Eph. 4:9, 10). In Eph. 1:23 also we are told, that He who is the Head of His body, the church, is the One who, as Head over all, "fills all in all," which corresponds with the thought of the Spirit of God in Col. 1 that He who is the beginning, or the Firstborn, in the whole sphere of the divine action and display, has the supreme preeminence in "all things," because He first created, and now sustains, and will be the Head and Center, in new creation power and heavenly glory, for all the fullness of the Godhead bodily was pleased to dwell in Him {Col. 2:9}; so

13. As Mr. Darby has been supposed to agree with these sentiments, we add from *Notes and Comments on Scripture* the following extracts.

I do not see more in its being said "God created great whales" than the importance of the thing; vast as the creatures might be, they were mere creatures . . . Up to that it had been the *creation* of materials, the earth or mere plants, now of living beings (part 1, p. 22).

Thus, according to Genesis 1, man was a distinct being made -- when the subject *creation* of plants and living creatures was complete -- in the image of God (p. 25).

The continued exercise of *creative* power, I apprehend, we are very ignorant about; that it exists we know, and upholds, which is the same thing -- save the exercise of the divine Will (p. 21).

that this preeminence (πρωτεῦων) is not merely what the heart of every Christian delights to render to Him, but the necessary and entire ascendancy of His Person over all. It has been remarked, that the nearer we are brought in relationship to Him, the more the soul loves to honor and adore Him in His own personal and exclusive supremacy.

It is as a consequence of connection with Christ that we are linked with, and brought into, the new creation. Such is the force of the apostle's argument in 2 Cor. 5. He has spoken of the death of Christ for man, as having its judicial effect upon all, owned distinctly by those that believe; but if Christ Himself is in this new position, so that He is no longer known as once He was in His relations in the flesh, however perfect and blessed He was in them, having died for us because our state required it, He has necessarily passed into relationships of a higher order than Jewish associations, or His title as Man on earth, could give: "We know him," thus, "no more." Hence the abstract nature of the declaration, "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, [there is] new creation" {2 Cor. 5:16, 17}, for it is in that connection that he (the apostle) so stands associated with Christ, and not in the old one, as an Israelite, who might claim relationship with Him as the Son of David, and, as the apostle was a Jew, he naturally speaks of (τὰ ἀρχαῖα) ancient things as passed away, however sanctioned and honored, as they had once been, even by God Himself, in a former dispensation. "All things have become new," or, according to the reading adopted by some, "New things have come in," or, "taken place."<sup>14</sup>

All things are of God, also, in contrast with man in the flesh and all his surroundings, not only divine life, position, and righteousness but the whole range of the display of God's power and glory in Christ, starting from resurrection right on into the new heaven and earth. We ourselves also are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works (Eph. 2:10), which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them; for new creation supposes the action of divine power, and here in the place of death, where we were found {Eph. 2:1-6}, when He thus wrought in quickening power, to bring us out of the old creation. It is again and again stated that it is in the *new* man -- the commencement of this new creation in righteousness and holiness and truth {Eph. 4:24}, that God has begun this display of His power.

There would be something strange and incongruous, were our souls brought into this association with Christ, as Head of the new creation, and not our bodies. Mr. S., indeed, says, that to "affirm recreation of the body, we must deny its resurrection, which is a very serious matter indeed" (p. 53). Mr. S., however, first assumes, that creation is only to bring forth out of nothing; and then, proceeding to reason from a false premise, can only draw a false conclusion. If new creation is the introduction of new life and power into what previously existed, it may be applied, as it is, to the

soul first, and afterwards to the body. If we can see no difficulty in applying new creation power to the soul, without its personal existence or individuality being annulled by it, it may be equally applied to the body, without its identity being at all affected.

Since in the original creation of man, and of sentient life, or in the future creation, God chooses to make use of existent material, and to give it life and organism, which it did not possess before, He may equally take up matter which has crumbled to dust, raising "it" spiritual, powerful, and in glory, in new organic form, totally inconceivable in our present state (1 Cor. 15:42), or He may produce similar effects on our present animal organism, as wonderful, and perhaps more wonderful as a display of creative energy, than anything that we have ever known of or believed. Interesting as the change may be, of the caterpillar or chrysalis into a butterfly, yet analogies are proverbially misleading, and certainly have no authority in this case. For the life is the same throughout, though varied in its form, being only the development of powers inherent in the chrysalis, by means of natural laws, which we see in its transformation into the butterfly. The analogy, therefore, which Mr. S. considers conclusive in his favor, however beautiful as a figure, breaks down entirely, for the resurrection of the body is a totally new application and introduction of the mighty power of God into dead, inanimate matter, altogether diverse from any inherent forces or powers of nature existing within us.

It should also be remarked that the heavenly city, the dwelling-place of God, the new Jerusalem, is a creation of an entirely new order, which corresponds with the apostle's statement concerning the "greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this *creation*" (κτίσις, Heb. 9:11); and this accords with Isa. 45, "Drop down *ye heavens* from above, and let the skies pour down righteousness, let *the earth* open, and let them bring forth salvation, and let righteousness spring forth together. I, the Lord, have created it." Hence, both heaven and earth, being then filled with blessing, the heavenly city, the abode of righteousness, and Israel and the nations of those which are saved, walking in the light of it, with righteousness, like streams, springing up out of the earth in the desert. Jehovah says, I have created it, and the Spirit of God connects with it, as we have seen, the subsequent physical recreation of the new heaven and earth.

How opposite is all this to the theory, that the new creation consists only in "a spiritual race, different from anything that had been before produced." We, indeed, are *in Him* who is the origin, and commencement, and Head of it; "to create [κτίση] *in Himself* of twain, one new man" (Eph. 2:15).

14. So it is given in the last edition of Mr. Darby's translation of the New Testament. "They have become new" would be a contradiction of the inspired statement, that they have passed away, and inconsistent with the word, *καίνος*, which expresses what is completely new, not merely fresh, *νεός*.



## Chapter 8

### The Summing Up And Conclusion

The entire divergence between these views and Mr. Darby's is so evident, that the attempt to make out from his writings that they are in accordance, would be as unaccountable as it is dishonorable, did we not know the blinding effect of partisanship. This, however, has compelled repeated reference to Mr. D.'s works. We add also, some extracts found in close juxtaposition to those on which it is sought to base this supposed agreement.

Extract of a letter in the *Christian Friend* {edited by Ed. Dennett} for April, 1885, on "Justification of Life," and the difference which has been noted between the teaching of Rom. 5, and "in Christ" in chapters 6 and 8.

As to "justification of life," it is that justification we have as being alive in Christ; that is, it goes beyond mere forgiveness of sins as in the old man which are put away. It is the clearance of all imputation which we have as alive in Christ; but the passage gives us something more specific, it refers to verses 16 and 17.

Verse 16 is of many offences to justification, which of itself *goes farther than clearing the conscience* of sins. Verse 17 further adds that they who have received abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, will reign in life. This, while based on the clearing, brings us into a new place in life, and reigning in it. Hence we have "justification of life." "By one offence towards all to condemnation." "By one complete righteousness towards all men to justification" (v. 18); but then "in life," a new life in Christ; not merely, that is, the old sins cleared away negatively, but *in the new place* by the work of Christ, which God had fully owned. He had finished the work which His Father had given Him to do, and was in virtue of it in a new place, as Man, in life -- life (in us) and justification went together. I do not know if I have made myself plain. *It does not go quite so far as the "in Christ,"* but it does identify *our justification and a new life* in Him.

As to the first part of the Romans to chapter 5:12, the following passage has been quoted:

I repeat, the first part {Rom. 1 - 5:12} is complete in itself; the man is a pardoned, justified man, enjoying God's favor, His love in his heart by the Holy Ghost given to him, and rejoicing in the hope of glory. It is judicial.

The next paragraph thus continues:

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 . . . 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* (*Collected Writings*, vol. 31, pp. 405, 406).

Again:

In Romans, the mention of the Holy Ghost comes in when forgiveness and justification have been made known, as in chapter 4, and indeed in chapter 3, and before the experience of what we *are and our being in Christ* is entered upon.

Next paragraph:

Some Christians would oblige souls to have the experience of Rom. 7, in order to the salvation of Rom. 5 being true. It may come before. When it does, and acceptance in Christ is seen in simplicity, all the subsequent christian life is one of assured grace, save cases of special discipline. But the acceptance of chapter 5 may be known by itself first (but then, *justification* is forgiveness, applies to what we have done, is not our being the righteousness of God *in Christ*); but if so, self-knowledge and *our place in Christ* must be learned afterwards (*Collected Writings*, vol. 26 pp. 216, 217).

The truths, moreover, for which we have been contending, are those which God has given to us in these last days, before the return of the Lord, for the recovery of His saints, and to recall them to a heavenly position in waiting for that blessed event. The responsibility for their maintenance becomes therefore very serious. The object of these covert attacks of the enemy by sap and mine is the more apparent; nor will the plausible assertion of jealousy for the work of Christ (the same plea that was put forward by Mr. Newton, when resisting the spread of heavenly truth), prevail, save with those who willingly allow themselves to be deceived -- when it is remembered, that the full value of that blessed work has been brought out (not by those who insisted on justification, federal headship, since reformation times, nor by those who now plead for them), but by those who have recently been gathered to the Lord, and who specially insisted on, and were the means of, unfolding our position in Christ, and corresponding heavenly truth.

The wells in Canaan, type of the heavenly country, which had been dug by Abraham when he sojourned there,

whilst the Philistines were yet in the land, had to be subsequently recovered and redug by Isaac and his servants, and that not without great contention and resistance from the Philistines, as the names of Ezek and Sitnah witness. Yet God, in the end, gave success and blessing at Rehoboth and Beersheba, where He appeared Himself to encourage and assure by His presence. Though there was not the energy of Abraham's faith, yet his earnestness and persistence met with its reward (Gen. 26:18-25). It is a time of contention now for the precious truth God has given us, and the result will be the same for those who hold fast. For we have to "overcome in the evil day, and having overcome, to stand"; and our conflict is not with flesh and blood, but with wicked spirits in heavenly places. As to those who may be the leaders in these new schools of thought, which are yet not new, but old theological views revived, embellished with a few new ideas, borrowed from those we are all so indebted to, we have to bear in mind that no excellence, or piety, nor scholarship either, though accompanied with the best intentions of the authors, if the mind be not kept in lowly dependence, will save from the snare of the enemy, or from becoming his instruments, to the great injury of souls; nay, these very qualities will expose their possessors all the more to this influence. Peter would have sought, out of sincere but misapplied affection for his Master, to turn Him from the cross which led to the heavenly glory, and was rebuked *by the Lord as Satan*, the real originator of the suggestion and of its utterance at that moment.

Nor should we think the less of the effort now made to deprive us of heavenly truth, because what is ordinarily considered fundamental is not in question, for Christ is "the truth" -- *no lie* is of the truth -- and the Spirit is the "Spirit of truth" sent down from heaven, to guide us into all truth, truth which could not be made known before His ascension; nor do we ever know, in giving up a part of the glory of Christ, where it may lead us, for there is a unity in the truth which we cannot afford to overlook. The scripture, however, *warns* us that "there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" {1 Cor. 11:19}.

If we are to judge by the teaching of scripture, as regards the value of heavenly truth, we shall see that the Spirit of God regards with great jealousy any effort to weaken its effect. The indignation of Moses was greatly aroused (Num. 32) when the two and a half tribes first proposed to settle on the other side of Jordan; he reminds them that, when the spies discouraged the children of Israel from going in to possess the land, promised by God to their fathers, they were destroyed, for it was really rebellion against the Lord, and brought His wrath upon the whole congregation. He adds, "Ye are risen up, an increase of sinful men, to augment yet the fierce anger of the Lord toward Israel." For it was turning away from "*after him*," instead of *following Him fully*, as Caleb and Joshua had done; nor is Moses pacified until assured that they will go into the land, and fight all the battles of the Lord, with their brethren, until they are in full possession of the inheritance the Lord

had promised them, and, if not, he says, "Ye have sinned against the Lord, and be sure your sin will find you out."

Error spreads, and influences gradually deteriorating the soul, by affecting its communion with God, if not resisted, rejected, and departed from. Many who, at first, as they have owned, in reading these pamphlets, felt a chill, something benumbing their spiritual senses or feelings, and did not then receive their teaching, are now found defending it, or to have wholly adopted it. Where there is first insensibility and indifference to error, and continued association with it, there will soon be acceptance of, and adherence to, it. Such as we are, we cannot afford to be neutral, nor does the value of the truth, or the glory of God, admit of it.

A solemn responsibility rests, therefore, upon those who are upholding the teachers of false doctrine, for "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" {Gal. 5:9}; and if it is not the truth of God to build up souls, it is surely error, which weakens and damages them. The apostle tells us that, even in those who were appointed by the Holy Ghost to have the care and oversight of the flock, there would arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them {Acts 20:30}; and those who caused dissensions and offences and stumbling-blocks, contrary to the doctrine saints had learned, were to be marked and avoided {Rom. 16:17}. Upon such must rest the burden of the scandals and divisions, caused by the introduction of these doctrines among the faithful, as well as upon their adherents and those who link themselves with them. They have demanded the examination of these views, and it is for them now to go into the presence of God, and, laying aside their own self-will, which is sure to becloud the mind, ask themselves what they have gained spiritually by these speculations, and what they have lost. "If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father" {1 John 2:24}.

Confusion and darkness will surely be the result in the end, of giving up that which has been received from God.

Give glory to the LORD your God, before he cause darkness, and before your feet stumble upon the dark mountains, and while ye look for light, he turn it into the shadow of death, and make it gross darkness. But if ye will not hear it, my soul shall weep in secret places for your pride; mine eye shall weep sore, and run down with tears, because the LORD'S flock is carried away captive" (Jer. 13:16, 17).

*"Italics" are mostly the Author's.*



## *Appendix* *"In Christ"*

{Quotations from J. N. Darby, old editions}

This presence of the Spirit, all real as it is, is spoken of in a manner which has the force rather of character than of distinct and personal presence, although that character could not exist unless He was personally there. "Ye are in Spirit, if so be that Spirit of God dwell in you." <sup>15</sup> The emphasis is on the word God, and in Greek there is no article before Spirit. Nevertheless it plainly refers to the Spirit personally, for it is said "dwell in you," so that He is distinct from the person He dwells in . . . (Rom. 7, *Synopsis*, vol. 4, p. 194).

He dwells -- Christ having accomplished the work of deliverance, of which this is the power in us -- in the man, and the man is in Christ and Christ in the man . . . This is the Christian's *standing* before God. We are no longer in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in us. There is no other means (*ibid.*, p. 195).

This Spirit dwells in us, acts in us, and brings us in effect into this relationship [the position of Christ] which has been acquired for us by Christ, through that work which He accomplished for us, entering into it Himself (that is, as man risen) (*ibid.*, p. 195).

But here the power of the Holy Ghost comes in which dwells in us . . . 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" "On Sealing," *Collected Writings*, vol. 31, p. 411).

While His work is the basis, it [deliverance] 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 (*ibid.*, p. 413).

The blood of sprinkling having made us perfectly clean in God's sight, the Holy Ghost comes to dwell in us, the seal of the value of that blood, and consequently, so coming to dwell in us, gives us the consciousness that we are in a *new place* before God -- not in the flesh, not in our natural Adam state, but in the condition in which the Spirit sets us in God's presence. *This position* belongs only to those who have the Spirit. It is the Spirit of Christ {Rom. 8:9}. If any man has not this he has not *the proper christian place*, is not of Christ, does not belong to Him according to the power of redemption, which brings us before God according to its own efficacy, of which the Spirit's presence and indwelling is the characteristic seal and living power, that by which those who have entered into this place are distinguished ("Exposition of Romans," *Collected Writings*, vol. 26, p. 250).

The believer is in Christ *by the life of Christ and the Holy Spirit* . . . *The new life and the Holy Spirit give to the believer his place in Christ* . . . A converted man, as such, is only in the christian standing when he has been anointed (*Meditations on Romans*, p. 88).

The presence, and as to the individual, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost constitute Christianity, and the christian state of the individual (*On Sealing*, p. 1).

---

15. Note here, we are said to be "in Christ" in the beginning of the chapter, and in the Spirit here: so, to have the Spirit of Christ and then "if Christ be in you"; because it is by the Spirit we are "in Christ." "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" (Cp. John 14, &c.).



## *Eternal Life*

Eternal life is said to be in the Son rather than in us; just as we should speak of the water being in the reservoir rather than in the pipes or cisterns which it supplies, and through which the water is conveyed to the houses where it is enjoyed. So we speak of life being in the plant or the tree, not in the branch or leaf, though they are alive also by virtue of their connection with the tree. But life is spoken of as being in us (2 Cor. 4:10-12). Eternal life is looked at as the Word, the Son Himself. "In Him was life," {John 1:4} "that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us" {1 John 1:2}. It has qualities and characteristics of its own: it was the Light of men shining in the darkness, and was not understood by them because they were darkness. It was seen, heard, gazed upon, and handled, because manifested in flesh. All this is objective; for we are too prone to look at life subjectively as communicated to us, and to examine it in its details in us, instead of fixing our eyes on it in its source or origin and display in the Son of God.

Two opposite dangers are before us; that of making eternal life, which all Christians possess, a matter of attainment on the one hand, and on the other ascribing to Old Testament saints, or to souls just quickened and under the conviction of sin, or under the law {cp. Rom. 7}, this eternal life, which is the proper portion of the Christian as such, the full revelation of the Father and the Son being known and believed.

A merely convicted soul, wrought on by the Spirit of God where there is a true sense of sin and desire after Christ, is really quickened {Rom. 7:22}; for pain is evidence of life, and these feelings are according to God, and produced by the effect of the Word of God in the soul. This we see in Acts 2 where the reception of the Word preached made those who received it cry out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" They believed the truth spoken about Christ and about themselves, but did not know the value of His death for themselves, or as applicable to the guilt which they felt, and this is what the apostle Peter next presents to them. We see the same work of the Spirit in the apostle himself, when he falls at Jesus knees, saying, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man, O Lord" {Luke 5:8}. Attraction to Christ on the one hand, and the consciousness of his own unfitness and unworthiness on the other. So in many souls in the present day (and still more before the forgiveness of sins was as fully preached as is now) we meet with souls who feel what sin is, and look to Christ as a Mediator between God and themselves, but have no knowledge of His work as clearing them before God. They own Him as Son of man, and even as a divine Savior, but not as the Son revealing the Father; and have still a dread of God, whom they regard at a distance, and do not know as Father. They are as the Israelites in Egypt, before they crossed the Red Sea {Ex. 14}, and had seen all their enemies dead upon the seashore, being brought through as on dry land by the hand of God

Himself. Souls may, like them, know something of the value of the blood, and still look on God as a Judge, and death and Satan's power are still feared. The effect of the resurrection of Christ is not known, nor is God known as Father, nor consequently eternal life; though there exists in the soul faith, repentance, and life, according to the measure in which the truth has been apprehended {cp. Rom. 7}.

But eternal life is placed in Scripture in the knowledge of the Father through the Son and of the work of Christ in its full, perfect character. "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God [the Father] and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent" {John 17:3}. Christ is *lifted up* on the cross as Son of man in order "that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" {John 3:16}; and he who eats His flesh and drinks His blood hath everlasting life {John 6:53}; both passages showing that the proper knowledge or appreciation of the atoning efficacy of the work of Christ gives eternal life, and thus teaching that the possession of it is the normal state of every believer. So the babes are said to know the Father {1 John 2:13}, and this can only be through the Son who reveals the Father; and "this is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day" {John 6:40}. Again, "He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him *that sent Me* [the Father], hath everlasting life." In none of these verses can we make it a matter of attainment. It belongs to the babes, to all who have seen the Son, or known the Father, or have believed in the work of Christ, according to its proper value or efficacy before God. The little children also have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things {1 John 2:20}; and holding fast what they have heard from the beginning, they then continue *in the Son* and *in the Father*.

So in 1 John 4 the testimony is, that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world, and "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is *the Son of God*, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." This involves the possession of eternal life though in the power of the Holy Ghost. The indwelling of the Holy Ghost shows at the same time that all Christian privilege according to the present dispensation is included. When also the eternal life is manifested and declared, it is that fellowship *with the Father and the Son* may be known which is enjoyed by the same life communicated to the soul by the Word; for this fellowship has all the blessed elements of this life both known and participated in, and the full revelation of the Father and the Son. "We beheld His glory," says the apostle, "the glory as of an only begotten with a Father, full of grace and truth" {John 1:14}; and he adds, "Out of His fullness have all received, and grace for grace." This last was not apostolic, but the common property of all in the proper blessing of this dispensation.

By Christ, as the risen Corn of Wheat {John 12:24}, this

life is communicated after His resurrection when He breathed on His disciples {John 20:22}. It could not be given before, and this shows markedly the difference between life incipient or in its first stage -- or as possessed by saints when our Lord was on earth, even though quickened by Him -- and the life more abundantly {John 10:10} bestowed in resurrection power {John 20:22}, and in the new creation, and in the power of the Holy Ghost. Speaking of this He says, "Because I live ye shall live also." "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you." In the gospel of John, save in these anticipative passages, and in John 17, which also looks forward, we never have saints spoken of as "in Him": whereas in the epistle of John it is constant. "We are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and *eternal life*" {1 John 5:20}. "Which thing is true in Him and in you." "In the Son, and in the Father," etc. This life was

given us in Christ Jesus, and promised before the world began (2 Tim. 1:1, 8, 9, 10; Titus 1:2); but this shows its proper sphere and range to be heavenly, both as being before time, and as brought to light *in Him* who abolished death; whereas those who enjoy divine life on earth have their names written in the book of life "*from* the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13:8; 17:8). Their kingdom also was prepared for them from the foundation of the world. In the Old Testament this is spoken of as life for evermore (Psa. 133). We do not read of the revelation of the Father by the Son in the Old Testament, nor in the book of Revelation; nor are millennial saints ever spoken of as "in Christ," nor as wearing a crown of life, though we have generally the idea of sons and daughters of the living God as in Old Testament times with Israel (Deut. 32:19).

From *The Christian Friend* 1888.

*The Manifestation of the  
Divine Nature in the  
Person of Christ*

The Lord's voice crieth unto the city, and the man of wisdom shall see Thy name: hear ye the rod and who hath appointed it (Micah 6:9).

To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word (Isaiah 56).

## *Introductory Remarks on the Errors and Dangers of the Present Moment*

Can two walk together, except they be agreed?

Will a lion roar in the forest, when he hath no prey? will a young lion cry out of his den, if he have taken nothing?

Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no gin is for him? shall one take up a snare from the earth, and have taken nothing at all?

Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in a city, and the Lord hath not done it?

Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.

The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy? -- Amos 3:3-8.

The speculations concerning the Person of Christ, which have been prevalent the last few years, have been the occasion of much distress among us. A special cause of trouble has been that some brethren of weight, whom we all love and honor, have lent their countenance to them, instead of repelling them as unworthy to be entertained for a moment. Such speculations lead inevitably to a separation of the divine and human natures in the Person of Christ, so that that blessed Person, as Scripture presents Him to our faith is virtually lost, and even if it does not end in this, the affection and adoration with which His Person is enshrined in the heart of the believer, are imperceptibly diminished in these discussions. More than forty years ago we had something of the same kind from which souls then suffered greatly. From the first, brethren should not only have refused to allow these questions to be raised amongst us, but they should have been met with indignant and summary judgment. Failing to do this, the sense of their evil nature has been gradually lost, and they have spread far and wide. They have been carried to places abroad from their focus near London, where the writer met with them as well as in England since his return. The desire in writing this paper has been that the souls of those who have been thus affected may be recovered to truer thoughts about the Lord, and right appreciation of His glory, and may judge in themselves that state of soul which has accepted these lowering views of the highest and dearest Object of the heart.

At first the hope was entertained that the warnings of danger that have been given, and the pain which these discussions had occasioned in godly minds, would have deterred those who had indulged in them from pursuing them further, and that their own minds moreover would have recoiled from the evident, though unintentional disloyalty to Christ displayed in them. But it has not been so, and now we have to face the fact that these determined and persistent attempts to discover something new and distinguishing have

found their natural issue in dividing the Person of Christ; so much so that at last we have two lives, not merely the life of the body which could be surrendered on the Cross, nor the varied display of life which every Christian believes, but the upper and the lower, different relationships in different spheres, *distinct and independent* of each other.

The fact is, that no one can entertain these sentiments without suffering loss, and having their thoughts of the blessed Lord beclouded by them. Hence, those we believe to have been truly loyal to Christ, having permitted themselves to be drawn into them, have necessarily lost their footing, and unconsciously have been led to make statements which darken His proper glory.

These statements will be found in the sequel, where they are accompanied by their antidote. To give them here in all their number and undisguised plainness, as the writer has met with them, would be too painful and would greatly distress every right-minded saint. Their true character has been shown in a letter that has been circulated among saints and afterwards withdrawn. That a letter containing such sentiments, on such a subject, from one so prominent, to another well-known and esteemed servant of Christ, should be in circulation amongst us for months, is an ominous fact, but in various parts of England teachers are more or less impregnated with them and imparting them to others, and this was only to be expected, if they were not stamped out at the first. A recent instance we have met with (alluding to the beautiful display of divine sympathy in John 11) is -- "Eternal life never wept!"

Mr. {F. E.} Raven declines being in any way "identified" with the letter referred to, printed at the end of a pamphlet entitled *Be not Deceived*. No one could fairly identify Mr. Raven with what is there expressed, but to say that he has *no responsibility* with regard to it is quite another matter. If he originated the thoughts concerning the Lord

which are worked out in it, and which have now, alas! spread so widely, we cannot hold him clear of responsibility for them.

His letter to Mr. Barker, penned expressly in reply to earnest inquiries as to what was contained in a previous letter to a brother in Ealing, makes this too evident. Mr. Barker forwards to Mr. R. the following questions:

1. Is it true that Mr. Raven has owned (as I am informed) that he was the author of the sentence, "*Fancy a helpless babe an expression of eternal life?*"<sup>1</sup>
2. Does Mr. Raven hold that eternal life was in the Son with the Father before the world was?
3. Does he hold that eternal life is imparted to us?<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Raven replies to Mr. Barker:

Greenwich, March 6,  
1890.

My dear brother, -- I return Mr. {H. H.} Snell's letter. In regard to the first point, I am not aware that I ever penned the sentence supposed to be mine. It is for Major McCarthy, who I believe is the author of the paper, in which the sentence appears in inverted commas, to prove whence he derived it.

As to the other points I think I would bow to Scripture in a moment, but Scripture does *not speak* of Christ having been the eternal life which was with the Father before the world was. That the *Eternal life* was *with the Father* (as I should say essentially) Scripture says, and I have no doubt whatever that the *reference* is to the Son: but the importance of the difference is that John in his Epistle is giving prominence to *the condition* because we have part in it.

Again, Scripture does not I think speak of our having had eternal life imparted to us. What is imparted to us, as I understand it, is life in the power of the Holy Spirit, a well of water in the believer.

Eternal life is in the Son and we are in Him, and live by Him in the power of the Spirit. This is the form in which eternal life is now given to us. I will send you a further line as to the remaining part of your letter.

Your affectionate Brother, F. E. Raven

Mr. Barker to Mr. Raven:

Tonquay, March 19, 1890.

Dear brother, -- I shall be very glad if you will place me in the position to say that the sentence with which Major McCarthy's tract begins never emanated from you.

The sentence I mean is, "Fancy a helpless babe an expression of eternal life!" Possibly in passing from one to another the sentence may have undergone some unintentional change while the substance of the thing

remained. So I shall be more than thankful if you can tell me that not only the sentence as it stands, but no such sentence ever came from you.

If you can do this I think you should be cleared from so serious an imputation. That such a sentence, whoever be its author, is a serious one, you yourself I am sure will readily admit, for if the words "eternal life" were struck out and "the true God" put in, then there are but few who would distinguish it from blasphemous Unitarianism, though the author of it might himself be sound as to the deity of the Son while unwittingly betrayed into a loose way of speaking.

Many letters reach me from various quarters as to these matters, and in moving about from place to place I find brethren speaking of them, and therefore I am anxious to be able to contradict the sentence in Major McCarthy's tract.

One line in your last letter to me seems somewhat confused; you say, "I think that *morally* life is there the moment a person is born again." But how can you speak of life "morally" except as the operation of life actually imparted.

I still hope that you may be led to put forth a simple statement to the effect that you had and have no thought either of denying or enfeebling the fact that Christ was ever "that eternal life which was with the Father" manifested indeed on earth in incarnation, so that it could be seen and handled, but was ever that.

Secondly, that the life of which He is the source, eternal life, is the life with which He quickens and is the life imparted to all believers now.

May I ask that the line you may send me in reply should be a plain answer, such as will need no explanation when giving it to simple souls. -- Ever affectionately yours in Christ,

William Barker

F. E. Raven to W. Barker:

Greenwich, March 20, 1890.

My Dear brother, -- I thank you for your letter, and hasten to reply, I trust plainly.

I have understood that Major McCarthy printed the words, "Fancy a helpless babe an expression of eternal life," supposing them to be an extract from a letter of mine. I am satisfied I never used these words.

When an earlier paper of Major McCarthy's appeared, in writing to a brother at Ealing I pointed out the monstrosity of an assertion of the Major's, that the Lord never ceased to be the EXHIBITION of eternal life from a babe in the manger to the throne of the Father. It was no question of what was there in the babe -- God manifest in the flesh, eternal life, and all else, but of what He was the exhibition, for Major McCarthy meant in detail. He was as a babe the EXHIBITION of infancy in its helplessness, for all else, though there, was for the moment veiled, and it was His glory, for in being made of a woman, becoming man, He came truly and really into humanity in its conditions here, grew and increased in wisdom and stature.

As to new birth being life "morally," I mean that it is not life in power, and power is an essential of life.

A newborn soul is alive, sees and appreciates and delights in what is of God, but wants deliverance and power, the cross, and the well of water within, springing up to everlasting life.

1. {Appendix A will show that F. E. Raven **lied** in denying this. He had written the substance of this remark in a letter dated June 29, 1889. This letter is not found in the 1963 edition of his letters.}

2. No apology is needed for printing these letters. They were written, as we learn from their contents, to satisfy public inquiry; and have been largely circulated in MS.

Liberty and the spring of energies, affections, activities, and enjoyment is, in the believer, in the Spirit of Christ.

I trust, in spite of being harassed by these questions, you are having a good time.

Your affectionate Brother, F. E. Raven

What are we to think of such a reply, or of the refusal of Mr. Raven's friends at Ealing to produce the letter in question, which contains some sentence which they at first communicated, and which undeniably embodies a lowering reflection upon the Person of the only begotten Son of God? Where is the care for the glory of God, when the Lord Himself is in question, and when Mr. Raven and his friends at Ealing persist in concealing that which has given so much occasion for distress among those gathered to the name of Christ. "He that doeth truth cometh to the Light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." Is the Person of the Lord held in so little estimation that such conduct can be passed over, or is the credit of Mr. Raven's character to be held of more importance? His own statement in reply to Mr. Barker, painful as it is, is a confirmation of the deeper gravity of the sentence they agree to conceal.

Alas! it appears of far more consequence to some that the unity of brethren should be preserved than that the dignity and glory of the Son of God should be maintained unsullied. A loud outcry has been raised about the former, but the latter passed over, how lightly! The same may be said with reference to Mr. \_\_\_\_'s letter, now withdrawn, much more being made by some of its being printed, than of such doctrines being written and circulated.

In these letters we have also the three principal facts relating to these doctrines concerning Eternal Life. First, the denial that Christ is spoken of personally as the Eternal Life that was with the Father! secondly, that it is not imparted to us; thirdly, that it is a "condition" or state; fourthly, we may add, from Mr. Raven's letter, obtainable from Vassall Road, that it was not manifested to the world. It results from this that it is not to be manifested in the Christian either, and becomes a mystic, ideal thing, altogether different from the practical exhibition of it, which is insisted on in Scripture.

But let us unravel the sentence in the above quoted letter, March 20:

In writing to a brother at Ealing, I pointed out the monstrosity of an assertion of the Major's that the Lord never ceased to be the EXHIBITION of eternal life from a babe in the manger to the throne of the Father.

Though Mr. Raven admits all was there in the Person of Christ, he will allow *nothing* but the exhibition of *infancy in its helplessness*, because "all else, though there, was for the moment veiled," for He had come "into humanity *in its conditions here*." And they were undoubtedly limited enough.

In the sight of God and of faith, He was, as we have shown in the following pages, ever the exhibition of Eternal Life or what was divine. It belongs to the essential nature and glory of His Person, and this is said to be a

"monstrosity"!

No doubt it would be a mistake to say that He was *presented formally* to Israel as the exhibition of Eternal Life, until His public ministry began. But to characterize as a *monstrosity* this declaration of the glory of Christ shows how dimmed that glory must have been, and betrays unmistakably the hand of the enemy. It is simply a profanation of His glorious Person.

Can we, then, be surprised, when pondering these things and their gravity in the sight of God, that He has made a breach upon us? God will not let Uzzah put his hand upon the Ark, and He will not pass by this indignity rendered to the Person of His Son.

It is remarkable, also, that this breach should have been first made at the place where the questionable letter was sent, which is still concealed. With us it is a question of unity, with God it is a question of a slight put upon the Person of His Son, before which no associations can stand or be allowed a place in His sight. We are far from charging any intention of doing this, even upon those who have gone the furthest in it. It has been done in ignorance of the danger involved in it. Hence, in exposing the serious evil of the expressions that have been used, no names are given, in order to avoid causing needless pain or offence, the desire of the writer being to recover those who have been beguiled into them, by the presentation of Christ in His own glory and blessedness, as the Word of God keeps Him before us. Not that this is to be viewed as a light thing in the sight of God, for when the Ark of God, which was a figure of the Person of Christ and the special link of God's presence with His people, His strength and His glory, and theirs likewise, was desecrated by those Israelites who profanely looked into it, the judgment of God fell upon them. Not only this, but when the hand of Uzzah was put forth to steady it, as he thought, because the oxen shook it, he was smitten by God for his inadvertence, so that the place was called Perez Uzzah, or the breach of Uzzah. But David has to justify God in His resenting the touch of this unholy hand, calling upon the Levites, who were set apart as holy persons for this service, to *sanctify themselves* in order to bring up the Ark, and adding, "Because ye did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us."

What makes all this more serious, is that the Person of Christ is at present the evident object of Satan's attack, not only amongst ourselves, but all around us. In a recent publication of a volume of Essays, the joint production of twelve Oxford clergymen and professors of the High Church school, entitled "Lux Mundi," -- i.e., The Light of the World -- treating on the Person of Christ and the sanction which he puts on Old Testament Scripture, this dividing of His Person into different spheres is carried so far that He is stated to have been ignorant in His human nature of what He knew in His divine nature; and Luke 2:52 is appealed to in support of this doctrine, the same Scripture that is brought forward by those amongst ourselves who lightly venture to reason on this subject.



Brethren in Switzerland, France, Germany, the United States, and Canada are decided in their rejection of these views, and marvel at what they deem the spiritual blindness of their brethren in England, who do not discern their grave import. We have, in addition, been warned against them, almost with the dying breath of two of the most devoted, experienced, and faithful servants of the Lord, and who have been most blessed in their service, now taken "from the evil to come," but this, instead of producing serious inquiry and awakening and self-judgment before God, as to why these watchmen of Israel have sounded the alarm, has only brought out the painful self-confidence that marks this movement, both in its spirit and teaching, with the intimation that they have been removed in judgment!

Two printed papers of Mr. Raven's have just reached us: one on *Eternal Life*, the other, *A Letter to a Brother*, having the address of 73 Vassall Road. The former does not attempt to recall anything that Mr. Raven has written, but carefully evades the points which have been challenged in his views, and puts forward what most, with some exceptions, would accept, and whilst pressing eternal life as the new sphere, and speaking of it as in Christ as Man, carefully avoids stating that He was the Eternal Life personally before the world began, though quoting the Scripture which says, "He is the true God and Eternal Life." This, which is illusive, is explained in the letter below to be applicable to Him after incarnation, because this "*condition*," this "something," was then expressed in Him.

The letter which is subjoined, of later date than the others already given, shows that Mr. Raven's views on the subject of Eternal Life are unchanged.

Greenwich, July 24, 1890

My dear brother, -- It is Mr. Darby who over and over again maintains that eternal life consists in a *condition of relationship and being*,<sup>3</sup> and he brings forward Eph. 1:4, 5, to illustrate it, and (seeing that *that condition* existed, and was manifested, and is now fully expressed, even as to bodily condition, in the Son) he says it is Christ. His words are: "It is Christ Himself, and that revealed as man in glory," and quotes 1 John 5:20 for it.

I strongly object to *the talk* about the personality of Eternal Life, because (as the reference is to Christ) it makes Eternal Life commensurate with the Person of the Eternal Son, and this I believe to be very wrong. In the Epistle of John, the apostle is not, as I understand it, unfolding the Person of the Son; but declaring something that came to light and is now perfectly expressed in Him, and in which, in having

him, we, too, have part. -- Believe me your affectionate Brother,

(Signed) F. E.

Raven  
To Mr. Edwards

We look in vain in either of the two printed papers, especially the last, dated July 3rd, for some expression, or even acknowledgment of errors which have caused so much sorrow among brethren, but instead of this we have the statement of "suffering under charges *without truth*," and that "no cherished truth is *touched*, or given up, or its *force lessened* or unduly pressed." Reading these words we can only conclude that there must be some strange defect in Mr. Raven's estimate of things, or in his memory.

When we recall the original statement which so startled brethren at Witney {1888} that the babes had not (in some sense) eternal life, which was dropped when generally refused; *then* that Eternal Life was a sphere, which, though denied, was proved at a meeting at Park Street to have been said by Mr. Raven, and then modified; *then* that our position in righteousness before God in Christ, "if it means anything, means sin is to be completely displaced in us by Divine righteousness" -- Divine righteousness being thus destroyed by a moral effect being substituted for it; this also was ostensibly modified subsequently; *then*, that the grand display of Divine righteousness, in Romans, in connection with God's character as on the mercy-seat of gold and meeting man there, is reduced to a "reckoning." Eternal Life denied to be Christ personally, with the statement that there is no such thing as responsibility in Christ, and all this, not to speak of the reflections on the Person of the Lord, summed up by Mr. Raven himself in the following terms:

The key to *almost all that I have said* lies in my objection to apply in an absolute way to the believer in his *mixed condition down here* statements in Scripture which refer to what he is, or what is true of him, viewed as "in Christ": such a practice results in the statements becoming mere dogmas, conveying little sense of reality

--what can we think of the sentence that "no cherished truth has been touched, or its force lessened?" or what confidence can we feel in Mr. Raven's representations of his own views?

This systematic weakening of the believer's connection with God and standing before Him, is backed by accusations of his brethren as, "Limiting Divine righteousness to the believer being justified -- and therefore to Christ being raised<sup>4</sup> -- confining 'in Christ' to a present position, so that it brings no light of eternal purpose or future glory -- separating in the believer, eternal life from the Holy Ghost," &c., charges which are dropped in the printed letter of March 21, without a word of the wrong done in making them. All this raises the saddest reflections

3. No one of course denies that Eternal life is enjoyed in an out of the world *condition* of relationship and being, but to make it *only* a condition, is, as Mr. Darby shows in extracts given at the close of this paper, to destroy its true nature, as well as what Christ is personally. It is, as has been observed, making life consist in the element, instead of in the being it is fitted for; for example, in the water the fish lives in, instead of in the fish. No doubt there must be the element or the fish could not live, but the life is in the fish, not in the water. Even in those animals which change from an aquatic condition to one totally different, and are fitted with wings to enjoy and to live in a new sphere, an atmospheric element, this life is not in the element but in themselves. (The italics are ours.)

4. A general accusation, only supported by an individual and exceptional example in either case.

as to their author, though we are far from thinking he intends or even knows the mischief which all this is working in the souls of many; but his declarations are the proof that he is being used by the enemy of souls and of the truth for his purposes, as indeed any of us may be, if we allow our minds to work upon the truth of God. Satan never gives us error pure and undiluted, but mixed up with and disguised by accompanying truth, which for the time being, causes the error to be overlooked.

With views such as these there can be no compromise. We trust indeed that when godly souls perceive the length to which they have gone, and that the central Object of their faith and of heaven and earth has been thus assailed, their hearts, if hitherto unsuspecting, will deeply feel that what is dearer than life itself (and hallowed by ten thousand associations of Divine life and love and glory), has been

involved in this sorrowful trespassing upon holy ground. Christian, can you suffer persons or associations, however cherished, to stand in the way, when the Lord who bought you is in question? Will aught of these things compensate you for what will surely end in the loss of His Person, or even the partial eclipse of His glory? Bear with me, while for a moment, one who owes everything to that blessed Lord, and who loves you for His sake, seeks to recall the heart to a sense of His own blessedness and perfections, by presenting Him to you as the Holy Ghost sets Him before us, in the infallible word of truth.

## *The Manifestation of the Divine Nature in The Person of Christ*

The pretension to fathom such adorable mysteries as the Trinity, or the blessed Person of Christ, is both folly and irreverence. The Lord Himself tells us that no man knoweth the Son but the Father. How can the finite creature fathom the infinite? The mind of man has no adequate measure for it, and must be infinite as God Himself to do so. Were it possible to penetrate that mystery, Christ would soon cease to be the holy, precious, and ever-increasing object of interest to the heart. For a subject that our thoughts can scan or compass soon loses its attraction for us, and in the end comes to be neglected or despised. The search, therefore, into the mystery of godliness, "God manifest in the flesh," the human mind is precluded from entering upon; not only because it transcends its powers, but it is forbidden ground; God has so reserved it in order to maintain its precious and sacred character. It is as inscrutable to angels, or any created being, as to ourselves. It is not only no man, but "no one (οὐδεὶς) knoweth the Son but the Father": this mystery is in the secret knowledge of the Father alone.<sup>5</sup> Yet, with this reservation, to endeavor to remove false conceptions raised by the enemy of souls, by showing the way in which Scripture presents Christ to us, is sometimes right and even imperative, for the sake of those who have been beguiled into them, and for His sake who is God and Man in one blessed person for ever. Nevertheless, this is holy ground, and the shoes of our feet should be taken off in approaching it.

"Great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in flesh."<sup>6</sup> All that is essentially and properly divine, and all that is truly and perfectly human, were found combined in the unity of His Person apart from the taint of sin and its inevitable consequences, corruption and subjection to death. And though we cannot tell how, yet Scripture shows us that He was always at the same moment, and at times evidently

in the same acts, dependent Man as well as manifest God,<sup>7</sup> the Infant of days as well as the Ancient of days. The angels could celebrate His entry in divine love upon this scene of human woe and misery, (to take up as Man the cause of fallen man) *as the expression* of glory to God in the highest and of the divine good pleasure in man (manifested in the assumption of manhood): and faith could delight in the Virgin's seed, "as the Dayspring from on high," who had come to bruise the serpent's head, conquering death in divine power on our behalf. Yet, He Himself tells us what He felt in the apparent, and yet real, weakness of infancy, in the touching appeal He makes to His Father, when, hanging on the Cross, reminding Him of that dependence which was to Him so sweet, and of the confidence which He alone could exercise in those earliest moments of human life. "But thou art He who took me out of the womb; *thou didst make me hope*, when I was upon my mother's breasts. I was cast upon thee from the womb, thou art *my God from my mother's belly*" (Psa. 22:8, 9). Even in infancy the blessed unfailing sense of personal relationship, the dawning of hope, the expectation of faith that could not be disappointed, that had all its stay in God, are all presented to God whose title and place as Jehovah had even then awakened this response in the soul of that holy One.

This is all the more remarkable and intelligible also when we perceive from the comparison of Matt. 27:43, and Psa. 22:8, that the position and circumstances in which the Lord was found on our account, had given occasion to the taunt in which His enemies mocked His trust in God and His relationship to Him: "He trusted in God; let Him deliver him now, if He will have him; for he said, I am the Son of God." And this awakens the reply: "But *thou art* He that took me out of the womb. Thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts." Even in the case of John the Baptist, for instance, the angel says, "He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb"; hence

5. Even in our own marvelous constitution we have something analogous, a mystery we cannot solve, the union of two natures, body and soul in one person. *How* they are united, and act and react mutually upon each other we cannot tell; *the fact* is known to us, as in divine mysteries that have been revealed to our faith, but the mode or manner is hidden from us. This is the case with innumerable powers and secrets of nature -- the law of gravitation, what it is, *why* it acts as it does; the life of a plant, and *how* it assimilates certain elements from the soil and atmosphere around it and rejects others.

6. Dean Burgon has proved from the consensus of ancient MSS., early translations and citations of the passage, that the preponderance of evidence is in favor of it as it stands in the authorized version (θεός, and not ὁς).

7. This will be seen as we proceed, but among others we may instance the Lord's giving thanks for the loaves and the fishes whilst He multiplies them for the need of the multitude that surrounded Him (Mark 6:41; 8:6, 7). His cure of the man who was deaf and had an impediment in his speech, in Mark 7., when "He put His fingers into his ears and spit and touched his tongue, and, *looking up to heaven*, He sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened (read *ver.* 35, 37); in John 11., when acting as the resurrection and the life, He calls the dead out of the grave with the words, "Lazarus, come forth," and at the same time tells how the Father had heard Him: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always, but because of the people which stand by, I said it that they may believe that thou hast sent me" (*ver.* 41, 42).

Elizabeth, when “filled with the Holy Ghost,” exclaims, “Whence is this to me that the mother of *my Lord* should come to me, for as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the babe *leaped in my womb* for joy” (Luke 1:47, 48). What things incredible to human reason happen, where God is at work, and where, He for His glory, is pleased to display Himself! And how much more when this display is in the Son Himself!

But I shall be told, perhaps, by some one only partially acquainted with facts, that what has been stated, is, that in certain acts human life only was manifested. But how dare any one presume to affirm this? Who can assign limits either to the extent and range, or to the manifestation of the divine or the human in Christ? and who can tell what appeared to the eye and mind of God in that blessed One? If any lower estimate is taken, we are in danger of falling below the level which is proper to faith. The Jews had their blind and mistaken thoughts concerning Him, and the disciples beheld Him in the twilight of their own partially enlightened minds, which never rose to the divine estimate. Hence in attempting to discern what was manifested in Him to others, unless we keep in view what appeared to the eye of God, we necessarily descend to what unbelief, partial or entire, beheld, and take that estimate for our own. It has been the fear of this, combined with the sacredness of the subject, that has hitherto kept reverential minds from attempting to draw the line, or seeking to define with exactitude what is expressed in the acts of our blessed Lord; though in the different Gospels we see Him presented in various aspects, one giving us more of the human element, as in Luke, and another, as in John, more of the divine.

Why has this holy and sensitive feeling been cast aside? and the silence, which Scripture maintains respecting His life with His parents after the earliest stage of infancy, been rudely invaded? Is it not a holy wisdom that has veiled these years, along with His early life and His occupations, from our eye, lest we should intrude with our fleshly mind where Scripture and the Holy Ghost do not lead us? And though we are far from denying that He filled such a position with His reputed father, Joseph, yet we should not forget that it was not the Holy Ghost, but His rejecters, in order to depreciate His person and worth, who said, “Is not this the carpenter?” (Mark 6:3).

When at twelve years of age He is found in the Temple sitting in the midst of the doctors, in the very center of Jewish learning, and though with faultless propriety He takes the place of inquiry, both hearing them and asking them questions, we read of the effect produced: “All that heard Him” (even the doctors) “were *astonished* at His understanding and answers.”<sup>8</sup> And this was really service of the highest order, for being challenged by His mother with the words, “Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold

thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing,” she is answered with the rebuke: “How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about My Father’s business?” This reply intimates the glory of His own Person as the Son, His relationship with the Father, the supreme and divine character of that service He came to render. Striking indeed at such an age this must have been in their eyes. Was not their anxiety natural, and might they not justly have expected He should remember what appeared due to them, for He had remained behind in Jerusalem for three days, whilst they were returning home? But the claims of His Person and service were paramount, and far from being excused, His parents are blamed for their want of perception of the higher glories of His Person, and the purport of His presence here below, and this was before His public anointing and recognition by the Holy Ghost resting upon Him. It is also the more remarkable because, having thus indicated His personal glory and liberty of action, we are told: “He went down to Nazareth and was subject unto them.” This was the fulfillment of the prescribed obedience of the law; but, lest man’s unbelief should infer it was a mere human act, which had no divine spring and motive characterizing it, we are told by the prophet respecting the whole of this obedience: “He will magnify the law and make it honorable” (Isa. 42:21).

The law, as coming from God, would have put honor on any mere creature, who fulfilled it, but here this is reversed, and the law itself is honored and exalted by the dignity of the Person who undertook to accomplish it. Thus it was with every relationship in which He was found, every position which He filled in His life here below. He conferred honor upon it, shedding a divine luster on all the human path He trod in this world.

Everywhere indeed throughout His course we shall find this divine element, which lent its sweet savor to His life. The meat offering is specifically given as an exemplification of this. It was composed of three elements, the fine flour, the oil, and the frankincense; the fine flour without leaven is the fruit of the earth, significant of the pure and holy humanity of Christ, where no trace of sin or corruption, but all human perfection, was found; and next we have the special action and presence of the Holy Ghost, both in His birth and His anointing at His baptism. In order to make this more emphatic, and show the permeating power of the Holy Ghost, characterizing that holy nature and life throughout, the offering was parted in pieces and oil poured upon it, for there was this spring in it from its origin: “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*” (Luke 1:35). Lastly we find the frankincense which was to be wholly consumed upon the altar. The remainder of the offering was to be eaten by the priests, but only after the handful called “the memorial” had been taken out and burnt as a sweet savor unto the Lord with *all the frankincense*. This sets forth typically the fragrance which the divine element lent to all that human life and perfect devotedness and obedience. “Who made *Himself* of no reputation and took upon Him the

8. For the Holy Ghost says, “He was *filled* with wisdom,” and this was from the earliest (Luke 2:40); also that He grew in wisdom (ver. 52). But all this is unfathomable.

form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross" (Phil. 2:7, 8). This humiliation for the glory of God was so precious to God that all His future exaltation and place of supremacy as Man is due to it. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him and given Him a name which is above every name." But whilst the frankincense was entirely for God and offered to God, the fragrance of it so filled the atmosphere that none within its range could be unconscious of it.

Here we may pause for a moment to observe that the meat offering as repeatedly stated in Scripture, was a thing "*most holy* of the offerings of the Lord made by fire" (Lev. 2:3, 10, 16). The whole of it was to be presented to the Lord. Only the priests in their full character as such, were to partake of it. It was to be eaten in the *holy place*, every one that touched it was to be *holy*. Communion with God and nearness to Him and the sense of His presence, and of the holiness of this precious subject now before us are thus prescribed, as the necessary accompaniment and safeguard which Scripture throws around it. Has this been maintained in all that has transpired of late?

Never was there an act of Christ, even as Man, which did not exhale this perfume, and to which this divine life did not give its worth, its character, and perfection. In all the Gospels it is discernible to the spiritual eye; in John it is predominant, for there is no essential difference, though there are various aspects to what is divine; just as there are different *colors* and shades of color in the rainbow, though all proceed from, and are combined in, one ray of light. We know that in the earlier Gospels, especially in Matthew, where He is presented as the Messiah of Israel, the Object and Accomplisher of the promises, there was special reason for His hiding His glory (veiled as it was in the lowly guise of manhood), in order that Israel and the heart of man might be fully put to the proof, and that He might be owned by faith, not by sight or sense; which moreover, could not appreciate His true worth. Such were the conditions for the divine glory, under which He came. For Israel had been the subject of the divine dealings for ages past, under priesthood, law, kings, and prophets, and now was to be subjected to the last great test by which man was to be tried, the presence of God in love on this earth, whilst at the same time accomplishing or offering the fulfillment of the special promises given to that favored people. It is this that accounts for the special character of the Lord's presence and activities in this Gospel, though a stumbling-block to unbelief, as Scripture foretold, often resulting in the denial of the true glory of His person. Listen to the expression of what is an apparent inconsistency to the darkness of the human mind, in the words of His brethren, in the days of their unbelief. "Depart hence (out of Galilee), and go into Judea, that Thy disciples also may *see* the works that Thou doest. For there is no man that doeth anything *in secret* and he himself seeketh to be *known openly*. If thou do these things show thyself to the world" (John 7:2-5). For this display is what

man expects and looks for. But wisdom is justified of her children, for there was ample evidence to all that the God of Israel was there. And more than this, the character of God as come in love into the world, shone out in this way more than it ever could have done, had there been a visible or external glory apparent to the eye of man, and suited to flatter the pride of his corrupt heart.

But was not Israel held responsible according to the real glory of the Lord, when amongst them as Incarnate? What were the terms in which His birth was predicted? "Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, *God with us*" (Matt. 1:22). This was the sign given to the house of David of God's faithfulness, when that house seemed at its lowest point. He was the virgin's seed and yet Emmanuel. The remnant of Israel declare their conviction, and make their boast of this. "Unto us *a child is born*, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Father of Eternity, the Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6). Again, we say, it was a question of what faith always saw in that wondrous Babe. We have seen what the Angels beheld, and when the aged Simeon enters the Temple, his heart filled with exultation, he takes the Babe in his arms and blesses God and says: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word: For mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people" (Luke 2:29). "How could a helpless babe be the manifestation of eternal life" says one. How could Simeon "see" God's salvation in that Babe, and glory in it? -- has been the just reply given to the miserable reasoning of the human mind. He was announced by the Angel to the shepherds as, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David, *a Savior*, which is Christ *the Lord*," and this is Jehovah, for His title of Lordship over all as Man, is only given to Him in resurrection (Rom. 1:4), but His very name of Jesus, bestowed by the Angel, is the definite expression of His presence here as the Jehovah of Israel. "And she shall *bring forth a son*, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for He shall save His people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21; comp. Luke 2:21). Jesus -- that is Jehovah Savior -- the words added, *His people* whom *He* shall save, bring out more distinctly that it is Jehovah Himself who is manifested in this Babe.

Thus does the Holy Ghost, as if to guard us against the low unbelieving thought of the natural mind, delight to surround the One who, we are told, has been displayed as "a helpless babe," with varied testimonies to His glory, even in that very condition. The exultation and praises of the heavenly host attendant on that moment; the witness rendered by John the Baptist, or rather by the Holy Spirit even before His birth; the worship awakened in the heart of Simeon, as he glories in what he, by faith, discerns and possesses in this Babe born at Bethlehem; the honor rendered by the wise men from the East with their gold and frankincense and myrrh; all alike combine to show the way in which God delights to keep Him before us, as the holy

Object of faith, communion and adoration, and to put to shame the denial of the manifestation of divine life in Him at any moment of His history. All this is the more remarkable, because occurring chiefly in the Gospel of Luke, which dwells mostly on His character as Son of Man, and gives us all the human relationships in which He stood, and which have been used to divide or lower the dignity of His Person.

Of old we were rightly warned against the danger (on either side) of "dividing the Person or confounding the substance," as it has been termed -- i.e., supposing that the Godhead was changed into manhood, or manhood into Godhead, by their union in the Person of Christ: this would equally neutralize the value and be destructive of both natures, and would not be union, but transformation. But it was also observed by an eminent servant of God, that, so perfect was the union of the divine and human in the Christ of God, that what properly belonged to one nature, is in Scripture constantly applied to the other. "No man hath ascended up to heaven but He that *came down* from heaven, even the *Son of Man which is in heaven*" (John 3:13). "The bread of God" (Christ as manifested in His humanity here below) "is He which cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world" (John 6:33). These passages speak of Him as Man, and yet of His personal presence in heaven at that very moment, and preexistence there. In the first citation, when He was conversing with Nicodemus, and when he had moreover been telling him of *earthly* things, He says no one could tell him of heavenly things but He that came down from heaven, but whose intercourse with heaven and with His Father, were as infinite as His own being. "The Son *who is* in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." In Gal. 2. also and where *we* should have said the Son of Man, the Apostle Paul says, "The Son of God loved me and gave Himself for me." And again, implying His divine Presence, "Lo I am *with you always*, even to the end of the world." But above all are the words addressed to Him: "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against *the man* that is my *Fellow*, saith the Lord of hosts" (Zech. 13:7).

Even in speaking of the divinity and humanity of Christ, we have to be most guarded, for "God and Man are one Christ." Hence some have unwittingly erred in saying this was divinity, and that humanity, this was eternal life, and that was not eternal life; for, though we may speak of one nature predominating, or being more expressed than the other, in certain acts, the moment we speak of them separately, we divide them, and the Person is virtually falsified or lost. In Him the divine and human are *never abstract*, but always in their mutual relation to each other as combined. Scripture never speaks of Him but in the *unity* of His Person: "*Jesus* wept," -- "*Jesus* therefore being wearied with His journey, sat thus on the well -- i.e., He is spoken of under His personal name, which includes all that He is, Jehovah Savior. If I say, eternal life was never weary, I have made the divine *abstract*, and separated it from its relative position in the Person of Christ, and lost the thought of how both were involved and affected by their co-relation. Thus all the

perfect and divine love that made Him stoop so low, and come into the condition and circumstances of human want and weakness to win the heart, is lost. He asks indeed for a drink of water for *His thirst*, and He is *hungry* as well as *weary* as He sits upon the well, but He is Himself the Fountain and the Giver of the living water that He gives, and that water becomes a well itself in the soul, springing up to *life eternal*. Had the woman, as He says, but known *who it was* that said to her, "Give me to drink," it would have put her in the place of a lowly suppliant and recipient, of all this blessing; and yet we are now told that in all this, He is not the manifestation of eternal life! Again, we repeat that the Spirit, in the word, *never* speaks of our Lord but in the unity of His Person. "*Jesus, knowing*"<sup>9</sup> that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled saith, *I thirst*" (John 19:28). It is the same blessed Person, who, whether in the fullness of divine knowledge, or in lowly utterance from the depths of His humiliation, expresses Himself in these words: "They gave *me* also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave *me* vinegar to drink" (Psa. 69:21). It is because of what He is in the unity of His Person, that all His sufferings, and all His love to us in them, have their value to the heart.

Where is the separation here into "the upper and the lower life," nor "having to return to communion with His Father," as we are told He had to do after His conversation with the Samaritan woman in John 4?<sup>10</sup>

John the Baptist, contrasting Him with himself, says, "He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth; He that cometh from heaven is above all; and what He *hath seen and heard* that He testifieth" (John 3:31, 32); and again He says Himself, "He that hath sent me is true, and I speak *to the world* those things that I have *heard of Him*," and, as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things" (John 8:26, 28), and, "He that sent me is with me, the Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please Him" (*ver.* 29). Again, both to the Jews and to the disciples, He avers that the words and the works were expressive, not only of what He was essentially, but also demonstrative of His oneness with the Father. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not, but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and believe that the Father is *in me* and *I in Him*" (John 10:37, 38). "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?" and this, "*he* that hath seen" is *absolute*, not limited to the disciples. Referring again to His works and words, and the consequent guilt of His rejection by the world, He says, "Now have they both *seen* and hated *both me and my Father*" (John 15:24). His words therefore, and all that He did were the expression of this perfect unity, and were spoken in the infinite communion which flowed

9. In the Gospel of John this divine knowledge of the Lord is always brought before us (John 2:24,25; 6:6; 18:4).

10. This was modified by the statement that He returned to the joy of communion, but has been defended by teachers in its original form, as a proper and suitable remark.

from it. If He had to return to communion with His Father, He must have quitted it, and His words have ceased to be the manifestation of that divine unity, which *He* unequivocally declares they exhibited.

The Apostle John speaks in his Epistle of “the *Word of Life*,” for *the life* was manifested; “that *eternal life* which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us” (1 John 1:2). This is the essential nature of what was divine in the Person of Christ, *before* manifestation, *when* manifested, and (elsewhere in Scripture) as *now* on high. As seen in the world, He *could* not but display it, for it is what He was and is, essentially, whether before man or with the Father. It includes what He is *personally* and in *relationship*, for it was “(παπα) with the Father,” which is the expression of personal relationship; whilst “the Word of Life” indicates the manifestation of the mind of God; and “the Word” again identifies it with the Person who was with God, and was God, and was made flesh, and dwelt among us (John 1:1, 2, 14). Not to express this life when on earth, wherever and before whomsoever He was, must have been to cease, to exist, or to be Himself, in the world.

We have the Word presented to us in John 1 in all its varied relations, in the absoluteness of Godhead, *with God*, and *as God*, the eternal Creator; then in connection with men as having entered the scene where men were. Was the “life” invisible? Just the opposite; it was universal light, for it shines upon every man, and shows everything in its true character. “That which doth make manifest is light.” Angels saw God displayed for the first time, though borrowing light, so to speak, from that which was given as the Light of *men*. This Word of life, carried with it as the Light of men, its attractive, penetrating, exposing, and quickening character. Not a ray of divine Light was wanting; all was displayed, and displayed to the world and among men, and to men. “Yet a little while is the Light with you,” says the Lord: “Walk whilst ye have” (not some light) but “the Light, lest darkness come upon you; for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth. While ye have the light, believe in the Light, that ye may be the children of light” (John 12:35, 36).

The moral qualities of this divine or eternal life displayed in the world are light and love. “God is light,” and “God is love,” and it was impossible for the one to be hidden, as the other, when Christ was here. Indeed they cannot be separated in manifestation, in what He is, or God would be falsified. These are, as has been observed, the only two essential properties of the divine nature. For righteousness, holiness, majesty, &c., are all attributes, and are relative, whilst light and love are absolute. Constantly therefore in Scripture we find them associated in the manifestation of what was divine in this world (John 3:16, 19, 1 John 1:5, 4:8, 9, 2:8, 11). The latter passage, which refers to its manifestation *in us* shows that they must coexist (see *ver.* 9, 10) as flowing from what Christ is, “which thing” (speaking of the new commandment, love) “*is true in Him and in you*, because the darkness is past, and the true

light now shineth.” Again, in ch. 3:14, of this Epistle, love is given as the evidence of *this life* in us in association with Christ. “We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.” In the Gospel of John we have the characteristics of this life, which display, either what God is to man, or the Son as come from the Father; in the Epistle more of the traits of this life as manifested in the Christian. Hence righteousness, dependence, obedience, &c., are added, as well as all the enjoyment of relationship and communion. But all is included in the display (John 14:31).

As the Son also, manifesting the Father, and coming from the Father into the world, He bore *a glory* (when “made flesh”) adapted to the condition of man; “the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.” This grace and truth shone out in the world, and this was in contrast with the law, which had indeed a glory of its own, for the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth (that which God was, as meeting the evil, and as supremely above it) came by Jesus Christ. “*No man* hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.” It is the absolute manifestation of God, as the Father, through the Son, according to what the divine nature was (in itself and even in relationship, the Son in the bosom of the Father), which brought out all the grace which could be displayed through such a medium, and in terms which render evident, that God in this divine perfection, never could have been seen or known otherwise. If sin had not been in the world, and man what he was and is, never should we have seen all that was heavenly, and all that was divine, expressed in infinite perfection. Had aught of that perfection been hidden, God had not been completely glorified, nor man fully tested; nor could it have been displayed, save in the unity of the divine nature, and in the perfect communion with the Father, deep and full as the Godhead itself.

But not only this, the world into which He came was a world into which sin had entered, and death and ruin were all around Him. In the absence of all that was of God, of all divine life, the necessities of the soul of man were deep, the ruin infinite; for men were not only in darkness, but “alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, by reason of the hardness of their heart.” Was there nothing in Christ, as the Eternal Life, responding to their condition? adapted to this moral ruin? suited to the wants of the soul awakened, when light from God enters, or when it begins to say: “How many hired servants of my Father have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger? I will arise and go to my Father, &c.” (Luke 15:15, 17, 18)?

Was not His presence here the answer on God’s part, or rather that of the Father, to this need, as well as fitted to awaken the sense of it? He Himself makes use of the illustration -- the Manna, the bread which came down from

heaven, to satisfy the necessities of Israel in the desert. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a *man* may eat thereof and not die; I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat 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" (John 6:50, 51). Again, "I am the bread of life." Is not this personal and eternal? and, "my *Father giveth you* the true bread from heaven." "For the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and *giveth life unto the world*" (John 6:32, 33, 35). Again, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth in Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water" (John 7:37, 38), for from Him the streams of eternal life flow. What also does He Himself tell us of "His words," which He spoke at this very time (John 6) at Capernaum? "The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and *they are life*." And again of His words which He had received of the Father who "gave Him commandment what He should say and what He should speak"? "I know that His commandment *is life everlasting*, whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

Does this imply that these words of life (or all that Christ *was* as the Eternal Life, the Light of life, the Bread of life, or the Giver of the water of life), were received? No. But the effect was felt, as the reply in John 6 tells: "Lord, evermore give us this bread." Whilst not only could the Apostle Peter say, "Thou hast the words of eternal life"; but the officers sent by the chief priests and scribes to take Him, were disarmed by them, giving as the reason why they could not touch Him, "Never man spake like this man"; and these words of eternal life, because they were such, form the judgment of those who have rejected them at the last day (John 12:48-50).

But if this eternal life manifested in the world, and for man as such, in these varied ways and aspects, is denied, how deep is the deprivation to souls: how much of the beauty and attractiveness of the Gospel has disappeared! Like the Calvinistic system, which is limited to the elect, and has only something to offer to *them*; instead of Christ as the Eternal Life being the blessed display of, and response on, God's part to the spiritual wants of the human soul -- man, as such, is excluded from its sympathy and its outflow; though the words "whosoever," and "any man," constantly tell of the universality of its character, as it has been so often proclaimed, as coming down from the heart of God to sinners in this world.

Even His relationship and intercourse with the Father, and the Father's delight in Him, is positively declared among men, and this not only in the Gospel of John, but in Matthew also, the most Jewish of all the Gospels in its aspect. This at once accounts for the revelation of the Father's name in that Gospel, and shows that whilst we may see and learn much from the varied presentation of the

features of the blessed Person of the Savior in these different Gospels, we must beware of restricting them, or excluding what does not appear to be the special subject of the Spirit of God in that Gospel; for some additional ray of glory may, according to the perfection of that Person, throw further light on our view of His dignity and beauty, and on the Scripture itself. See Matt. 11:27.

In the Gospel of John, the Lord refers, amongst other public and emphatic testimonies that had been rendered to His glorious Person, to that of the Father, as special and above all other testimony to the Jews, saying: "The Father Himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me" (John 5). But it is remarkable that this testimony of the Father is much more fully given in the Gospel of Matthew, where the heavens open over Him (for He is the object of heaven, though in humiliation here on earth), the Spirit, like a dove, descends upon Him, and the voice of the Father is openly heard, saying in language that invites the attention of all, "*This* is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:14, 17). This revelation by the Father accounts for the grace made known, and in which the Father is revealed and acts in this Gospel, and the consequent conduct to be exhibited by the believer in manifesting the grace of the Father, as above the evil in this world (Matt. 5), which is far beyond what the revelation of the Messiah would imply. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (Matt. 5:48).

It has been said that when the Lord retired to a remote part of Israel's land, to the borders of Tyre and Sidon, and would have no man know it; surely this was not the display of divine life? Who is this, we may reply, that darkens counsel by words without knowledge? Is this the light in which the Holy Ghost presents this remarkable scene to us? (Matt. 20 and Mark 7). Grieved with the unbelief and the blindness occasioned by the formal religion which enveloped the people that He loved and hindered their discerning His glory -- a grief which He expressed elsewhere in the words, "How long shall I be with you and suffer you," -- He withdraws and takes the place and attitude described in the prophet: "Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. And I will wait upon Jehovah who *hideth His face* from the house of Jacob, and I will look for Him" (Isa. 8:16, 17). This was a divine action, and suited to the moment. He hides His face full of grace and healing power from an unbelieving nation. The Spirit's comment on this is, "But He could not be hid," for it was impossible that the beauty of that light could cease to penetrate even into some dark recesses of the human heart, where need existed. The Syrophenician woman attracted by it (though the Lord does not forget even then the primary claims of Israel), touches the spring of *divine fullness* of blessing, that was there overflowing even to the dogs. This could not be limited to the Jews, but reached even to a Gentile outcast in the distance, for God was manifest in grace, and she receives the response, "O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou wilt" (Matt. 15:28).



It will be now intelligible why John 3:14-16, containing the beautiful type of the brazen serpent, has been taken away from the sinner as such, and we are told it is “*not the beginning* of the Gospel.” But Scripture shows that it is for those who are “*perishing*,” and in death, an effect of the serpent’s power, and goes on to say, “*For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life*” (John 3:16). So that in both cases we have the perishing condition and eternal life, first in the death of the Son of *Man* on behalf of man (John 6:51); and then the love of *God* who has given *His Son* for *the world* and bestows *eternal life* according to the value of that gift, with *whosoever* believeth added in each case. Was He not lifted up for the world to see, as an effect of God’s love, and there and then, that “whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life?” But no, all this would not suit the system which denies that eternal life is presented to the world, and is a conditional relationship in which the world of course could have no interest. The most beautiful display of Christ’s person and work to the world, and which has been so wonderfully blessed to souls, is gone, and has even become “repulsive.”<sup>11</sup> Whilst another teacher avowed that he could not preach the Gospel any more from the Gospel of John.

But this manifestation of that life which was divine or eternal so characterized the Person of the Blessed Lord that the body was included in it. As the Apostle says: “That which was from the beginning . . . which our hands have handled, of the Word of life” (1 John 1:1).<sup>12</sup> Sometimes it flowed out in such power, that “the whole multitude sought to touch Him for there went virtue out of Him and healed them all;” sometimes He makes use of that which flowed from His body as conveying this living power; as when He made clay of spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay (John 9:6), figure of divine power and the humiliation of manhood combined (see also Mark 7:33; 8:23). There remains the glorious expression of this Eternal Life which is in Him, when applied to His saints, to put them in the same condition of life and glory as Himself. To this He alludes, in reply to the inadequate thoughts of Martha, when He says: “I am the resurrection and *the Life*; he that believeth in Me though he were dead yet *shall he live*: and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die” (John 11:20). This life was in Him then, for it is what He is, in Himself. When this shines forth from Him in quickening power it will raise to life and swallow up mortality in life, for those who remain, and fill the whole scene with this grand and wondrous exhibition of what He is essentially in His own Person. Not only we have this

word, “*I am*,” applied so often to the fullness of Eternal Life, in such varied aspects and ways, but finally He is presented in the Revelation as the Tree of life, in the paradise or city of God, bearing *twelve* manner of fruits, on which our souls shall feed throughout eternity; whilst during the Millennium the leaves of this Tree of life, “are for the healing of the nations,” and the water of life “proceeds out of the throne of God and of the Lamb” (Rev. 22:1, 2).

Christ is spoken of personally and essentially as the Life or the Eternal Life, just as He is addressed as “Jehovah,” or as “the Word;” for to be the source and spring of spiritual life, to give it or to maintain it, is a divine prerogative, and this Eternal Life is a special manifestation or aspect of the divine in Him. But though it is what He is essentially, it does not, any more than His title of “Jehovah,” or than that of “the Word,” include all that He is essentially; hence the idea that the participation in it introduces us into Deity, which is given as a reason for its being a condition or relationship, and not what Christ is personally, is a mistake; for it is not a question of His divine attributes, such as omniscience, omnipotence, &c., which are incommunicable, but of the moral qualities of the divine nature, in which we can participate, being made “partakers of the divine nature;” “the seed of God remains in him” (the believer), “and he cannot sin because he is born of God” (1 John 3:9).<sup>13</sup>

It is because it is personal, and that blessed Person who is the true God and Eternal Life, *is the Son*, that we who now believe, through His death and resurrection are introduced into His blessed relationship with the Father, for now He shares, as Man, what He had before the world was, with the Father, and having united us with Himself as Man risen from the dead, He can bring us into the sweetness and blessedness of what was His own with the Father. “Then I was by Him as one brought up with Him” (Prov. 8:30); “the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him” (John 1:18); and if there is this divine glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, out of His fullness *have we all* received, and grace for grace (ver. 18); so that we share in the Father’s love to Him, and in all the depth of this relationship. “Go, tell my brethren, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and unto my God and your God” (John 20:17). As He says Himself, when speaking of His own nearness, and the joy of relationship, “These things I speak in the world that they might have *my joy* fulfilled in themselves” (John 17:13).<sup>14</sup>

11. This comes from a mistake in not distinguishing the word “manifest” in John 14:21-22, from “manifested” in 1 John 1-2. See Appendix C. . . . (not available).

12. This was when He became incarnate as the words “from the beginning” show, and not merely in resurrection life. They could not handle or gaze upon a sphere or condition.

13. For God quickens by His Word, which is the expression of His nature, or what He is morally, just as a man’s breath and words are the expression of what he is. Hence Christ is called “the Word,” as well as the “Life,” or “the Eternal life.”

14. Mr. Darby gives us the clue to this in the following passage; “Christ introduces [us] into the enjoyment of that which is His own -- of His own position before the Father. This is blessedly true in every respect, except, of course, essential Godhead and oneness with the Father; in this He

(ὁὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ...)

But if Eternal life is “not imparted to us,” as we are now told, and if it is not Christ Himself, and what He was before the world began, and if it was not manifested to the world; not only there is no link with this infinite fullness, but it becomes some ideal mystic invisible thing, a sphere or condition, substituted for the divine reality presented to us in the Word of God.

It was the revelation of the Father, in contrast with Judaism and the knowledge of Jehovah in covenant relationship with His earthly people, which introduced into this new position of sonship and eternal life in its heavenly associations and character; for according to Matt. 25:31, Rom. 14:2 [sic], it has its earthly sphere and associations as well as its heavenly. But here the Lord takes His place on high, in the glory He had with the Father before the world was (and where His own are to be with Him, and behold Him) -- in order to give eternal life. Yet He says: “I *have* declared unto them Thy name and *will* declare it.” So that it was not only declared, and eternal life thus given, *after His death*, resurrection, and ascension had brought it out fully, but as we have seen in principle or germ whilst He was *here on earth*, and as a consequence of His glorious Person being known as Son of the Father (John 6:40).

This brings us to the subject of eternal life manifested in the believer. In 2 Cor. 4:10-13, the Apostle speaks of “the life of Jesus being made manifest in our mortal flesh.” The remark has been made upon this passage, that it is the human life of Christ, and not the divine that is referred to here. This is, in fact, to divide His blessed Person, as if the human and divine could be separated, and shows the deteriorating effect of these views, and that in result they lower the character of life in the Christian, as well as sever it from its proper spring. We have seen that Eternal Life cannot be limited or divided in the Person of Christ, nor does Scripture allow of any such limitation in the case of the believer. The words, “the life of Jesus,” relate to what He was personally, for as the name Jesus means “Jehovah Savior,” “for He shall save *His* people from their sins,” it involves all that He was, and all the perfections of that divine life which have been displayed in Him, as well as all that He is now.

And here appears the deep mischief and injury caused by these reasonings; for not only has the teaching robbed souls of Christ *as the Eternal Life* personally, but they are led unconsciously by the enemy (as their language shows) to speculate on what was or was not human or divine in Him, and His Person as well as life is *also divided*. Thus the enemy gains his end, whilst he leads them out of their depth, and Christ is gradually displaced in the soul, and His Person

openly dishonored. For though their intention is innocent, the result is not innocent.

The only way for the simple, when such thoughts are presented, is to treat them as sin against Christ. The attempt to realize their meaning or explain them, leads into temptation, and the soul is caught by the enemy and entangled in this net. Many have suffered in this way without being aware of it; teachers as well as taught.

To support this line of reasoning, a passage of Mr. Darby's is quoted, which has some apparent but merely fictitious resemblance to it. An inexperienced and unwary person may be deceived by a fictitious Bank of England note, while a practiced eye will readily detect the forgery. Mr. Darby's statement is as follows:

In both Philippians and Colossians, the heavenly life is spoken of as a present thing; but there is entire separation, even down here, between the pilgrimage and this heavenly life itself, although the latter has a powerful influence on the character of our pilgrim life.

*His life -- God Himself* (the last is more John's doctrine) -- was what was to be *expressed*, expressed suited to the scene He passed through; but, being a true man, He walked with objects before Him, which acted on the tenor of His path. The fact that *He was this life*, and, that for His living it, had not to die in His death as we have to an evil nature, makes it more difficult to realize in His case; but obedience, and He learned what it was, suffering, patience, all referred to His place here; compassion, grace as to His disciples, and *all the traits of His life*, though divine and such that He could say, “The Son of Man who is in heaven,” *all were the development of the heavenly and divine life here*.

Its influence was perfect and entire in the case of the Lord Jesus; but His life in connection with men, *although the ever perfect expression of the effect of His life of heavenly communion*, was evidently distinct from it. The joy of the heavenly life entirely set aside all the motives of the lower life, and, leading to the sufferings of His earthly life in connection with man, produced a life of perfect patience before God. In Him all was sinless; but His joys were elsewhere, save in acting in grace in the midst of sorrow and sin -- a divine joy (*Synopsis on Joshua 3*).

But in this passage, though the word sphere is subsequently used, which gives some apparent similarity, the unity of the Person of Christ is carefully preserved by the words -- “His life in connection with men, although the *ever perfect expression* of His life of heavenly communion.” We have all been taught to see the perfect way in which Scripture presents the Lord to us in various phases. In the Gospel of Luke much more of manhood -- the precious and holy dependence -- the temptations which surrounded Him -- His agony in the garden, where He prays more earnestly and the Angel from Heaven appearing to strengthen Him -- express this. So in the Epistle to the Hebrews He suffered, being tempted, “learning obedience by the things which He suffered,” accomplishing the whole path of faith with joy set before Him at God's right hand. This is in striking contrast with what we find in the Gospel of John, in Gethsemane, where He goes forth “knowing all things that should come upon Him,” to meet His adversaries, who go

---

(...ooiÜ÷âéa)

remains divinely alone. But all He has as Man, and as Son in manhood, He introduces [us] into. “My Father and your Father, my God and your God.” His peace, His joy, the words the Father gave to Him, He hath given to us; the glory given to Him, He has given to us; “with the love wherewith the Father has loved Him we are loved (*Synopsis (John) p. 541*).

backward and fall to the ground, and He gives Himself up; whilst protecting those who trusted in Him, from the power of the enemy. But in all this, though clearly distinguishable, the unity of His Person is never for a moment touched; it is one and the same Person that is always kept before us, though in various lights, just as photographs taken from different points of view will bring into prominence the varied features of the same lovely scene. So we have in the passage cited above, various influences or springs of life connected with God, but "a life of perfect patience before God produced." "His joys," Mr. Darby says, "were elsewhere," (speaking of this heavenly life, as the Apostle John presents Him to us), "*save* in acting in grace in the midst of sorrow and sin *a divine joy*"; just what this system denies, as regards this heavenly life, whether in Christ or ourselves.

So much is this the case, that even of the wondrous story of the descent which He made from the divine glory to the lowly form and state of manhood, the Apostle says: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." This descent and humiliation, inconceivable to us in its fullness, is yet that in which by His life in us, we can share as to the thoughts and springs which it displayed. The humiliation of this obedience (commenced in the assumption of manhood, going on even unto death, the death of the cross for the glory of God), was the obedience of a *δουλός* or bondservant -- for such was man; and into this Christ came, from the divine place and "form," and carried it out according to His divine purpose and love, even to the last and lowest point, the shameful death of a malefactor. Such is the mind in which we are called to participate, instead of glorying in ourselves, or hindering instead of edifying others by our pretentious assumptions. But this shows how the divine characterized and pervaded all the human life of this blessed One, and how it may be carried out in detail by us, from the fact that "we have the mind of Christ" (1 Cor. 2:16). "Put on therefore," says the Apostle, "as elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering," for all this was manifested in Christ, and is now to be seen in the new man, where "Christ is all and in all."

When He rose from the dead and appeared to His disciples on the first day of the week, He breathed on them, establishing them in His own relationship with the Father and position before God as risen {John 20:22}; for this He had promised, even life more abundantly, and that they should have life, not only from, but with Himself. "Because I live, ye shall live also." This, with the presence of the Holy Ghost, gave its heavenly character to that life, life of a new order, power, and blessing; in contrast with life in the Old Testament, and even in the Millennium. In it, as in the life of Christ on earth, grace is to be exemplified; whilst Israel, in the Millennium, will be used as the executors of divine judgment, as we learn from the Psalms. Though they have eternal life, it will bear an earthly character.

There are three aspects of responsibility brought before us in Scripture, answering to the three positions occupied by the nation of Israel; in Egypt, in the wilderness, and in

Canaan.

In the first they were in bondage, exposed to the judgment of God, and liable to destruction by their enemies. This corresponds with our standing in Adam as men in the flesh, on which ground, being creatures responsible for rendering the obedience and love which is due to the Creator, of which the law is the measure, we are totally lost. This is brought to an end in the Cross, where, owning Christ as in death for us, we see ourselves delivered from the consequences which sin entailed on us.

The second sphere of responsibility, which is more properly Christian, is, after having crossed the Red Sea -- figure of Christ's death and resurrection for us -- we have as pilgrims to pass through the desert scene of this world before reaching the heavenly Canaan. In this state is learned what the flesh is practically, and it is in this more especially that we are tested, as to what we are (Deut. 8), and to this more distinctly the "ifs" of Scripture apply; as we are not looked at as in heaven, but going on to it, in weakness, and amid the toils and dangers of this world, and we have the promise of being kept, and not being tempted above what we are able to bear (See 1 Cor. 10; Heb. 4; Rom. 5; &c.).

Thirdly, we are looked upon, in our highest aspect, as in Christ, seated in heavenly places in Him {Eph. 2:6}, in the new Creation -- i.e., already in Canaan, like the Israelites after they had crossed the Jordan, where they had to maintain their position in conflict with their enemies. But to say that there is "no such thing as responsibility in Christ" is an Antinomian statement, and runs upon the same mystic line as the notion of the invisibility of eternal life. True that this position, which according to the purpose of God, is beyond the effects of sin and failure, will be infallibly accomplished by divine power in glory, because secured to us in Christ, to whom we are united. But immediately upon our being spoken of, according to our calling and position in Ephesians 1, 2, as quickened, raised, and made to sit together in heavenly places, comes the warning, "*Wherefore remember*" and "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called"; so we have the character of God to be displayed in us as dear children, to walk in love, and a conflict, not down here, but maintained with wicked spirits in heavenly places, and we have to put on the whole armor of God and to stand in the combat. Indeed the whole book of Joshua exhibits the responsibility which belongs to this position; circumcision -- the constant returning to Gilgal, the place of circumcision or judgment of the flesh -- the government of God -- the holiness suitable to His presence -- the conditions under which the conflict is to be carried on, all exhibit responsibility of the highest order. Indeed the Apostle says: "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye *in Him*" (Col. 2:6). The higher the privilege, the higher and more elevated the responsibility attached to it. Hence in this heavenly position it relates more to the interests of the Church of God, the service and glory of Christ, the conflict with the power of Satan, in which we are now engaged, and which flows entirely from the fact that we are

in heavenly places in Christ.

Mr. Raven's statement is that "there is no such thing as responsibility in Christ." Mr. Darby's statements, now given, presents the matter in its true bearings:

We contend with spiritual wickedness in heavenly places where all passes, in Ephesians, and we are *called upon*, "having done all, *to stand*". We are in possession of our place, and our business is to *hold good*, and hence, being spiritual, the arms of God are what are called for. . . . Hence in conflict the matter is *to stand* against the wiles and having done all, *to stand* -- *Notes and Comments*, Part 16. p. 375.)

In Ephesians conflict and *government*, the armor of God to be able to stand in the evil day, but not on a journey, uncertain whether I arrive, or sure to fail in myself and if he is sure to be kept by another, but only therefore sure and hence tested" (*Notes and Comments*, Part 6, p. 200).

I can say "I abide in him" -- placed with the Father in His perfectness before Him, a place of joy and peace, and witness of eternal love. *I ought then so to walk as He walked*. *Christian responsibility* is the responsibility of being a Christian; that is of walking because we are in Christ, as Christ walked, through Christ dwelling in us (*Coll. Writings*, vol. 17, p. 450).

In the foregoing papers the subject of Eternal Life has been examined from Scripture. The following extracts are given to show how distinctly Mr. Darby, who has been quoted as agreeing with this teaching, presses that Christ is the Eternal Life personally (that it is not a condition merely, that its manifestation was before all and *to all*, whether in Christ or the Christian), as also, the infinite importance of the subject, with the seriousness of its denial.

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." It was in a man bodily. It comes by the power of the Word now, but they had seen this Eternal life in the person of a man walking about in this world. Just as we see natural life in Adam, so we see Divine life in Christ. If we look at the life in us, it is united with failure; but I can see and know what the perfectness of the life is by looking at Christ. For the life was manifested and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that Eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us. . . . Christ is my life, and *all Christ's words* are the expression of that life. . . . All the words of Christ are the expression of what He was. *They told out His nature, life and being*, and when we have got that nature, they guide and direct us.

In the Gospel we get Divine life in the Person of Christ, and in the Epistle this divine life in the person of Christians (from *Notes on John's Epistles*).

1 John exhibits to us specially Divine life in the Person of Christ, but communicated to us, and the traits which serve as a proof that life is there. He first speaks of this life as he had known it in Christ on earth; showing it as the means of communion with the Father and the Son, so that our joy may be full. But He who was and is this life, has given, yea, has been, the absolute revelation of God as light (from *Brief Outlines of the Books of the Bible*).

1 John 1:1. First, it was from the beginning;

second, it was a real substantial Person they had known familiarly, not a *doctrine*; that is the blessed secret of it all. If they had got Christ, then they have got all that the Father has got, all that is revealed of Him, and they can't go from that without being wrong. They have *got Eternal life*, the perfect revelation of God, the power of life in Christ. This is what is presented to us as the full enjoyment and the *safeguard* of the saint. It is ours through that which was with the Father, yet was so near to us, not union, but so near to us that nothing could be so near as Christ Himself. This is the Eternal Life that was with the Father, and it is as we study the Lord Jesus Christ we shall have affections established towards Him which nothing can break.

The *least thing* manifests the life of Jesus . . . Whatever does not manifest Him is of the world, *whatever is not the manifestation of the life of Christ* in our souls, that is *sin*.

We get in His person the life itself that was with the Father, "from the beginning." He was the life, it was in Him. Now it is never said eternal life is in us, it is in Him. But it is given to us; that's a different thing. He Himself is our life; He has life in Himself. God has given us Eternal life, and this life is in His Son; but the Son has life in Himself. My hand is alive, but my life is not in my hand; my hand lives by virtue of union with my body; take it off and I shall live still. It is in Him {that} the reality of life is. When Christ was down here, all His instructions were the expression of this life (from *Nine Lectures on First Epistle of John*).

The Person then of the Son, the Eternal life manifested in the flesh, is our subject in this Epistle. . . . Life came in the person of Jesus, in all its own divine perfection, in its human manifestations. Oh, how precious is the truth that this life, such as it was with the Father, such as it was in Jesus, is given to us.

The law promised life to those who obeyed it. Christ is the life. This life has been imparted to believers. Therefore the words which were the expression of that life in its perfection in Jesus, direct and guide it in us according to that perfection (from the *Synopsis, First Epistle of John*).

Christ Himself is this life sent from the Father into the world and here revealed in manhood. And now he that hath the Son hath life, "he that believeth on Him hath everlasting life." . . . "This life is Christ Himself" (1 John 1). He is the life which was with the Father and is come down here (from *Meditations on the Epistle to the Romans*, p. 75).

This life existed in a person, *Christ*, the One who was in the beginning with God, and was God; *that* is the Christ with whom my life is hidden with the Father. Being in Himself life, He came into the world as the life, and manifested the life -- The thing was embodied in the person of the Lord as Man. . . . If we turn to 1 John 1. we see how this life came down. "What our hands have handled of the Word of life" (1 John 1:3). It is a real Man. The life which was with the Father was manifested down here in the Person of Christ. In many you will find great vagueness of thought in connection with this life. It is Christ Himself. "When He who is our life," etc. Before he speaks of the communication of life he speaks of its enemies; he says, "we have looked upon, and our hands, etc." . . . What a thought! That Eternal life in this world -- a man, a poor man, a carpenter, one who had not where to lay His head (from *Collected Writings, Evangelical* vol. 2).

In the Person of Jesus, *people* saw Him who was come

down from heaven, the Son of God become Man, as we see in [the] first chapter of [the] First Epistle of John. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have contemplated, and our hands have handled concerning the Word of life" . . . "the Eternal life which was with the Father and has been manifested to us." . . . As in the whole Gospel, we have here what Jesus was, light and life, in His Person, as come into the world. . . .

Paul, in the Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. 1:3, 4) presents to us this life in its double character. In the first place, that which answers to His nature, that which Christ was, and is; and secondly, our relationship with the Father, that is to say, sons, and that in His presence. . . . The glory of Christ Himself will be the full manifestation of this life, and we shall participate in it, we shall be like Him. Still it is an inward life, real and divine, by which we live, although we possess it in these poor earthen vessels (from *Notes on the Gospel of John*.)

I could not say that life was not communicated, for surely if a man is born, life is communicated, only I do not admit life in us as a separate thing. "He that hath the Son hath life." God's "seed remaineth in him." . . . Christ is Eternal life. We have Him as life, and it will be complete when like Him in glory. (*Letters*, 12. p. 10).

Existence is not life; the table exists, but is not alive. "In Him we live" is not we have life. *But the thing I fear is, the unsettling the fact of what life in Christ is.* Thus "the Father hath life in Himself." Is that a mere condition of being? -- (*Letters*, 12. p. 17).

"He that hath the Son." "God hath given us Eternal life, and this life is in His Son." "He that hath the Son hath life." Christ is life. . . . *Life is not a condition of being*, it constitutes it; a material substance without life is not called a being, a being supposes *personal* spontaneity (p. 19).

Is life in God a mere *condition of being*? Being means what has life. Hence to say life is a condition of what has life, has, by itself, no sense (pp. 19, 20).

What we have to cleave to is Christ, in Him we know the Father, and He is that Eternal life which came down from heaven (*Letters of J. N. D.*, Part 13. p. 173).

The fact is that the body of our blessed Lord as an integral part of His person was the instrument and expression of these springs and motives of the divine Eternal life which existed in Him alone. The value of expiation itself in one aspect flows from and depends on this. The Lord says with all the fullness of divine purpose "when He cometh into the world." . . . "Lo, I come to do thy will" . . . "*a body* hast thou prepared me." "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of *the body* of Jesus Christ once for all." The body prepared for Him became the vessel for the fulfillment of the eternal counsels, taken by Him who alone could enter into, measure and accomplish them. The dignity and worth of the Person were such, that the varying conditions through which He passed were as nothing in comparison with what He was; and what He was always and in every circumstance impressed its stamp on the whole.

Hence to say "Eternal life never wept," is to partition His Person -- revolting to a Christian heart, and destructive

of all that affection and adoration, which the tender, loving manifestation of divine sympathy, in its human form, awakens. As another moved by reading the account of the Lord's weeping over Jerusalem has well expressed it:

They asked not whom those tears were for, they asked not whence they flowed.

Those tears were for rebellious man, their source the heart of God.

They fell upon this desert earth, like drops from heaven on high,

Struck from an ocean tide of love which fills eternity;  
With love and tenderness divine those crystal cells o'erflow,

'Tis God that weeps thro' human eyes, for human guilt and woe.

Even with ourselves the body of the believer is sanctified, and becomes the organ or vehicle of the divine life, so that whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we are to do all to the glory of God. Yet, we are told, "eternal life never ate and drank," or "commended His mother to the care of His loved disciple," and thus the beauty of this touching act is lost and it is reduced to a mere human level, by these unhallowed reasonings. We have seen that the exhibition of "all else" is denied, but "the manifestation of *infancy in its helplessness*," "*humanity in its conditions*." Yet even in a mere babe the divine life is often displayed in a wondrously attractive way. "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings Thou hast perfected praise"; whilst we are told this could not be in the Lord of all. To so low an estimate of Christ's glory has the originator of these sentiments fallen.

## Appendix A

Mr. Raven wrote to a brother in the West of England a letter dated July 2nd, 1890:

I send you an extract from the letter in which the statement, "Think of a helpless infant, &c.," occurs. I think it speaks for itself. The exhibition of eternal life is in the Risen Man, who has annulled death.

(Signed) F. E. Raven

### EXTRACT

June 29, 1889. -- Then, again, as to life, he says: "Christ never ceased to be the exhibition of eternal life, from a babe in the manger to the throne of the Father. Think of a helpless infant being the *exhibition of eternal life*, whatever might be there. Infancy, and all connected with it, does not find place in John. It is simply there "the Word became flesh." The fact is, there is a tendency to lose sight of the truth, that, as well as being eternal life, Jesus was God, and exercising Divine prerogatives down here. "The Word was God," and further, in taking part in human life down here (the life to which sin attached), He took part in that which in Him was brought to an end judicially in death, and this assuredly was not eternal life.

Here then is the letter (June 29, 1889) <sup>15</sup> so long held back: and the reason for this unholy compact in concealment is now evident. The leaders of the Raven party at Ealing, though Major McCarthy had got the sentence originally from them, which he printed afterwards, insisted that he should be put under discipline for his unrighteousness in printing a sentence reported from a letter, which was not contained in that letter; and Mr. Raven was a party to this conduct by *declining* to say to Mr. Barker more than “*I am satisfied I never used these words.*” Thus, with this prevaricating <sup>16</sup> reply, he leaves Major M., with the imputation of unrighteousness cast upon him, and its consequent effects conveying the impression that Major M. has done him an injustice. It now turns out that the difference in the sentence consists in:

*Fancy a helpless babe an expression of eternal life* (Major M., as reported to him).

*Think of a helpless infant being the exhibition of eternal life* (Mr. Raven to Mr. Rudling).

The reader, having both sentences in juxtaposition, will now be able to judge what is the difference between them. The dishonorable character of the concealment becomes evident; as it is clear that the charge against Major M. of unrighteousness, could not have been sustained for a moment, had the sentence as originally written been divulged. Thus the holy discipline of the House of God is made a handle for party spirit {heresy} -- a false charge made, and long sustained, against a servant of Christ; and this is maintained by these clandestine means, and by the professed leaders of an assembly, -- where the glory of the adorable Person of the Son of God was in question. One of these took the trouble to *count the words* in each, to insist upon the horror of the Major’s conduct, saying that there were *eleven* words in the original instead of *nine*, and that there were *six* differences. This he repeated, over and over again, on *many* different occasions, before many witnesses; whilst a leading London brother denounced, at Cheapside, the iniquity of the Major.

The words “expressed,” and “exhibited” (or “manifested,”) <sup>17</sup> which is the Scripture term, and, perhaps, the strongest), are expressive of what is displayed in the Person Himself, and not at all of perceptions existing in the beholder. Hence, if we say that anything that was essentially in Christ was not exhibited in Him, we deny His own Word, “I am altogether that which I say unto you” (John 8:25).

## Appendix B

That the development of the doctrine in question is proceeding rapidly the following extract will show. It is from a paper in circulation called *A Brief Account, &c.*, by C. E. M., written

15. {The assembly at Bexhill, England, separated from F. E. Raven, and the meeting at Greenwich, England, which sheltered him, in June 1890.}

16. {It is a lie, a deliberate deception. Dishonesty often, if not actually always, accompanies works of the flesh and doctrinal evil.}

17. See Appendix C. {This Appendix was not printed with this paper, but separately, and was not available for this present reprinting.}

by a teacher in the North, and printed at Leeds, in which eternal life is said to have been never manifested during the lifetime of the Son of God on earth at all. He writes:

*ETERNAL LIFE is an accomplished FACT EXISTING IN THE SON OF GOD, to receive which you look altogether outside yourself to Him, in whom it is: in the testimony which presents it to you learning also the way in which it has been ACCOMPLISHED FOR YOU. Whereas being born of the Spirit is described as purely wrought in you, without any distinct object being necessarily presented to your faith.*

The life was manifested. Now what is meant by this? It cannot only mean that the Person was visible, which we all know He was: He was visible, His words were audible, His ways and acts could be looked at, and His body was such as could be felt to be real. He was truly always the Word of life, but *when and how* was life manifested? I answer, that life was manifested by *overcoming death. When, having suffered death, He appeared among his own, alive* by a power quite distinct from the life of flesh and blood which He had given up. *Then, and not before*, was “the eternal life, which was with the Father, manifested unto us,” *so that they who saw Him could say it was manifested to them and they could bear witness* concerning it. That which existed always with the Father, that which existed when as man He walked about Judea and Galilee, was now manifested. They could now say that they had seen it; *they could not say so before*; and as the Lord Himself, when risen, appeared, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God, so it is true of the eternal life that it was manifested, as such, to those who saw Jesus in circumstances which proved that He lived, having overcome death by the power of what He was eternally.

From what we have seen it is evident how different was that which the disciples saw in John 20, from that which the wise men saw in Matthew 2. The wise men saw the infant King of the Jews; the beginning, if you please, of the kingdom of God on the earth: the King who should bring about a new state of things, a state of peace and blessing; but it was that they saw; in that character they worshiped Him. The disciples in John 20 saw eternal life the first time made manifest as such to human eyes. Observe, *as such*.

This shows us the object of *the teachings of wisdom*. Therefore *no dark saying*, and we may add *no hard saying*, ought to be an offence to a disciple of wisdom.

Another teacher in the North, otherwise worthy of love and respect, made the following statement, which we give, as put down by the brother to whom it was made:

The Word was made flesh, had you taken hold of the Lord’s hand, you would not have taken hold of “eternal life,” but simply taken hold of a hand of flesh.

And yet Scripture says, “our hands have handled of the Word of Life” {1 John 1:1}.

As an antidote to these poisonous statements, we add an extract from a letter by a loved and honored servant of Christ in Ireland, which will be helpful, not only as a statement of truth, but as expressing that adoring spirit, which had it more generally existed, would have been a safeguard against these irreverent notions.

Where is there any warrant in Scripture for the distinction between life, and the expression of life? Only conceive a teacher in the Church of God, asking if the

Babe in the Manger was an expression of eternal life! Was it an expression of eternal life, to be hungry, weary, and thirsty? to eat, drink, and sleep on a pillow? We reply with reverence and adoring worship, He who was the eternal life, the eternal Son, the Creator of the Universe, God over all blessed for ever, was the babe in the manger, was hungry, thirsty, weary, sat on the well, slept on a pillow, because he was "God manifest in the flesh." Well might the inspired apostle exclaim: "Great is the mystery of godliness." Far too great indeed to be made the subject of irreverent discussion. What authority has any one to assert that some things were the expression of eternal life, and some not? If there ever was a moment, ever a scene, ever a circumstance, in the life of our adorable Lord and Savior, in which He was not the expression of eternal life, then what was He? What becomes of His Divine Person? This blessed and glorious truth is, that in His every thought, His every look, His every word, His every movement, He was the Eternal Life and the expression of it. He expressed what He was, and He was what He expressed (John 8:25).<sup>18</sup>

If phrases and statements of belief, so derogatory to the Person of the Lord and subversive of the truth, emanate from teachers amongst us, what can be said of the mass of deductive fragmentary teaching, and conversational expressions of belief by saints, only known and heard in their respective local circles, which one cannot avoid hearing of from time to time? The effect must be truly appalling in its blighting results, where affection for, and faith in the Lord, is concerned. The words of one of old will find an echo at the present moment in the heart of many a faithful saint of God: "Oh that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night, for the slain of the daughter of my people."

In the hope that God may awaken many a heart to its "first love," and "most holy faith," by making manifest what all this is tending to, and what many are unconsciously identifying themselves with, one example may suffice, for the many expressions of this kind in currency; and this is given of a brother who left the Lord's Table, because the assembly gathering, where he broke bread, had judged that they could have no fellowship with Mr. R.'s teachings. The brother is not a teacher; but he is a very active proselytizing agent and in regular personal communication with the most prominent of Mr. R.'s followers. He said within the last few days:

God did not confer Deity and Eternal Life upon Christ until He ascended up on high.

When asked the day following, by the brother to whom he made this declaration, if these were his exact words, he replied, "Yes, decidedly. We are told so in effect in 1 John 5:20."

A simple unlettered man, also, after hearing the statements concerning Christ not being the manifestation of Eternal Life, discussed at a Scripture reading by a leading Evangelist, asked, "When then did Jesus begin to be God?"

Beloved reader, while the heart is crushed with sorrow at

the irreverent statements in circulation amongst God's people, there cannot but be praise to God, that He does not allow such things to pass unchallenged.

Attention having been called, by those opposed to these doctrines, to the statement, that the Son of God "had to return to communion with His Father," in John 4, after His conversation with the woman of Samaria; the expression has, we are thankful to say, been renounced and confessed as wrong, by two of the teachers who had adopted it. But how serious is the confession by one of these, that he had upheld and explained this sentence; and that this should have been known and going on among us for eighteen months. Whilst the other, though it had been brought before him previously, only acknowledged it, when faced publicly by his own statement supplied by the writer. Thankful as we are for the acknowledgments that have been made, it is, however, to be feared, that unless these dear brethren judge the matter more deeply yet, and see that their thoughts about the Lord and His glory must have been deeply deteriorated during all the time that they held these views, and unless they perceive also the connection between the statements, that our Lord was not manifesting Eternal Life to the woman of Samaria, and, the notions of Eternal Life as taught by Mr. R, -- they will not be fully delivered in their own souls, but will be still liable to similar thoughts: for they do not fully perceive the ground they have got upon. And this applies also to the author of the letter printed in *Be not Deceived*.

Were these teachers fully clear it would be with them as the Apostle describes: "Behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge! In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this matter" (2 Cor. 7:11). For this we would still hope and wait and pray; and then they would surely endeavor to disentangle others from this net of the enemy, and would abhor the whole thing as his snare.

For all that the Son said and did *flowed from the infinite* unity subsisting, and the *infinite* communion between the Father and the Son, so that as He says both of the words and the works they were *the Father's* as much as His own, "that ye may know and believe that the Father is *in me* and I *in Him*." Think of any puny mortal saying He had to return to communion (or even to "communing") after the scene at Sychar! It is really reducing this infinite union between the Father and the Son to *our level*, the only begotten in the bosom of the Father, in this respect to a mere *man like ourselves* who have to return to communion (or "communing") because it has been interrupted (not perhaps by sin) but by other engagements or occupations, our minds being at times incapable of more, through lack of dependence or not having Christ more before the soul.

18. {This was written by C. H. M.; see p. 107, n. 13.}





*An Explanation as to Statements  
Made on Page 46 <sup>1</sup> of  
“The Manifestation of the Divine  
Nature in the Person of Christ.”*

**“The Lord is a God of knowledge,  
and by Him actions are weighed.”**

The accuracy of two incidents related on page 46 {p. 89a, herein} of *The Manifestation of the Divine Nature in the Person of Christ* having been called in question, some explanation seems to be required, as well as the production of such evidence as exists respecting them.

It may be well to recall what is stated in page 7 {p. 74b, herein} of that pamphlet:

We are far from charging any intention of . . . putting a slight upon the Person of God’s Son, . . . even upon those who have gone the farthest in it. It has been done in ignorance of the danger involved in it. Hence, in exposing the serious evil of the expressions that have been used, no names are given, in order to avoid causing needless pain or offence, the desire of the writer being to recover those who have been beguiled into them, by the presentation of Christ in His own glory and blessedness, as the Word of God keeps Him before us.

The author, therefore, whilst seeking to arouse saints as to the danger of the course being pursued, not only brought no *charges against individuals*, but sought, as far as was possible, consistently with this object, to avoid giving such details as might subject them to public exposure or general attack. Hence, when information was applied for *from all parts*, it was given only in such instances as seemed specially to call for it.

With respect to the incident first alluded to; as the particulars were derived from Mr. Mathieson, the writer (as he was about leaving England) referred enquirers to him as specially responsible, and able to give more details. The author had given information as to the other instances alluded to in the pamphlet (both before and since its publication) which speedily became known in consequence, as he had *no intention of concealment in any case*; nor did he expect that Mr. M. would have so long entirely refused to satisfy enquirers, or to withhold Mr. Laws’ name and address. Finding Mr. M. continued to do so, he wrote to him from Chexbres, Switzerland, desiring him to communicate these particulars; and subsequently to two other brothers in England, with the same object, *giving the name*.

Having recently seen a letter of Mr. M.’s which appeared to be inconsistent with the above statement, the

author wrote, reminding Mr. M. how he had himself acted in the matter, and recalling the fact that he had written to him expressing regret that he had withheld the information asked for. Mr. M. replies as follows:

London, 20th Nov., 1890.

My dear Brother in Christ,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 17th, and regret that the first part of the copy of letter forwarded to you conveys to your mind a wrong impression. What you say in your letter is quite correct, and I thought I had really conveyed that meaning in the paragraph you allude to . . . The object in relating the incident was not to *incriminate* any particular person, with the idea of making him an example, but to discover the fact that the teachings of F. E. R. had produced the thought. If you had related the incident with the intention of impeaching Laws, that he might be dealt with accordingly, then I question if it should have appeared in the pamphlet at all . . . I will do as you say, repair the wrong impression where I can, which you imagine may have been made. . . .

Yours, &c. R. A. MATHIESON.

To A. C. Ord.

The evidence as to the statement respecting this case in page 46 {p. 89a, herein}, is now given in letters which have been received confirmatory of it, and are here subjoined, with one from Mr. Laws in his own defense. The author leaves it to his readers to form their own judgment respecting it.

13, Mansfield Street, Oct. 17th, 1890.

Dear Brother,

After our conversation here last night and what has taken place since, I thought it well to write to you that we may clear up any misunderstanding. What I gathered from you, you had accepted the explanation I had given, and was satisfied that our brother (Stenner) had misunderstood what I intended to convey to him -- simply the difference between Incarnation and New Creation and its connection with Eternal Life; but I find this morning he still maintains his ground, but he refuses certain statements as not coming from him. First, he denies having had any knowledge that what he told you was to be put in print, and said nothing about the statement “*Deity*,” and that he did not give 1 John 5:20 as coming from me in support of this theory. And also he makes out you were wrong in saying this was

---

1. {Page 89a, herein.}

me, as he says it means several. Now this cannot be true according to the book, as it can only mean one and that one was myself.

He said very little last night, but was very violent this morning, but he must see to that, as he, or who is to blame, is responsible to the Lord, and He makes no mistakes, we may.

Trusting for the Lord's honor and glory you will endeavor to meet my conscience about this solemn matter, as there appears to be falsehood somewhere.

Yours affectionately and faithfully in Christ,

E. LAWS

To Mr. Mathieson.

358, Strand, London, 19th Oct., 1890.

Dear Brother,

I am in receipt of your letter of the 17th inst., and am glad you have written me in case any misunderstanding should exist regarding the result of my visit to you.

Although the word "Deity" was not employed as you point out, yet substantially the printed sentence is the same as the verbal expression, which was, "God did not confer Eternal life upon Christ until after He arose from the dead, neither was He the Eternal God till then."

You must have misapprehended our Brother in saying that he said the expression reported in A. C. O.'s pamphlet was intended as the saying of several. That is not the case. His meaning is that, while what is reported in the pamphlet conveys the expression peculiar to one individual, it appears not to have been the expression of one alone, because others who have read the statement identified it as applying to another.

I believe you have seen Stenner again since you saw him with me, and he has said to you that there cannot possibly be any mistake about what you said, and he is prepared to maintain the fact and correctness of the utterance before any brethren.

There I must leave it till the Lord makes it manifest.

Yours faithfully in Him,  
ROBT. A. MATHIESON.

To Mr. LAWS,  
13, Mansfield Street, W.

9, Queen Anne's Mews,  
Cavendish Square, W.,  
Nov. 19th, 1890.

I think it would be within a week after the judgment of North Row (on) the question of Mr. Raven's teaching that Mr. Laws and I were disputing on that passage in the pamphlet on Eternal life, "It is as the risen and glorified man," etc. In the course of his (Laws') remarks, he made use of a statement so contrary to Scripture it fixed itself at once on my mind. The sentence was, "God did not confer Eternal life upon Christ until after He arose from the dead, neither was He the Eternal God till then." As soon as Laws left me I went upstairs, and my wife has it [as] I repeated it to her thus, "Christ was not the Eternal God, neither did God confer Eternal life upon Him, until after He arose from the dead."

But, at Mr. Mathieson's suggestion, I asked Laws next morning if I understood him to say on the previous day, that "God did not confer Eternal life upon Christ

until after He arose from the dead, neither was He the Eternal God till then; he said, "Yes, certainly." My wife also says that a Scripture, I told her, was quoted by Laws. Mr. Mathieson and his sister confirm this, so that I do not doubt the Scripture quoted, 1 John 5:20, will be quite right. I had no further conversation with Laws. A few weeks ago three brothers came with Laws, and questioned me for about an hour on the subject. During the course of the conversation, the leading brother, Mr. Nunnerly, said to Laws (after taking down the first part of my statement ending with "from the dead"): "It looks as if you did say this from the conversation you had with me the other day, when I told you that was wrong in what you said to me."

I remain, Yours faithfully in Christ  
(Signed) W. STENNER

To Mr. Ord.

Warwick House, Ellington Road, Ramsgate,  
21st October, 1890.

My dear Brother in Christ,

Your letter is to hand. As far as my memory serves, I refused to shake hands with either Laws or Cole because they endorsed the statements of F. E. R.: "It is a monstrosity to say that the Lord never ceased to be the exhibition of Eternal life from a babe in the manger to the Throne of the Father." The other statement was, that the Lord Jesus was not "The True God and Eternal life" till after His Resurrection.

Yours affectionately in Him,  
(Signed) GEO. C. MILLWARD

To Mr. R. A. Mathieson

358, Strand, London, 2nd Dec., 1890

My dear Brother in Christ,

Regarding the statement on page 46 of your pamphlet, "God did not confer deity," etc., the result of my inquiries into the truth of its utterance has led me to discover that the word "deity" was not used by Laws, and it is really an interpolation of the sense of the sentence. . . . Knowing this, I cannot but express my regret that I was not more careful in ascertaining the exact words, and the order in which they were employed.

Yours, &c., R. A. MATHIESON

As to the second incident. No such idea ever occurred to the Author that anyone would charge the leading Evangelist there alluded to, with Unitarian doctrine. The discussion the previous evening was *not* on the divinity of our blessed Lord, but on the subject of Eternal life; and the incident was brought forward to illustrate what had been stated previously in the pamphlet, viz., the danger of such discussions, and what effect, without any such intention, they might leave on uninstructed minds.

The Evangelist himself, who is universally loved and honored, expressed regret next morning for what had taken place the evening previously, as the author was informed by Mr. W. himself.

A brother at Malvern writes as follows: "I saw Mr. W. after receiving your letter, and what he said seemed to confirm your statement, that Mr. C's. visit to him referred not only to the spirit of the discussion the previous evening,

but also to what he had said.”

As the facts stated, in connection with this incident, have been called in question in several publications, it seems well to give some extracts from letters received from Malvern which bear upon them.

West End Cottage, Malvern Link,  
Oct. 17th, 1890.

Beloved Brother in the Lord,

. . . I may say to begin with, that your statement is a perfectly accurate account of what actually took place.

What gave immediate rise to the *question* which Badham put, was doubtless some very proper observations which had just been made by Mr. Cavanagh, but what was supposed to have given rise to the *doubt expressed in that question* were the remarks he had made the previous evening, during the discussion on Eternal life . . . The facts then are as follow: On a certain Tuesday evening a reading was held at Mr. Lear's, at which the subject of Eternal life was entered upon; a very severe contention arose between Mr. Cavanagh and Mr. Whitehead. On the following evening, at the usual reading meeting, the question was asked by Brother Badham, in answer to some observations by Mr. C., “When, then, did Jesus begin to be God?” The impression produced by this question upon the mind of Mr. Whitehead, was, that this uncertainty as to the Eternal Godhead of Jesus, was the result of the discussion on Eternal life, of the previous evening. Mr. Whitehead communicated his impression to me.

. . . I have pointed out to Mr. Whitehead, and he does not in the least dispute it, that he is entirely responsible for it, and that your statement is an exact record of the facts.

Yours, &c., T. CAINK.

To Mr. Gipps.

Albert Park Road, Malvern Link,  
Nov. 16th, 1890.

Dear Brother,

I have your letter of the 14th. I see no difficulty whatever in Mr. Whitehead's issuing a brief statement explaining how the story told by Mr. Ord originated, and, if he now regrets it, and thinks his impression a wrong one, expressing that regret.

You complain at my saying Mr. Ord's statement was a perfectly accurate account of what actually took place, because it “was not true” that Badham asked the question after hearing the statements concerning the manifestation of Eternal life. It is your statement that is “*not true*”; and it was not until a few days ago, when I saw Mr. Champney's paper, that I was aware that the facts reported by Mr. Ord had ever been denied.

I have since seen your paper “Follow Righteousness” (2nd Edition) and I find you also denied it; but on the last page you strangely enough correct the statement which you now reaffirm.

Are you aware, that in the paragraph in which you correct the false statement contained on page 11, you state what is *positively untrue*.

I allude to the observation “that absolutely nothing was said which either did or could possibly lead to the question,” etc.; this is so contrary to the truth, that the statements made by Mr. Cavanagh *did absolutely lead*

a brother now in fellowship with you (whose name you know) to the belief that Badham's question was entirely the consequence of those statements.

And further, that this belief was the *sole origin* of the whole story. Were you not aware of this at the time you wrote the paragraph? I cannot think you were. You will see that it is obviously false that “it absolutely alters nothing.”

In denying what you refer to at the end of your letter, I did not rest alone upon my own testimony, but on that of others also . . . who were sitting near Badham . . .

. . . When you say I have confirmed Mr. O. in publishing to the world that which is a calumny on a servant of Christ and inaccurate as to fact, you state, through ignorance of what I have written, what is absolutely false, and fall into the same evil you are so loud in decrying in others.

Yours faithfully in Christ,  
(Signed) T. CAINK

There was a strong impression at that time, that the expression used by the brother in question, was connected with the discussion of the previous evening. That impression being now questioned, even where it then existed, the author feels it right to withdraw the incident altogether as an illustration of what had been stated, although it was received on what appeared at the time to be satisfactory evidence; deeply regretting that it should have been brought forward or occasioned reflections upon the Evangelist referred to.

As to the “proselytism” mentioned in the first incident which has been called in question, it would be far too personal to give the numerous details of this, which the author has received. Mr. M., and others with whom this brother was in fellowship, at North Row, can bear ample testimony to this, to such as care to inform themselves on the subject.

The only other point requiring notice is, that Mr. Gipps makes the following remarks upon a part of the author's letter which he suppresses: “I do not give the rest of Mr. O.'s letter, because it contains a *charge of false doctrine* against a brother, who is, I believe, in India, and *cannot therefore meet it*, and, moreover, had nothing to do with the subject of my letter to him.” We give the letter in full, that it may be seen that it is the circulation of evil doctrines in Gen. H's paper rather than a personal charge that was in the author's mind.

45, Great Cumberland Place, Hyde Park,  
September 30th, 1890.

My dear Brother in Christ,

I have given the information you seek to two godly brothers of weight who seemed to me not seeking the credit of a party, but to have a fear of God and regard for the glory of His Son, but who also are on the same ground as yourself. This is all that I feel it right to do in the matter. . . .

*There is General Haig's paper*, which is very bad, if you wish for further evidence of how *false doctrine is spreading*, and I have other details; but unless there is a sense of what is due to Christ, things are explained

away or glossed over. Since Mr. {B. W.} Newton's day I have never met with such evidence of irreverence and disregard of what is due to the Son of God.

I was very thankful to have your testimony of dear W.'s bright departure to be with the Lord. I suppose when we reach Switzerland, for which we are starting (D. V.) on Wednesday, we shall hear more from Mrs. C.

Yours affectionately in Christ,  
A. C. ORD

To Mr. Gipps

The writer regrets that he did not keep Mr. Gipps' first letter; his conviction is, that it had reference to other information, besides the first incident on page 46 {p. 89a, herein}. He would hardly otherwise have replied, "I have given the information you seek to two godly brothers." At the same time, the writer, having had no opportunity of personal intercourse with Mr. L., preferred to refer these enquirers to Mr. Mathieson for full particulars, which he did in all good faith.<sup>2</sup>

We have sought to state the facts, touching these points simply as they occurred, and to dissipate the false coloring which has been given to them.

The weight of the evidence contained in the pamphlet, by no means rests upon these instances, but much more upon

irreverent statements made, not as these were, by those who are taught, but by the teachers themselves. The Park Street meeting of October 7th, in its summons and its report, is an ample verification of this. The author's object was, not to offend, but to awaken and recover his brethren, by making a last appeal to their consciences to detect and judge the root from which all this evil springs.

We do not charge Mr. Gipps with intentional wrong, in the incorrect statements he has made, nor Mr. Champney in his exaggerations of them; for we have already had painful experience of the effect of party spirit, and how it blinds the eyes of the most upright and estimable, and renders them insensible to the character and effect of their own actions. It is a solemn thing, and should chasten our judgment of others, that the Lord warns us that "with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again."

\* \* \* \* \*

The Author regrets that ill-health, and the difficulty arising from carrying on correspondence abroad, have occasioned delay in the appearance of this statement.

---

2. The statement that the author did not know, and even "stated that he did not know" the name of the person referred to when enquiry *was* made from him in London is wholly untrue.

*The Glory of the  
Person of the Son of God:  
His Title as  
the Eternal Life,  
and the Connection of the  
Believer with Him as Such*

To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life,  
which is in the midst of the paradise of God (Rev. 2:7).

*Introduction*

The testimony that distinguished brethren in early days is now

being given up. The positive and distinct possession of eternal life, as the certain and conscious portion of the believer, was formerly known and held amongst us, and was the subject of public testimony, whilst other Christians were in doubt and uncertainty, and sought to find this certainty in their state or feelings or enjoyment -- all of which are unable to give it, not being the sure Word of God.

Not only so, but the distinct presentation of Eternal Life to be received through the Son, as the result of the gift of God's Son (John 3:16), or of believing in the Son of God (John 6:40), or receiving the Word of the Son of God (John 5:24) with *the immediate certainty of its possession* as the consequence of the reception of the Son of God (John 3:36), has for fifty years marked the testimony which has been given and owned of God. This, moreover, was understood to be the divine object for which the Gospel of John was written. "These things are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might *have life* through His name" (John 20:31). Whilst the Epistle was expressly written to believers to establish them in the certainty of what they had received, not as a matter of evidence within themselves, but as a divine testimony: "If we receive the witness of men the witness of God is greater"; "These things," says the apostle, "I have written to you that ye *may know* that ye *have* eternal life who believe on the name of the Son of God" (1 John 5:13).

It were serious enough if only uncertainty were thrown upon all this divine truth, which so long characterized the

testimony, and was the means of so much blessing to souls who previously were in doubt as to the possession of eternal life. But far worse than this, is the deprivation of the Son of God of His personal and divine glory as "the Eternal Life," and the dividing His blessed Person in order to distinguish what is Eternal Life in Him and what is not. We had ventured to hope that the irreverences which had resulted from this attempt would, when attention was drawn to them, have deterred souls from venturing further on such dangerous ground. Instead of this, the supposed necessity and capability of distinguishing in the person of Christ what is divine and communicable, from what is incommunicable, has led to an alarming development of this system of thought, in which life and deity in the Son of God are divided -- Christ, as the Second Man and Eternal Life, is denied the possession of divine attributes -- whilst what is essentially human, is virtually introduced into His Godhead. Not only is Mr. Raven supported in this by writers hitherto little known among Brethren, but the positive necessity of this view is now affirmed by leaders among them, so that the mass, instead of being warned of the danger, are thereby invited and encouraged to pursue these unholy and soul-withering speculations. The serious responsibility which they have incurred by so doing, in appending their names and declaring that they have "full fellowship" with Mr. Anstey's statements, we leave to God and their own consciences. But rapidly as these views and the false doctrine and expressions connected with them were spreading previously, we can only anticipate, after the impulse thus distinctly, and without any warning, given to them, by men in such a prominent position, that the enemy of souls will take full advantage of

the opportunity thus afforded him, of spreading this poisonous leaven in their ranks to a fatal extent. They perhaps will only discover this when irreparable mischief has been done, for false doctrine is always ruinous in its effects upon souls, and numerous teachers, as will be shown in the sequel, are doing their utmost to give currency to these views in some of their worst features.

Such is the total loss of spiritual discernment produced by constant contact with this system of error, that others, instead of having uneasiness, or even jealousy for the personal glory of Christ, awakened in their minds, are ready to disseminate the pamphlets containing these sentiments broadcast, in order to discredit those who have opposed them; disregarding the injury they are inflicting in this way on souls, and the triumph that they are thus giving to the enemy, in his worst and darkest designs against the Son of God. To expose these errors from Scripture in their true light, is a duty from which love to the Lord and to souls forbids us to shrink, even though we expose ourselves as before to misapprehension, and even charges of insincerity. There is a day coming when all will be manifested. In the meantime, the approval of Him who knows the secrets of all hearts, and the deliverance of any of His who have yet "an ear to hear," are consolations which God gives in His grace. Besides this, the setting forth of the truth of God tends to strengthen faith in those that are weak, and to deliver them from the confusion of thought in which the adversary has sought by specious arguments to involve them. This has necessitated the further stating and bringing forward the truth concerning the Person of Christ, in order to show how that Person is presented and kept before us in Scripture -- our sure and safe guide if we follow it, as well as the divine antidote provided against the vain and dangerous speculations of the human mind. At the same time, whilst maintaining the reality of the union of the divine and human natures in the blessed Person of Christ, in opposition to the unhallowed attempts now made to divide them (after the fashion of the Nestorian heresy that troubled the church in the early part of the fifth century), we utterly refuse to define the manner of that union. We do not suppose for a moment that many of these writers are aware of what they are doing; for their evident ignorance of the ground they are traversing, and of the consequences that have followed to those who have ventured on this path before them, in the attempt to "distinguish" (as they call it) "between the human and divine," not merely in active manifestation, but in the Person of Christ Himself, makes the danger all the more serious for themselves and their followers.

It is evident from original letters of Mr. R.'s, now printed, that his views have become more developed and systematized. Indeed, he himself tells us "he was a learner, not a teacher, at Witney," and was then "on the road to light." This claim to "more light," on the subject of Eternal Life is advanced in the

Sept. No. of the *A Voice {to the Faithful, 1891}*, in a paper entitled "Divine Light Exposes its Contrary" (pp. 257-266). Such infatuation should only lead us to take a lower place for ourselves before God, and earnestly cry to Him for our brethren. But this claim is totally inconsistent with the assertion, that this system involved no new truth, but what we had all been accustomed to for so many years. The chief difficulty in reality has been, in the mystic and obscure nature of the system Mr. R. has elaborated, as well as the apparent contra- dictions it contains, which puzzle and perplex simple souls in a way that we never find in Scripture or in the teaching of the Spirit of God. We can see now that as a system it is fully developed, it is consistent as a whole, and the difficulty of grasping it is greatly diminished, now that we have something more than detached parts or fragments of it to examine; whilst it becomes evident where he is conducting us, and to what extent the truth of God is involved or lost, by adopting these views.

The citations from Mr. Darby, contained in various parts of this pamphlet, will be found of great value, and it seemed well to rescue them on this account from the mass of his writings, in which they are almost unknown or lost. Besides this, the subjects treated in this pamphlet are so little familiar to Brethren, that it appeared almost necessary to give some further evidence as to what has been held, by those who were raised up, to maintain the truth among us, on former occasions.

There does not seem anything that deserves a serious reply in the writings of those who have attacked the doctrine of the Tract entitled *The Manifestation of the Divine Nature*. If these attacks originated in value for the truth of God or love for souls, it would be another matter; but where sentences are taken up, only to twist and misrepresent their meaning, it is better to leave that to God, and seek rather to occupy the reader with the truth, adding explanation only of difficulties which have been raised, where it is required.

## Chapter 1

### *Eternal Life: Its Nature -- The Diversity of Thought Existing on this Subject*

It seems as if God had specially retained in His own hand certain secrets of nature, in order that we may be sensible how limited are the powers of the human mind, and may be prevented from intruding into that domain, which He has reserved for Himself. For though men may observe and ascertain the phenomena of nature, and what are the laws which govern them, the origin of these laws, and how they exist, is hidden from us. This is especially the case with life, whether in its highest or its lowest manifestations; from the infinite God, and heavenly or angelic life, down to its lowest terrestrial forms. If it is beyond our capacity then to seize and define that vital essence -- which even in the plant distinguishes it from mere dead matter -- how much more profound and impenetrable to us, must be the mystery of the blessed Person, who unites in one combination of glories all that is human and divine; and how vain, and almost blasphemous, the conceit that has assumed to decipher, to define, or limit Eternal Life, or life of any kind, as it exists, or is expressed, in Him.

Being what He is essentially, His life is as infinite as Himself; and it is an unwarrantable intrusion into the glory of His Person, to attempt to gauge it. Never before the rise of this system of thought, since Gnosticism had its day, do we find such unhallowed speculations. Nor do we believe that they would have been indulged in, or entertained in the minds of so many, unless, by describing Eternal Life as a sphere or condition, they had first accepted the thought that it could be dissociated, or distinguished from what Christ is personally. Thus -- though that thought is a mistake and profane -- the holy fear which would have prevented the enquiry, has been disarmed.

No one denies that "condition" or "sphere," is a necessary and indispensable accompaniment of life, and that in which the life displays itself; and thus it has come to be used, in a secondary or subordinate sense, for life itself. In intelligent beings, life belongs to, or is what is proper to, a *person* or *being*, not to a *condition*, for the condition only answers to, or corresponds with, that life. Hence Mr. Darby says, "Life is not a condition of being: it characterizes it." "Is life in God a mere condition of being? -- 'Being' means, what *has life*." This shows that he does not lose sight of the proper and primary sense of Eternal Life, as being personal, which these writers however will not allow in the sense in which it is here maintained, because they say that that would take us into Deity. To speak of it merely as a condition of being, when its essence is in question, destroys its proper nature -- life in its primary and proper sense, -- and substitutes by a sophism, (perhaps unconsciously), a *state* in

which life is found, for the reality of life itself.<sup>1</sup>

This sophism underlies almost all the reasoning of Mr. Raven and those who receive his views; and when it comes to be applied to Scripture teaching, or to the Person of Christ, or to the life we receive, it becomes very serious. Whilst the reader is thinking of life in its proper and original signification, he is unconsciously deceived by the substitution of a condition, without being aware that essential life is either lost or dropped out of view, or the two senses confused.

Is it honest therefore of Mr. R., or his advocates, to say to enquirers, that he "believes Christ Himself to be Eternal Life"; when he is using the term in another sense<sup>2</sup> and means something quite different from what is in the mind of the enquirer?

I do not accept the assertion of some that Eternal Life is an essential title of the Son of God. I am sure it cannot be maintained. I believe it to be a *term* indicating a *condition* (Letter of August 25th, 1890, published by Mr. Boyt, p. 4).

In the closing pages (see Appendix A) we have the most distinct proof, that the Eternal Life has *always* been identified, in the mind of saints, with the divine nature and the Person of the Son of God; that it is *His own life* with the Father in eternity, and is therefore identical in its character and nature with the life that was in the Father, though the relationship of Son is distinct.

The "*Word of life*" unites the manifestation of the divine nature, with this life, before the universe existed, for the Word is the expression of the mind of God. It was "the Word" that was "made flesh"; and we have also the statement, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." But this differs materially from a "sphere," "condition," or "state of blessing prepared for man," though finally it may be included as proper to it. Hence Mr. Raven carefully separates Eternal Life from Deity and from Sonship, saying that Sonship is "greater" than Eternal Life. But He cannot be greater than Himself. This is conclusive. Thus he will not allow that "the Eternal Life" is applicable to, or describes, or is used to distinguish, Christ as a Person.

1. There is in fact absolutely no life at all in the sphere, condition, or state in which life exists or is developed. And though life could not exist without such a sphere, yet life itself is not that *sphere*, and never should be confounded with it; for the water is not the fish in which the life resides, nor the air the bird.

2. This Mr. Raven at last admits. In writing to Mr. F. J. Rowan he says,

There is this difference between {A. H.} Rule and myself, in that he, so far as I can apprehend, gives to Scripture terms, such as "life," "eternal life," etc., a sort of substantive force, while my habit has been to regard them morally; i.e. as to what is characteristic in them.

I strongly object, [he says] to the talk about the Personality of Eternal Life, because (as the reference is to Christ) it makes Eternal Life commensurate with the person of the eternal Son, and this I believe to be very wrong.

For the same reason he will not apply Eternal Life to passages such as, "In Him was life"; nor allow that Christ is spoken of in the Gospel of John as Eternal Life. Nor can he find anywhere that Scripture "says that He was it, though it was manifested in Him." "Nor do I know," he says, "where Scripture says, 'He was in His own person the manifestation of Eternal Life,' nor where it says, 'It was what He was, not what He enjoyed.'" <sup>3</sup> (Letter of October 1st, 1890).

All this it is impossible to mistake; and though Mr. R. says elsewhere that "Eternal Life is Christ for the believer," he himself explains in what a limited sense, and with how different meaning he understands this, when he says it was "something that came to light, and is now perfectly expressed in Him." "A condition of relationship and being" . . . "and seeing that that condition existed, and was manifested, and is now fully expressed, even as to bodily condition, in the Son" -- (putting his own construction on J. N. D.'s language) he says, "it is Christ" (Letter of July 24th, 1890). This is perfectly consistent with the previous statements which we have given. If, as he says, Eternal Life is "an integral part of His Person," as having "embodied" this condition or state of being and relationship when He became Man, *the condition became identified with His person*, though it was not what He was personally, or His own divine nature in eternity. Indeed, we know the explanation given on this very point by a brother: "As my arm is an integral part of myself, so Eternal Life is an integral part of Christ." But Mr. Darby has given the reply to this, contrasting what the *believer* is with Christ, the Source and Sustainer of life: "My hand is a *part of myself*, and I may lose my hand, but that is not myself." To give another figure -- which may partially illustrate a sphere or condition or state of blessing -- Royalty is a condition attaching to the heir-apparent of the throne when born into this world, and, doubtless, he has a sphere connected with that state or condition; but it is not himself, nor his own essential life and being, though belonging to it, and though (as it has been explained in this controversy) he may enjoy royal life in its completeness when he comes to the throne, when royalty "is fully embodied and expressed in him."

Condition or relationships are more *accidentals* than *essentials* of life. We may have an earthly state of life as in man, or a heavenly as in angels. Royalty or Sonship are conditions or relations of life accessory but not necessary to it. Adam was not a son, nor in the relationship of a son; all are not fathers, nor are all in the sphere pertaining to Royalty. So that to identify life with a condition is in reality absurd, and reduces it to a nullity. Hence, *some* of Mr. Raven's passages give the serious impression that he does not believe in the impartation of life and of its real existence in the believer at all. He says "life is presented in Scripture, not so

much as a deposit in the believer, though Christ lives in him in the power of the Spirit, but as a state of blessing. Scripture does not, I think, speak of our having had eternal life imparted to us." (See also passages quoted in Appendix B). But thus divine truth is undermined in the soul, though the writer is variable and not always consistent in his statements.

But where is there authority in the Word of God for a separation between Life and Eternal Life, when speaking of Christ? He is the Life and the Eternal Life. Both are averred of Him. Mr. R. says:

The Life of which we are made participants is not the same life which was proper to the Son of God in His eternal existence . . . I could not make, "So hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself," and Eternal life to be the same (*Some Letters*, p. 10).

So that we have this elaborate system built upon the extraordinary theory that the addition of *eternal* to *life*, or to *the life*, makes it "a term indicating a condition," and a division or separation is made between Life and Eternal Life in Him, because the word *Eternal* is not always added. Mr. R. does not give the slightest proof of this from the word of God, but merely reasons from the fact that we receive eternal life, notwithstanding that the result of this theory is to make two kinds of life in Christ. Besides, we are as constantly said, to be recipients of life in the Son, as of eternal life. "And 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 of God hath not life." <sup>4</sup> Here life and eternal life are used interchangeably, as in the Son, and possessed by the believer without any distinction between them.

But it is the Son, though in Manhood, who is spoken of here, and we are to believe that this life in His Son is not identical with "In Him was Life" (*Some Letters*, p. 15). Mr. R. does not tell us what there is in the word "eternal," thus to qualify or alter the meaning of Life, nor can we find any such use of it in Scripture. We have "Eternal God," "Eternal Spirit," "eternal redemption," "eternal salvation," "eternal righteousness," but in none of these can we discover such a modifying or "technical" use of the word eternal; for though life is mysterious, both in its origin and nature and varied in its developments and manifestations, that is not due to the force of the word eternal, which has a constant meaning of its own. Will Mr. R. venture to say that when Christ says, "I am the Life," that it is not eternal life?

We subjoin an emphatic passage of Mr. Darby's on this point:

Here again (1 John 5:11, 12) it is evident as to our possession of it, that it is impossible to distinguish eternal life from the possession of life in the Son; that life is eternal life. He that has the Son has life in the Son, eternal life, for He is eternal life, and he that has not that has no life at all spiritually . . . In John 3:36 we have the same truth that Christ is life -- eternal life, and that he that has not eternal life has none . . . The distinction between life and eternal life is utterly futile"

3. Mr. R. now says, "I would not apply to the eternal Son, as *descriptive of His existence as a divine Person*, a term connected in scripture with blessing for man and consequently with Christ viewed mediatorially as man" (Letter of September, 1891).

4. This "record" of "life in His Son" moreover is presented to men as sinners, so that he who does not believe it makes God a liar; "because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son," a statement inapplicable to the believer.



(Collected Writings, vol. 7, pp. 32, 33).

## Chapter 2

### *Is Christ Personally the Eternal Life Which was Manifested Here? And Was Eternal Life Received From Him Whilst on Earth?*

In the Gospel of John, Christ is Himself everywhere, and in various ways, presented personally, as “the Life.” It is what *He is* essentially; what is *in Him*, shines out in Him, and flows forth from Him. On coming to Him, therefore, or believing in Him, or hearing His word, life is received. This life, as the effect of divine prerogative, is attached to the recognition of His Person here on earth, as well as to His work subsequently, and is again and again stated to be *eternal life*. It could not be less, as found in Him, and flowing from Him, according to the glory of His Person. Did He cease to manifest it, He would cease to be, or to manifest, Himself; for it is, as we have said, what He is, and He could not hide Himself. “In Him was life, and the life was the light of men.” “As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.” “Coming into the world, it shines upon every man”; not upon Jews only. It acted upon man’s heart and conscience, though, in its true nature, it was not comprehended. But the Lord says distinctly, “As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.” And, in the same chapter (John 9:5, 41), “If ye were blind, ye should not have sin”; for had they been blind, they would not have been morally guilty of slighting all that was displayed in Him. “Yet a little while,” he adds, “is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you” (i.e., the effect of His withdrawal). “While ye have the light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light” (John 12:35, 36).

This life shone as *the light* of men, and thus brought out the moral condition and need of man, and the whole state of the world; yet the light always shone as God’s perfect answer in grace to that need, and as life provided for man, and presented to man in His Person. He had come as Man, and for man, and was manifested here below in the lowliness and self-renunciation of manhood, in order to reach man. His external glory was hidden, in order to come so near to man, to attract and win him. Its effect was felt before it was really known in its true character, as we see in those who were disarmed by His words, and could not take Him (John 7:45, 46). In John 4 He says to the woman of Samaria, “If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give Me to drink, thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water.” This produced its effect, and attracted her, whilst it awakened confidence in His word,

even before she knew all that was implied. But was it not a present thing? And was it less than eternal life? “He would have given thee *living water*.” It is the gift of God, as in John 6, “My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven, for the bread of God *is He* which cometh down from heaven, and *giveth life* unto the world.” This is clearly, as incarnate, and as present here in the world, and for the world; as the repeated use of the present tense in the word “giveth” implies. Again, “*I am* the bread of life: he that *cometh* to Me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in Me shall never thirst.” Again, “This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one that *seeth the Son*, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day.” If His blessed Person was discerned, under this lowly form of manhood, not only to be the Messiah, but in reality the Son of God, it was even then eternal life (v. 40). Thus Peter, at the end of the same chapter, confesses Him and the glory of His Person; little as he may have apprehended all that his confession involved. Christ’s words to him, even then, were “The words of *eternal life*.” This is confirmed by the Lord’s own statement at the same time, and with reference to their effect upon the same persons; “It is the Spirit that quickeneth” -- It gives life -- “the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.” This accords with John 12:48-50, that the words that He then spake were the words given Him of *the Father*, and as such “*life everlasting*.”

Jesus, according to His divine title and prerogative, as the Son of God, acting with the Father (John 5), does the same works as the Father, and “*quickens whom He will*.” He states positively that the hour had already commenced (“now is”) when the dead should hear the voice of *the Son of God*, and they that hear should live. It was the hour,<sup>5</sup> even then,

---

5. This “hour” “now is,” (compare John 4:21, where though the chosen place of worship had not been formally set aside, the hour of spiritual worship had already begun), is in distinct contrast with that “hour” of resurrection which is only future: “the hour is *coming*” (not “now is,” i.e., not present). Besides this, the Lord adds, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that *heareth My word*, and *believeth* on Him that sent Me (*the Father*), *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment, but is passed from death unto life.” The words of the Son of God (“he that heareth My word”)

(ὁδὶαὶ Ὑᾶ ᾠδάέ...)

for the display of His power and title as the Son of God, in this way. Even as regards His position taken in manhood, "As the Father had life in Himself," so had "He given to the Son to have life in Himself." How could this be another kind of life? It was the same that was in the Father, and active in the same way (v. 21). Hence, after all the abundant evidence given concerning His blessed Person, and the object of His coming, He complains of the Jews at that very moment, "Ye will not come to Me that ye might have life."

In John 7:37, on that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried (according to the infinite fullness of divine life, and the depth of divine love that brought Him here for human need), giving the loud and distinct invitation to all who are conscious of such need, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink" -- a present and yet continuous thing. In this He takes, as so constantly in John, a worldwide aspect, and opens out that He has this living water for "*any* man." Is not this eternal life? And is it not presented as such *to the world*? The very same that afterwards was to flow out from the believer to others by the power of the Spirit -- descended from heaven -- when bestowed in its abundance, as *rivers of living water*?<sup>6</sup>

Granted that it was needful He should die that it might flow forth thus freely, yet He says, in words that express both these thoughts, "I am come that they *might have life*, and that they might have it abundantly" {John 10:10}.

Again, in the same chapter (John 10), He says, "I give unto them eternal life." It was indeed requisite that He should not only become incarnate, but die. And we have both these blessed facts set before us in John 6, "The bread of God is He that cometh down from heaven, and giveth *life unto the world*." And then, "The bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give *for the life of the world*." But both are alike on behalf of the world. Indeed, always in the Gospel of John, where, though Son of Man, He is specially before us as Son of God, He is for "the world," and not for Jews only, as their Messiah, in descent from *Abraham and David*. For a Jew has an undoubted and prescriptive right to Him as *such*, but as Son of God, sent by the Father, He is for *all*. Hence in this Gospel only He is seen among those outside. He gives the living water to the woman at the well, where His love makes Him at home among the Samaritans; and He rejoices in the prospect of an abundant harvest. Thus the apostle Paul says, "It pleased God to reveal *His Son* in me, that I might preach *Him* among the *heathen*."

There could not indeed be the same abundant outflow as when the just claims of the divine majesty and the rights of

God in regard to sin were met; for then divine love could express itself in all its fullness to a lost and perishing world in the gift of God's Son, so that *whosoever* believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life. But here, as elsewhere, this life is for the perishing (John 3:14-17).

There is a contrast, however, in this respect, between life and its manifestation, and forgiveness or justification; for life distinctly belongs to the manifestation of what is *in God Himself*, and *what the Son of God is personally*, as displayed in this world. Hence the Gospel of John, which presents God and the divine nature in the Son, speaks so much of "life"; whilst forgiveness and justification, being connected with the accomplishment of the work on which they are founded, are scarcely alluded to in it.

In the Old Testament, indeed, life was given with certain divine and essential qualities which always distinguish it, or souls could not have been in relation with God at all; as we learn from what is said of faith in Heb. 11. But the distinct testimony of "eternal life" was reserved for the presence of the Son of God on earth; in order to give it its true character, and to mark the glory of His Person, when manifested in His own divine fullness. Hence it is always what He is, that is brought before us in the Gospel of John, and declared publicly before all. "*I am*," (not I shall be) "the bread of life." "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." "I am the resurrection and the life."

This life in Him, in its fullness, extends not only to the soul, but to the body, and the sphere also in which that life is to be displayed -- beyond the power of death and the grave. He had but to apply the power of life that was there present, and existed in Himself; for the voice of the Son of God not only quickens the soul, but calls out of the grave; for here (John 11), it is not the effect of His work, as Man victorious over the grave, as in 1 Cor. 15, but the vivifying energy of divine power. For the life was present, divine, and eternal, subsisting in His own Person. He was it, and is it. "*I am* the resurrection and the life." The hour, however, for the full display of His life-giving power in that sphere of its action had not yet arrived; in *the other* it was present (John 5:25); this power was already in effective operation. He was the Son, and it was "*seeing* the Son," or the knowledge of the Son, that, according to the will of the Father that sent Him, was eternal life (John 5:40). But besides this, it was the knowledge of the Father, and the One whom He had sent, that was "eternal life" (John 17:3). This the disciples had already received: "I *have* manifested Thy name unto the men that Thou gavest Me out of the world . . . and they have known surely that I came out from Thee; and they have believed that *Thou* didst send Me." So in John 14:7, "From henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him." For the Lord speaks according to the character of the faith which had owned Him as the Son, and involved the knowledge of the Father -- as He tells them; though their intelligence did not reach to all that was included in it.

Everywhere, and at every turn in this Gospel, do we find this subject of eternal life, as the positive thing before us. At the very moment when the Son of God was present here upon

---

(...ooiÜ÷âéa)

were life eternal, as well as the knowledge of or belief on the Father that sent Him. Hence it is here, all (not in the future, but) in the present tense -- "*hath* everlasting life." Still stronger is the statement that such a soul *is* passed from death unto life, and shall not come into judgment.

6. Can there be any question that this is the same living water that Jesus speaks of in John 4, saying, "The water that I shall give him [the believer] shall be *in him* a well of water springing up into everlasting life"? Here it is not only a well, but a river flowing forth for others. Yet it has been denied to be within; or eternal life capable of being manifested to others.

earth, it was here in Him. He brought it with Him. It came in His Person. He was it essentially. He gave it (John 4 and 5). And He presented in His Person as incarnate, to man, and to the world, eternal life, in contrast with Judaism, and mere external privileges such as the Jews had enjoyed. Note the words, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead; this is the bread which *cometh down from heaven*, that a man may eat thereof, and not die" (John 6:50). If He spoke the words of eternal life, and the Jews would not come to Him that they may have it, the consequences would be fatal and final (John 8:25, 26). They would be left in darkness, and to die in their sins; and where He is they would never come. The life was *identical with the life that was in the Father*, and He, being the Son, quickened as the Father, as well as being in His manhood the depositary of this life from the Father; in order that, in every way, even in His humiliation, the glory of His Person might be maintained.

This life, and the communication of it whilst here on earth, is the leading and distinctive feature and characteristic glory of His Person, as incarnate, and is presented in every possible way in this Gospel, in connection with the revelation of Himself as the Son, and of the Father in Him.

Do we deny that though there are certain qualities essential to divine life, and though it was given as eternal life whilst the Son of God was on earth, that there is a marked difference to be noted after the death and resurrection of our Lord, in its character in the saint, and in our enjoyment of it? <sup>7</sup> or do we deny that its full expression and perfection are now seen in Christ in glory, to whom we are to be conformed? He says indeed that He *is come* that His sheep might have life, but He adds "and that they might have it abundantly," as the flowing forth of rivers of living water from the believer indicates. And again, "Yet a little while and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me; because I live ye shall live also." For though He quickened souls with eternal life as the Son of God (by virtue of the life that dwelt in Himself, and of which He was the embodiment and expression, as having come from the Father), yet there was no association in it with others at that time. Nor could it be said to be continuous with, and in *this* way, inseparable from, His own life; as the words "Because I live ye shall live also," imply. It was indeed *from* Him by the power of His living voice and word; but it was not enjoyed *with* Him, nor in Him, till the resurrection, when (seen as the corn of wheat with its much fruit risen out of the ground, bearing the multiplied grain) it exists as one whole plant (John 12:24). He comes back to His disciples after His resurrection, and for the first time breathes into (ἐν) them {John 20:22}; not only that this life may be realized abundantly {John 10:10} in the power of the Holy Ghost, but that it may be in inseparable association with Himself -- dwelling *in Him* and He *in us*. As He says, "*At that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and ye in Me, and I in you.*" How are we to enjoy all the sweetness of the

Father's love, as He enjoys it, and the depth of the relationship -- His relationship -- with the Father; save as having His risen life, and His Spirit? Thus only can He dwell in us Himself, as He says, "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*. And, these things I speak in the world, that they might have *My joy* fulfilled in themselves." This is not exactly union, though we dwell in God, and God in us, by His Spirit, yet we are never said to be united to God, as some have erroneously taught. But it is more than union; for if I could share both the life and spirit of a man, so as to dwell in him, it would be to participate in his thoughts and feelings, in a more intimate manner than even a wife, united as she is in the closest way to her husband, and by the tenderest bond.

In the following extracts from the writings of J. N. D. it will be seen that his views correspond in all points with what is here presented, whilst though a fictitious resemblance is sought to be established in some things, between Mr. D.'s views and Mr. Raven's, the whole system is entirely different. For it is evident: First, that, in contrast with F. E. R.'s statement, Mr. Darby says that the Gospel as well as the Epistle of John is characterized by the presentation of Christ as the Eternal Life. Secondly, that this life which God gives us in Christ was *essentially in the Father Himself* as well as in Him *as Son of God, a divine Person*; F. E. R. however carefully distinguishes it in Him from what is divine and essential, because he says, as we receive it, that would make us partakers of Deity. Hence he will not apply John 1:4 to Eternal Life, which is so applied by Mr. D., and connected with us. Thirdly, that of this life Christ was the representative, and that it has to be manifested in us here below, which F. E. R. will not admit. Fourthly, it is connected by Mr. D. with the new birth, from which in its origin it cannot be separated. Lastly, Mr. D. calls it the Life divine and eternal, which, he says, cannot by any possibility perish.

John 10:10. Jesus, in contrast with all the false pretenders, who only came to steal and to kill, came that we might *have life*, and that we might have it in abundance. The first expression is the object of His coming in general, which characterizes the Gospel and also the Epistle of John. *It is the Son of God* come down, that we might live through Him. *He is the Eternal Life* which was with the Father, and gives life, and becomes Himself our life. (Compare 1 John 4:9; 1:2; 5:11, 12; John 3:15, 16. These quotations might be multiplied). The second part of the sentence shows the character and fullness of *this life*. This life is in the Son. *Having the Son*, we have life, and we have it according to the power of His resurrection. The faithful in old times were quickened; but here it is *the Son Himself who becomes our life*, and that as Man risen from amongst the dead. We have it "abundantly." This tenth verse gives us the great purpose of the coming of the Son of God ("Notes on the Gospel of John," chap. 10. *Coll. Writ.* 33, p. 339).

Then the Lord declares plainly to us what He gives them; that is, eternal life, in the full assurance of the faithfulness of Christ, and of the power of the Father Himself. Already had He declared that His object in coming was, in grace, to give life, and life in

7. For further unfolding of this difference in Old Testament and Millennial Saints, see *The Teaching of Scripture on the Subject of Spiritual Life and the Sealing of the Holy Ghost*, by the same author. (See pp. 34-45, 58, 59 {26-30, 34, herein}), G. Morrish.

abundance, not to seek booty, like a robber, but to give life from above, in grace. We have here the nature and character of this life, in grace; it was eternal life, that life of which Christ was the source and representative in humanity (compare 1 John 1:2, and also John 1:4) *that life which was essentially in the Father Himself*, which was in the Person of the Son down here, the life that God gives us in Him (1 John 5:11, 12), and by Him, which we possess in Him; for He is our life (Col. 3:4; Gal. 2:20); which bears the impress of Christ, new position of man, according to the counsels of God. For us -- first character of this life, for we were dead in our trespasses and sins, and under the power of death down here -- Christ is, then, the resurrection and the life, a life *which ought to manifest itself in us now*, and which breathes, so to speak, by faith in Him (Gal. 2:20; 2 Cor. 4:10-18), and will be fully developed when we shall be with Him, and glorified (Rom. 6:22), but which subsists in the knowledge of the Father, the only true God, and of Jesus Christ whom He has sent (John 17:2, 3; see 1 John 5:20) (p. 343).

But if Christ is thus our life, then life in Him does not perish, nor fail in us; because He lives, we shall live also. Can He die, or can the *divine life* in us come to decay? Assuredly not. We shall not perish; the life of which we live is *divine and eternal life* (p. 344).

As to *Eternal Life*, in the full sense of it, it is Christ Himself, and that revealed as Man in glory (1 John 5:20). But its essence is *divine life* in the person of Christ (1 John 5:11, 12). "In Him was life," and that life *He has in manhood* (John 5:24). But this has a double character; the Son quickens as Son (verse 21), and then we are when dead in sins quickened together with Christ: in one *as Son of God, a divine person*; in the other a dead man whom God raises. Now life and

incorruptibility were brought to light by the gospel . . . Now *till He came* this never was displayed, nor according to God's full purpose in man till He was glorified. But I have no doubt the Old Testament saints were quickened, and they will be perfected. Still it was *as much in Christ humbled* as in Christ glorified. 1 John 1 was before the world, and that is its essence, only now brought to light in connection with the incorruptibility of the body in resurrection (or changed), a spiritual body.

But in the Lord's unfolding of the subject, in John 6, you find having *Eternal Life as a present thing*, as constantly in John,<sup>8</sup> but directly connected four times over with His raising us in the last day. Its full development is in the sphere it came from, and in the power of Him who has it in connection with man; and so immortality (incorruptibility) the body brought in. Nor, though they have it down here, is this shut out in the final result in Matthew 25, Daniel 1, and Psalm 133.

*You cannot separate Eternal Life and new birth*; but though the essence of divine life is there, yet *Eternal Life in Christ as Man and finally in glory does go further*, man being quickened, as accomplished in Christ glorified. It is the gospel which has brought it to light" (*Letters*, part 13 p. 171-173).

---

8. As an illustration of the effect of these doctrines, the writer observes with regret, that in a new edition of the well-known paper on *The Old Nature and the New Birth*, the author (Mr. G. Cutting) has suppressed all that he stated in the first edition, on the certain possession of eternal life, on believing on the Son of God (see pages 5-12). This, moreover, is done without any intimation of the author's change of sentiment!

## Chapter 3

### *The Person of Christ Unfathomable*

This great mystery of the person of Christ is what is specially committed to the Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, to uphold and maintain it in the world. She has to be faithful to the sacred trust committed to her, and it is for this object she specially exists. It is this which gives its character to her position in this scene; and this is the mystery of godliness, and is the foundation of all spiritual life and piety (1 Tim. 3:15, 16). "God was manifested in flesh." This manifestation characterized His whole existence here. As such, He was "seen of angels," and we know from Luke 2 that this commenced at His birth, and was a source of wonder, delight, and praise even then to those exalted beings. Not only so, but He was "justified in the Spirit." The Spirit verified His title, or glorious claim, as God manifest down here -- by the power of the Holy Ghost that accompanied His whole life, path, actions, and testimony in this world -- by publicly descending on Him from the opened heaven -- and by rendering witness to Him in His resurrection, in which He was "declared to be the Son of God with power according to *the Spirit of holiness*" {Rom. 1:4}. His subsequent descent on the day of Pentecost, with "signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts," renders additional testimony to this great fact and mystery.

All this is typically expressed in Lev. 8, where the high priest is anointed without blood, alone and apart from his sons, but along with the tabernacle and all that it contained, according to the title Christ has in His own divine Person. The tabernacle, figure of God's abode in creation, where He revealed Himself in connection with it, becomes thus the scene where the glory of Christ is displayed. After that Aaron, the high priest, was clothed with the garments of glory and beauty which distinguished his position, the tabernacle and all that was within it, with the altar and the laver, were anointed with the fragrant oil. And this was done in conjunction with the person and the position occupied by the high priest, emblematical of the preeminence and dignity of Christ thus prefigured, of which the Holy Ghost's presence and power and action in the universe is the expression.

The Scripture, when announcing the birth of Christ and His manifestation to Israel, puts these words into the lips of the remnant: "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given"; but the very first thing that is revealed respecting this Child is that, His name shall be called "*Wonderful*," and that He is the "Counselor, the mighty God, the Father of eternity" (Isa. 9:5); that is, that the mystery of His Person is "wonderful," and as such surpassing human ken, even when presented as a *Child born* and a Son given to Israel, or as the virgin's seed whose name was called "Immanuel," i.e. God with us. This mystery is "wonderful" from the first moment

to the last. It is intended to be a mystery, infinitely so; and as such is impenetrable, unfathomable. Hence, he who attempts to touch it, or to reason upon it, necessarily loses the proper glory which belongs to it and gets out of his depth, and in reality destroys what he touches, because it is infinite, and he is only finite; he is limited, and this is illimitable, undefinable. As another has well said on these very subjects: "The moment you define you *limit*," reducing the glory of His divine person to the low level or measure of the human mind. *Faith*, and faith only, can apprehend, or rightly receive, without pretending to fathom, such mysteries as the Trinity, or the Person of Christ, or even creation (Heb. 11:3). It receives the wondrous revelation of them, and bows and worships; whilst reason, if it attempts to search into them, exceeds its powers, and is necessarily at fault. Faith alone can appreciate, or in any little measure respond to the revelation which God has given of His blessed Person as "wonderful." God has become Man, for He has not taken angelic nature to manifest Himself in, but manhood; as the angels tell us, the expression of divine "good pleasure in men, and *glory in the highest*" (Luke 2:14).<sup>9</sup>

Whilst the Lord loves to be near us and show Himself to us in the most gracious and condescending way in order to win our confidence and draw us near to Himself -- allowing the apostle John to rest on His bosom, the multitudes to throng and press Him, or the woman and others to draw virtue out of Him by a touch -- yet how often do we see a sort of mysterious power surrounding or displayed by Him! When exposed apparently to the fury of His enemies, He sometimes hides Himself, or passes through the midst of them untouched (Luke 4; John 8). He appears to the relief of His disciples, walking on the sea in the midst of the storm, and saying, "It is I, be not afraid." And in a moment on His entry into the ship it is *at the land* whither they went (John 6:21). On other occasions, with power over all, He tells them where to find the ass with the colt, to bring it from the hand of the owner, for His triumphal entry into Jerusalem; or indicates the upper chamber for the last paschal supper; or directs Peter to the

---

9. Hence Mr. Raven and others with him were bound to err when they attempted to define or declare what was *not* manifested in Him; and hence the offensiveness of the statement that it is a "monstrosity to say that the Lord never ceased to be the exhibition of eternal life from the babe in the manger to the throne of the Father." And he reasons further and says that "He was as a babe the exhibition of infancy in its helplessness, for all else, though there, was for the moment veiled, and it was His glory, for in being made of a woman, becoming man, He came truly and really into humanity in its conditions here, grew and increased in wisdom and stature" (Letter dated "Greenwich, March 20, 1890"). Besides this, negatives, as has been said, are always dangerous things; for you must know *everything*, even about a human person from his infancy, to be able to say such or such qualities had not been manifested in him in childhood.

piece of money in the fish's mouth for the tribute.

We have said, indeed, that it is needful always to have before us the divine estimate of this blessed One as that which is presented to us in the Gospels. Into this faith gradually enters as it studies these divine revelations, and becomes more imbued with their spirit and character; for we otherwise fall into the danger of being more or less affected by the atmosphere of unbelief which surrounded Him, and which is so congenial to our fallen nature. None assuredly can "tell" all that God could discern in its perfection in His Son as Man here, though it is evident that this is just what the Gospels reveal; and that whilst we have there a perfect picture of Christ, according to the mind of God, we have also as a sort of background, the unbelief of the human heart.

But again and again we are reminded in the Scriptures, that what is infinite and illimitable lies hid in His blessed Person, for there dwells all the fullness of the Godhead *bodily*; so that all the vain speculations now current among brethren, and among the ritualistic and rationalistic leaders of thought in the Establishment, only involve them in a labyrinth of error. For the subject transcends the powers of the human understanding, which is sure to fail in the attempt to resolve it.

Though He is rejected by man because of His humiliation (in Matt. 11) -- for the pride of man is "offended" by the lowly guise and form of manhood which He has assumed -- He bows to His Father, who hides these things from the wise and prudent, and reveals them unto babes; and we there learn that so glorious and profound is this mystery of His Person, that it is inexplicable to man. But what is most remarkable, and shows how, on account of His humiliation, His sacred character is guarded, it is not so affirmed of the Father; for while it is said that no man or creature "knoweth the Son but the Father," *it is* permitted to us by the indwelling of the Spirit to know the Father. "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, *and he* to whomsoever the Son wills (βούληται) to reveal Him." There is not in the Father that complex glory which exists in the Person of the Son become man, but pure and simple divine character and nature, which could be revealed and made known by the Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (cp. John 1:18, 14:8, 9, 16:25, 17:6, 25, 26). Hence the glory of the Son who became man, and in consequence exposed Himself to be scrutinized and treated with indignity by the wretched ingratitude of the heart of man, for whose sake He humbled Himself, is safeguarded by the inscrutability which surrounds it. And so jealous is the Holy Ghost, by whom the Gospels are indited, on this subject, that the same truth is repeated still more emphatically in Luke 10:22: "*All things* are delivered to Me of My Father; and no man knoweth who *the Son is*, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, *and he to whom* the Son wills to reveal Him" {Luke 10:22}. The difference of the language here observable is remarkable; it is not only "no man knoweth the Son, but the Father," but no man knoweth (τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς) *who the Son is* but the Father," that is, not only His Person cannot be fathomed, *but*

*the manner of His existence is wholly incomprehensible* to the human understanding.<sup>10</sup>

Who, for instance, can form an idea of the effect of the presence, action, and power of the Holy Ghost in that human nature, the Seed of the woman conceived of the Virgin by His power? For though it was "the Seed of the woman," and conceived *of her* according to the promise, and thus of her nature and substance, the action of the Spirit was such, in the miraculous conception of that holy humanity {Luke 1:35}, that the angel says that that Holy Thing born of her could, on this account (as well as in His own higher nature), bear the title of the Son of God. Thus all His human life was in the power of the Holy Ghost, infinitely beyond His marvelous action on saints in earlier days. This explains how, in the sacrificial aspect of His giving up Himself to death, it is said by the apostle Paul in Heb. 9, that He, "*through the Eternal Spirit*, offered Himself without spot to God"; for the Holy Ghost acts in being Himself, in an infinite way, the power of those motives and feelings, which led Him to devote Himself thus for the glory of God, in His death. So again we read, "He was led of the Spirit into the wilderness" to be "tempted of the devil," and "Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (Luke 4).

This was signified of old in the type when the fine flour was *mingled*, as well as *anointed* with oil. We have pointed out the activity of the Spirit of God from the earliest moment in John the Baptist; how then can we limit His energy, and the effect of His *all-pervading presence* thus specially marked, in the case of our Lord Himself? Before the scene in the temple, even from His infancy, we read what could not be said of another, He was "filled with wisdom." Now wisdom is not only knowledge, but the power or capacity of adjusting the relations of things, or using knowledge rightly. Where can we find another who could tell us what was addressed to Him at the moment of His birth? "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art My Son; *this day have I begotten Thee*. Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession" (Psa. 2:7, 8). We have seen (*The Manifestation of the Divine Nature*) in Psa. 22 how the sense of conscious relationship, confidence, and hope was expressed by the Lord when He was upon His mother's breasts; but this goes even farther, for He declares how He was addressed as Son and heir by the Father, on the day of His birth, and what was then pledged to Him, and on what ground.

Of Him alone, in contrast with all others, it is said, "He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him" (John 3:34). A prophet might communicate messages which were given to

10. Thus is rebuked the slighting allusion to this passage contained in the words,

Retiring behind the oft-quoted phrase, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father" (*Voice to the Faithful*, January, 1891, page 15).

And the dangerous claim to *distinguish*, in this incomprehensible mystery, the human from the divine (page 17), now put forth by so many of these teachers.

him, but at other times he spake as other ordinary men; whilst Jesus spake only and always *the words of God*, and nothing else, just because He was God, and spake always by the Spirit of God. If He cast out devils, it was by the finger of God, and by the Spirit of God (Matt. 12:28); but He could also whilst on earth confer on others the power of doing the same and working miracles, to impart which is the prerogative of God alone (Luke 9:1; Mark 6:7). What above all marks the import of the passage, that none knows who the Son is but the Father, is the statement in Colossians, twice repeated, that in Him all the fullness (of the Godhead) is pleased to dwell.<sup>11</sup> Not only this, but "in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." This statement, true of Him when on earth, is generally supposed to express that He is God incarnate; but far more than this is contained in it. He is corporeally the center of the presence and action of all the divine Persons. He is the Son in His own Person. He manifests perfectly the Father in all His blessed nature; for He can say, "I and My Father are one," and, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." And all the energies and working of the Holy Ghost, in the scene of evil that surrounded Him, proceeded from Himself as their center. This is expressed in the Revelation, when He is said to be, both now and in the future, possessor of the seven Spirits of God (originally seen before the throne, and subsequently sent forth into all the earth), first in the address to the church at Sardis, and afterwards when seen as the Lamb that had been slain, in the midst of the throne, with seven horns and seven eyes, emblematic of the fullness of divine intelligence, and of active power which He wields in all the universe (Rev. 1:4; 4:5).<sup>12</sup>

It is important to observe, that in both the passages which

11. "The Father" has been wrongly introduced here (A. V.); for the πληρωμα or "fullness" refers to the Godhead, i.e. all the persons subsisting in the divine glory. It expresses the complacency of which the Person of Christ is both the object and the subject; so that instead of being some inferior or subordinate person because he became Man, it is exactly the reverse. The Godhead has been pleased to magnify His Person, by making His human form its dwelling-place, the channel of its expression and display, and His death the means of the reconciliation to itself of the whole scene which has been defiled by sin, as well as of ourselves, i.e. persons, who are *now* brought nigh. The word εὐδοκῆσθαι (was pleased) being in the past tense shows that the former extends to His Person and life when on earth.

12. Mr. Raven may see only the exhibition of infancy in its helplessness; but Scripture calls Him, the babe, "God with us," and the child "the mighty God," i.e., far more than saying "God was in the babe," for God has dwelt in man in the prophets of old by His Spirit, or now, as the apostle John tell us, in us (1 John 4), but never before or in any other were God and man united in one for our eternal blessing and to accomplish redemption. Is it possible that Mr. Anstey (*Letter to Brethren on the Continent*, p. 4) can be ignorant of this difference? He denies that "Mr. R. separates the true Godhead from the manhood," because he says "God was IN the babe," and adds, "The weakness of such a charge is manifest. Have we never read 'God was in Christ'?" Unitarian and other heretical teachers will admit that God was in the babe, as He was in John the Baptist, who was full of the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb; but they will not admit that the babe was God. Mr. Raven, as the consequence of dividing the Person of Christ, to which his views on eternal life have led him, always thus speaks, "All was there"; but to his eye nothing but "helplessness" was "exhibited," all else though there, was "veiled." He has repeated this in various ways, so that the withdrawal of the word "helpless" in one instance leaves his teaching untouched. He says, "It was humanity in as conditions," to which he then limits the Lord's Person; and, in consequence, the manifestation also.

specially speak of the Lord before the assumption of humanity, and subsequently to His becoming man, His divine personality is always maintained. Nor did He take another personality by becoming man. It is one and the same Person that Scripture presents to us throughout. In Heb. 10, "Then said I, Lo, *I* come to do Thy will, O God"; "A body hast Thou prepared Me." The statement, "In the volume of the book it is written of Me," comprises all that He fulfilled, *after* that He had taken as well as in taking the body prepared for Him. In what follows we read, "But *this man*, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." In Phil. 2 He who is subsistent in the form and glory of God, empties *Himself*; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbles *Himself*. The divine personality is not lost by His becoming man, but is marked or distinguished even then, by these acts ascribed to Him. Hence He carried with Him the infinite sense of what He was, and what He came to do. "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God." And the result of His intervention never falls below the height of this infinite purpose and presence, as is distinctly shown in His still *humbling Himself*, and fulfilling what was written in these eternal counsels concerning Him. At no moment of His life, from His birth, when He takes the body prepared for Him, to His giving it up on the cross, could this be wanting.

On this passage in Heb. 10 Mr. Darby thus comments:

Before He became man, in the place where only divinity is known, and its eternal counsels and thoughts are communicated between the divine Persons, the Word -- as He has declared it to us, in time, by the prophetic Spirit -- such being the will of God contained in the book of the eternal counsels, He who was able to do it, offered Himself freely to accomplish that will.

That of which we have been speaking is *continually* manifested in the life of Jesus on earth. *God shines through His position in the human body*; for He was necessarily God in the act itself of His humiliation, and none but God could have undertaken and been found in it. Yet He was always, and entirely and perfectly, obedient and dependent on God. That which *revealed itself in His existence on earth* was the expression of that which was accomplished in the eternal abode in His own nature. That is to say (and of this Ps. 40 speaks), that which He declares and that which He was here below are the same thing: the one in reality in heaven, the other bodily on earth. That which He was here below was but the expression -- the living, real, bodily manifestation of what is contained in those divine communications which have been revealed to us and which were the reality of the position that He assumed (*Synopsis on Hebrews*, p. 335, 336).

... He tells us that He took this place willingly, according to the eternal counsels respecting His own Person. For the Person is not changed. But He speaks in the Psalm according to the position of obedience which He had taken, saying always *I* and *Me* in speaking of what took place before His incarnation" (p. 334, note).

How different all this is from Mr. R. and those writers whose reasonings would reduce us to the conclusion that His infancy was practically unaffected by His divinity or by the unlimited presence of the Holy Ghost; thus lowering Him below what was true of John the Baptist, who was "filled with the Holy Ghost from His mother's womb!"





## Chapter 4

### *The Person of Christ. The Result of this System in Dividing that ever Blessed Person*

The evil effect of the spread of this teaching in the minds of saints is becoming very palpable. Mr. Anstey states, in his second letter to Continental brethren:

We may *distinguish* Eternal Life and true Godhead in the person of the Son of God (see 1 John 1, 2), and we must *separate* them when we think and speak of what has been communicated to us.

The truth is that in rejecting, as you do, the distinction which he (Mr. R.) makes between "Eternal Life and Deity" in the Godhead, and in affirming (with this thought in your minds) a further point -- that Eternal Life and Godhead, as to God's gift to us, cannot be separated, because that it is "Christ Himself and not a part of Him" that we receive (true as this is in its place) -- you have fallen into the very same system of error, as is exposed above by J. N. D. You say that we *must not* "distinguish" (which you call "separate") "Eternal Life" from "Godhead." Hence if we have the one we must have the other" (pp. 1, 2).

Now this attempt to distinguish Eternal Life and true Godhead in the person of Christ, is without any foundation in Scripture, and the passage Mr. Anstey refers to, viz., 1 John 1:2, teaches exactly the opposite. For what the Eternal Life was *with* the Father, was *before* manifestation in this world; and (unless we admit the false ideas which have been advanced involving a pre-existent humanity in His Person) was certainly Godhead; for there was nothing else existent there but Godhead being, life, and nature. This fact disposes of all these false and mystic notions at one blow. Pure Godhead *alone* existed in Christ before He came into the world, just as in the Father and in the Spirit, and no other; though the personality was distinct. Therefore the attempt to make out "something" distinct and different from Godhead, because that "something" is communicated to us, creates a false and mythical nature, which is supposed to be Eternal Life, but which has no existence at all, except in the mind of its author. This is what J. B. S. and C. H. M. have now, by attaching their signatures, committed themselves to, as well as other teachers, and virtually all who have adopted these views. The relationship was divine, and the existence purely and exclusively divine, and from eternity; so that distinction of personality in the Godhead does not make any such nature of being as is described by Mr. Raven and his supporters.

This endeavor to "*distinguish* Eternal Life and true Godhead in the person of the Son," is just what has led to the irreverent expressions which have been uttered concerning the Lord, and to the dividing of His glorious person. And what

follows, that "we must *separate* them, when we *think* and *speak* of what has been communicated to us," has the same tendency; for it cuts off and separates the eternal life which we enjoy, from its true divine source, and that which can alone sustain it in us. In ourselves we unquestionably must distinguish it from true Godhead; but to distinguish it in Him is to destroy both its nature and His Person. Faith knows and delights to recognize "both what is human and what is divine" in the blessed Person of Christ. But this distinguishing, now generally advocated by rationalistic writers, is most dangerous ground to get upon, and it is wholly false to say that the Gospels ever do this.<sup>13</sup> On the contrary, as we have said, they ever keep Him before us in the unity of His Person. No doubt they present, as has been stated, sometimes more of the divine and sometimes more of the human; and doubtless some acts are more characteristically divine in their nature, and others more characteristically human. But even in specifically human acts, to attempt to draw the line, even as to these, or to *exclude* what is divine from them, and *vice versa*, is not permissible; and if reverence and faith and love for that blessed One are allowed to have their place, such an

---

13. We have in the *A Voice to the Faithful* for January, 1891, page 14:

There is a tendency on the part of some at present to connect believers directly with Deity, by affirming that "*Deity and life are inseparable*," and other similar statements, and this mainly on the ground of 1 John 5:20. I do not doubt it is a subtle effort of the enemy to obscure the glory of the ever-blessed Son of God, by limiting Him to that in which we can be united to Him; for we could not have association with Him in His divine character and glory.

What gives this paper an importance it would not have of itself, is that it has the sanction of the editor {J. B. Stoney} of the *Voice*, and has been widely distributed for the instruction of the faithful, like the second letter to the foreign brethren, countersigned by J. B. S. and C. H. M. Alas! that these writers also, in signing this letter, objecting to Eternal Life being identified with Deity in the Person of our blessed Lord, should give the impression that they have become strongly impregnated with F. E. R.'s views.

It is alarming to see evil doctrine spreading in this way; and men of weight and character in the Church of God becoming involved in it, and lending their authority to unsound statements such as these, on the fundamental truth of the Person of Christ; instead of repudiating such assertions, and lifting up a warning voice to all they can reach against them. What hope can there be for the mass, who are sure to follow where their leaders are not afraid to tread, and who are equally sure to go beyond them. Our brother C. H. M. at the first refused to allow of any defining or separating Eternal Life in its existence and manifestation in the Person of our blessed Lord. (See Appendix B. in *The Manifestation of the Divine Nature*, p. 45 {pp. 88b, 89a, herein). But there is no safeguard against the power of evil for the saint, but total repudiation of and separation from it. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." Those who practically lend it their sanction, cannot expect to escape its taint.

attempt will be at once checked. Take, for instance, the Lord touching the leper. No doubt it was with a human hand that He does so; but that blessed hand conveys divine virtue and power, and dispels the leprosy in a moment. And the words, "I will, be thou clean," expressive of divine title and authority, coming forth from human lips, and a heart filled with infinite love, accompany His touch, which in any other than His would have involved defilement. So when "the whole multitude sought to touch Him," the Spirit of God adds, "for there went virtue out of Him and healed them all." Even in death (which is an act of a specific human character), we have seen that the divine purpose and nature (Heb. 10), not only gave all force and meaning to the assuming the body prepared for Him, but characterized the wondrous offering of that body on the cross; so that God could find His infinite pleasure and satisfaction in it. No man could take His life from Him. He had power to lay it down, and power to take it again. In a similar way we are not only told, that, whilst voluntarily submitting to it for our sakes, He could not be holden of death, for He was the Prince of Life; but He gives His flesh for the life of the world, and He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever. This life in Him overcomes all the power of death, and this is here extended distinctly to His humanity.

In this His divine title and exemption from death, save by His own act, as well as His resurrection power, appear. He adds, "Therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again"; i.e., it was the voluntary nature of this act, and loving obedience to His Father in it, that constituted its value.

Thus, though we do not call divine acts human nor human acts divine, the Scripture shows us that, in His acts, the human and divine combine or mingle. If this is denied, His blessed Person is divided, and all the value of what He does, and is, is lost. This does not imply any confusion or transformation of the human into the divine, or the divine into the human; but it implies a union intimate and perfect, in His blessed Person, which will be our joy, as it is the ground of our confidence, throughout eternity. An union which is impenetrable and unfathomable, but because of which it could be said, when He was on earth, "The Son of man which is in heaven."

For the help of the reader we quote a passage of Mr. Darby's, in which he comments on Mr. B. W. Newton's views, who in like manner was led by his false doctrine to divide the Person of the Lord. It will be seen that Mr. D. takes precisely the same ground as the writer has done in these pages, and wholly condemns the attempt to sever, either in thought, feeling, or action, the two natures, which coexist in the one and the same blessed Person of Christ.

Mr. N. goes beyond Scripture in saying that "to say that there was in His *humanity* a *divine* spring of thought and feeling is to deny His *real* humanity." Was His humanity then without a divine spring of thought and feeling? Had he said it was not of or from His humanity I should have nothing to say. But to say there was none in it unsettles the doctrine of Christ's Person. There was the fullness of the Godhead bodily;

and the divine nature was a spring of many thoughts and feelings in Him. This is not the whole truth, but to deny it is not truth. If it merely means that humanity has not in itself a divine spring, that is plain enough, it would not be humanity. I am equally aware that it will be said that it was in His Person. But to separate wholly the humanity and divinity in springs of thought and feeling is dangerously overstepping Scripture. Is it meant that the love and holiness of the *divine nature* did not produce, was not a spring of, thought and feeling in His human soul? This would be to lower Christ below a Christian.

"His humanity," it is said, "was not *sui generis*." This too is confusion. The abstract word humanity means humanity, and no more; and, being abstract, must be taken absolutely, according to its own meaning. But if the writer means that in fact the state of Christ's humanity was not *sui generis*, it is quite wrong, for it was united to Godhead, which no one else's humanity ever was, which, as to fact, *alters its whole condition*. For instance, it was not only sinless, but, in that condition, incapable of sinning; and to take it *out of that condition is to take it out of Christ's Person*. What conclusion do I draw from all this? That the wise soul will avoid the wretched attempt to settle, in such a manner, questions as to Him whom no one knoweth but the Father. The whole process of the reasoning is false (p. 229).

Now that Christ was truly man, in thought, feeling, and sympathy, is a truth of cardinal blessing and fundamental importance to our souls. But I have learnt thereby, not that humanity is not real humanity if there is a divine spring of thought and feeling in it, but that God can be the spring of thought and feeling in it, without its ceasing to be truly and really man. This is *the very truth of infinite and unspeakable blessedness* that I have learnt. This, in its little feeble measure, and in another and derivative way, is *true of us now by grace*. He who searches the hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit. This is true in Jesus in a yet far more important and blessed way . . . What I see in Christ is man, where God has become the spring of thought and feeling. And, *through this wonderful mystery*, in the new creation *in us* all things are of God. *That*, if we speak of His and our humanity, is what distinguishes it . . . Humanity is always simply humanity. The moment I call it His it is *sui generis*, because it is His; and, in fact, humanity sustained by Godhead is not humanity in the same state as humanity unsustained by Godhead (Extracts from "Letter on Subjects Connected with the Lord's Humanity" *Collected Writings of J. N. D.*, vol. 15, pp. 228-230).

In a note Mr. Darby also says:

Did He hereby cease to be man? Not at all. It is, though according to God, *in* man, and *as* man, these thoughts and feelings are to be found. And this extends itself to all the sorrows and the pressure of death itself upon his soul, in thought. He had human feelings as to what lay upon Him, and before Him; but God was the spring of His estimate of it all. Besides, the manifestation of God was in His ways. We had known man innocent, in suitable circumstances; and guilty, subject to misery; but in Christ we have perfectness in relation to God in every way, *in infallibly maintained communion* in the midst of all the circumstances of sorrow, temptation, and death, by which He was beset; the spring of divine life in the midst of evil, so that His every thought, as man, was perfection before God, and perfect in that position. This was what marked His state, as being down here, this new thing (*Collected*

Writings of J. N. D., vol. 15, p. 230).

## Chapter 5

### *Does the Fact of Christ Being Himself "The Life," Involve Association with Him in Deity, in Those Who Partake of It?*

The idea of absorption or participation in Deity is shocking to every godly mind; for it would, if in any sense admitted, deprive the ever-blessed God of that worship and glory, which every renewed soul finds its delight in rendering to Him, and of which He alone is the object. In fact in such case there could only be contemplation, but not adoration; for we should be worshiping ourselves, after having dethroned God from His exclusive place of supremacy. Whereas the more blest we are, the more we delight to own Him as God alone, and to celebrate the worthiness of God and the Lamb, by the Holy Ghost for ever.

But there is really no sense in the objection made, that the partaking of divine life involves participation in Godhead.<sup>14</sup> It is confusing between personality, and nature, or life. Though I derive human life from earthly parents, I do not share their personality. The mother also has a personality distinct from that of her unborn babe. This does not, indeed, exhibit all the difference needful to be pointed out in the case of spiritual life received from God, but it shows how life and divine nature may be, and are, imparted to us, as Scripture teaches, without touching the distinct personality, either of the Father, who begets us by His word and His Spirit, or of the Son, who quickens and sustains us by His life, without in any sense bringing us into Godhead. "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father" (as the Lord alone could be), "and ye in Me, and I in you"; and "because I live, ye shall live also." We do not attempt to fathom *how* this can be; but, like other divine mysteries, we rejoice in the fact, and the reality; and that it cannot, as is averted, be separated in His Person from what He is divinely, or all the blessing of it would be lost.

There are four points alluded to in *The Manifestation of*

*the Divine Nature* which distinguish the participation in Eternal Life from Godhead, and render such a notion wholly inconsistent with what is there advanced. It is there said,

Christ is spoken of *personally* and *essentially* as the Life or the Eternal Life, just as He is addressed as "Jehovah," or as "the Word"; for to be the source and spring of spiritual life, to give it or to maintain it, *is a divine prerogative*, and this Eternal Life is a special manifestation or aspect of the divine in Him. But though it is what He is essentially, *it does not*, any more than His title of "Jehovah," or than that of "the Word," *include all that He is essentially*; hence the idea that the participation in it introduces us into Deity, which is given as a reason for its being a condition or relationship, and not what Christ is personally, is a mistake; for it is not a question of His divine attributes, such as omniscience, omnipotence, &c., which are incommunicable, *but of the moral qualities* of the divine nature, in which we can participate, being made "partakers of the divine nature"; "the seed of God remains in him" (the believer), "and he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (1 John 3:9).

First of all, the distinction of what Christ is "*personally* and *essentially*," is stated, because He is called *the Life*, or "*the Eternal Life*," which is never affirmed of *us* in Scripture; nor can it be said of *the saint*, as of Him, "In Him was life." And the reason is given: "For *to be* the source and spring of spiritual life, to *give* it or to *maintain* it, is a divine prerogative; and *this* Eternal Life (i.e. so displayed) is a special manifestation or aspect of the divine *in Him*." Thus in us, with whom this is in implied contrast, it is only derivative, and not personal or essential; for from Him alone it flows, and is only sustained in us by Him, and in connection with Him.<sup>15</sup>

14. It is a wholly untrue accusation, and unsupported by a single quotation in proof, that those brethren who disapprove of Mr. Raven's views hold the introduction of believers into Godhead. The statement of our Continental brethren, that we receive "Christ Himself, and not a part of Him," does not afford a shadow of foundation for such a charge. In *The Manifestation of the Divine Nature* the reader is carefully guarded from such a thought. No one ever heard of it since Mr. B. W. Newton's *Thoughts on the Apocalypse* were published, in which that author invests the saints hereafter with Omnipotence and Omnipresence.

15. This entirely corresponds with what is said by Mr. Darby in his second letter to saints in Ebrington Street, to which the author's attention has recently been called by the brother who first reprinted it, in order to show what is believed among those who are apart from Mr. R. and from his followers.

He has really confounded the possession of the divine nature,  
(ὁδία÷ Ὑᾶᾰᾰᾰᾰ...)

Secondly, it is distinctly stated that eternal life in us

is not a question of His divine attributes, such as omniscience, omnipotence, &c., which are incommunicable, but of the moral qualities of the divine nature in which we can participate, being made "partakers of the divine nature." "The seed of God remains in him" [the believer]: and "he cannot sin, because he is born of God" (1 John 3:9).

And it is added in a note,

For God quickeneth by His word, which is the expression of His nature, or what He is morally, just as a man's breath and words are the expression of what he is. Hence, Christ is called "the Word," as well as "the Life," or "the Eternal Life."

Thirdly, this eternal life in us consisting specially in the moral qualities of the divine nature, comes through the reception of the Word, and not as a mere emanation of what is divine, apart from the word of God, and the quickening action of His Spirit. Moreover, it is stated (p. 25)

that the moral qualities of this divine or eternal life are specially light and love. In the Gospel of John we have the characteristics of this life, which display either what God is to man or the Son as come from the Father; in the Epistle more of the traits of this life as manifested in the Christian. Hence, righteousness, dependence, obedience, &c., are added, as well as all the enjoyment of relationship and communion.

The fourth point is, that whatever we taste of, that which is divine, is declared to be, through our association with Christ *as Man*, and in His human nature as risen from the dead.

Having united us with Himself as Man risen from the dead, He can bring us into the sweetness and blessedness of what was His own with the Father, "Then I was by Him, as one brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight, rejoicing always before Him" (Prov. 8:30).

Observe also the note from Mr. Darby, purposely quoted by the author as distinctly reserving the Godhead of the Lord (*Synopsis*, vol. 2, p. 32).

Christ introduces (us) into the enjoyment of that which is His own -- of His own position before the Father. This is blessedly true in every respect, *except, of course, essential Godhead and oneness with the Father*; in this He remains divinely alone. But all He has as man, and *as Son in manhood*, He introduces (us) into: "My Father and your Father, my God and your God, His peace, His joy, the words the Father gave to Him He hath given to us; the glory given to Him He hath given to us; with the love wherewith the Father has loved Him, we are loved" (*Synopsis on John*, p. 541).

(...οοιῦ ÷ ᾧ εἶα)

by which Christ could take the incommunicable name of God, with the life in us *which flows from His fullness*. Whatever union we may have with Christ -- yea, though it may be said that we dwell in God and God in us -- yet essential life can be attributed, in its very nature, to God only. That this was, by the mystery of the incarnation, in the man Jesus, every saint owns. But to talk of this being heavenly life in the sense in which we possess it, is the grossest confusion. And here I will ask, Does the writer really believe, or does he wish to make others believe, that any of his brethren doubt, (if we are so to speak,) about the heavenly, much more than mere heavenly, life of the Son of God? A man is no Christian at all that does not believe in the nature and person of Christ. But does the author mean to confound this divine *person* with the life in us derived from Him? Could it be said of anyone but of Him, "The Son of man who is in heaven"? For this ὁ ὢν is really, if taken as a title, the incommunicable name, I AM. It never was nor could be said of any man but of Him who, if He was man, was the true God and Eternal Life. We have life, but we are not Eternal Life; nor have we it properly nor essentially in ourselves. God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in the Son. He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life . . . But to confound the derived life in them with what Christ was in His Person, so that it was said of Him, "The Son of man who is (ὁ ὢν -- the 'being One') in heaven," is the greatest confusion possible. Could it be said of them, ὁ ὢν, the 'being One' in heaven"? Nay, could it be said, He hath given to them to have life in themselves? And to argue about the Person of Christ when I was arguing about the life of the saints, is deplorable confusion . . . Now, I believe it to be *only confusion*; but there is the most complete confusion between the *Person* of the Son of God, the divine Being and existence, and the life communicated to the saints *which flows from it*.

## Chapter 6

### *Participation in the Divine Nature*

It is, however, of the greatest importance to discern, that the believer does partake, in the blessed qualities of the divine nature. Both light and love, are in their very nature, divine qualities, and characteristic of eternal life; and that, as displayed in the midst of evil and of the darkness, caused by sin. Was God ever so manifested as “love,” *before* sending His Son into the world, that we might live through Him? And Christ was the expression of this: “Hereby perceive we the love, because He laid down His life for us” (1 John 3:16). God is love, and love is given as evidence of the existence and the manifestation of eternal life in us (1 John 3:14). Again, “He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love.” God is also light, and was displayed thus by Christ Himself as “the Life,” for “in Him was life, and the life was the light of men.” Now we are not only said to be sons of light (1 Thess. 5:5), and in the light as God is in the light (1 John 1:7), but more than this, we “are light in the Lord” (Eph. 5:3). These are the very perfections of the divine nature, and hence we only have them fully unfolded in the writings of the apostle John, who expressly treats of that nature. The same may be said of “grace and truth,” which, in contrast with the law (given by Moses), are said to have come by Jesus Christ, for this shows what God is Himself, as above the sin of man, and active healing, saving, and blessing man, as ruined under the effects of sin in this world. Hence the glory, as of the only begotten with the Father, was *full* of grace and truth.

It is thus that though we are not infinite, yet we participate in what is divine and infinite in Him; for Jesus, as man, and as the Son, has brought these divine qualities, which He had with the Father before the world was, into manhood. The apostle John speaks of His glory, which he beheld, “The glory as of an only begotten with a Father, *full* of grace and truth.” This glory was divine in its character, being that of the Son with the Father, and existing *in Him* in divine fullness, and displayed here in its perfectness, so that it could be beheld by the apostles and declared. But the apostle adds, “And of His fullness have *all* we received, and grace for grace.” The words “*all* we” *extend* the participation or enjoyment of what is named beyond the apostle, and the words “of His fullness” *extend* the range of reception, to *every* grace that is found in Him. For this glory is not here an external thing visible to the eye, but those qualities, divine in their nature, which never could have been seen or known otherwise, for “*The Word* was made flesh, and tabernacled among us,” and this glory dwelt in His blessed Person, as with Israel of old in another way in the wilderness. How entirely does this display of His glory correspond with “*The Life* was *manifested*, and we have *seen* it, and show unto you

that eternal life that was *with* the Father, and was manifested unto us” -- that life of which He is personally the expression. And it is in the contemplation of this that we have fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, through participating in the divine nature; or (as in John 1), as already said, receiving out of His fullness.<sup>16</sup>

Indeed it is remarkable how Scripture identifies what is really divine with what we participate in or enjoy. Not, of course, that we are the fountain, but that we drink into this fountain in different ways. Not only the Spirit of God is in us, searching all things, even the deep things (Gr. depths) of God, and knows what is in His mind, as a man’s spirit knows the things of a man, but the Apostle Paul, when speaking of the one that is spiritual, says, “He judgeth [discerneth] *all things*, yet he himself is judged [discerned] of no man,” and quoting the striking passage in Isa. 40, he adds, “For who hath known *the mind of the Lord* [i.e. Jehovah]? but we have *the mind of Christ*.” This refers both to the capacity of knowing and to the things known. Associated with Him as Man, we thus enter into His mind, here called the mind of Jehovah.

We have the same kind of connection also between what is human and divine in 1 Cor. 1:30, 31: “Of Him [God] are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” We are in Christ, who is in a special sense the wisdom of God, as well as the One in whom the righteousness of God is displayed, and we are made the righteousness of God in Him, and are also made “partakers of His [God’s] holiness” (Heb. 12). Thus, though we have nothing, and are nothing in ourselves, we may glory in what we have in Him in whom, as Lord or Jehovah, it all exists.

In Phil. 2 also we are exhorted to have the same “mind” in us *which was also in Christ Jesus*. And what is this

---

16. Yet here excessive ignorance pursues me. We are assured that divine attributes cannot be conferred upon the human race. Here all is triumph. Now the believer is made partaker of the divine nature, and all God’s moral attributes are communicated to, or conferred upon man. He is created again, and “renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him, in righteousness and true holiness.” Is holiness not one of God’s attributes? Is it not conferred upon man? Is it some other kind of holiness? It is said, “that we may be partakers of His holiness.” I can hardly call love an “attribute,” for it is God’s nature; yet practically it is the same, or a stronger case; but he that loveth is born of God and knows God. Love is of God. I suppose this is conferred upon us. The very essence of practical Christianity is our partaking of the divine nature, and having God’s moral attributes conferred on us, or implanted, with His nature, in us (J. N. D., *From Brethren and their Reviewers*).

described to be? The wondrous descent from the glory, dignity, and personal position of God, to the lowly form of manhood, even of a bondservant. Is not such a principle of thought and feeling wholly divine, both in its origin and nature? Could it exist in us, apart from the divine nature and life which we have received -- the mind of Christ in us? Though we may speak of the blessed traits of divine life, this does not imply that we can define or fathom this life, even in ourselves; and still less in Christ, from whom it all proceeds, and in whom it is infinite and illimitable. For how otherwise could this life be the light of men? or the light of life? or, still more, the light of the heavenly scenes (Rev. 21), which are all illumined by His blessed presence?<sup>17</sup>

How poor and misty must be the exchange of a state or sphere of blessedness prepared for man, which does not go beyond manhood in Christ, or in us, for the wonderful infinite display of what the Son is, of what He was with the Father on earth likewise! It is like giving up the glory, beauty, and life-giving influence of the sun, for the pale, feeble, reflected light of the moon, which communicates no heat, and contains no life-sustaining properties. For thus the soul is turned back and occupied with its own subjective condition, instead of what the apostle says, "*I live by faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave Himself for me*" (Gal. 2:20).

But when we speak of Christ being like the sun (and it is a figure Scripture delights in: Mal. 4:2; Matt. 17:2; 1 Sam. 23:4), we think not only of its light (and even vitalizing power), beautiful as that is, and giving a charm to the whole natural scene, but of the radiance of that countenance which fills heaven and earth with delight, and of those beams, every one of which is a *living* ray, and has a deep and yet pregnant meaning of its own, and which will waken and thrill every pulse of life in us. "We shall be like Him," says the apostle, "for we shall see Him as He is"; and when we see Him, mortality will be "swallowed up of life." For one gleam of His countenance, when we behold Him, will transform us into life and glory for ever. He is the Sun of Righteousness, and we shall be as the rays of His glory, for "the righteous shine forth as the Sun in the kingdom of their Father." "Her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal (Rev. 21:11). "And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it" (Rev. 21:24); for though her light shines upon the nations, Christ Himself is the light of the heavenly city, the glory of God.<sup>18</sup>

---

17. Mr. Raven admits moral qualities of the divine nature in eternal life (see extract, p. 42 [p. 114a, herein]; but apparently in a different sense and distinct from what is divine in Christ.

---

18. This corresponds with what Mr. Darby has said, that the power of life and the object of the life are, in reality, the same.

Here it (this life, John 17) is presented objectively. In fact, in our relations with God, that which is the object of faith is the power of life in us. Thus Paul says, "When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me"; but in receiving, by grace, by faith, the Savior that he was to preach to others, he received life; for Christ is our life" ("Notes on the Gospel of John," *Coll. Writ.* vol. 33, p. 431).

## Chapter 7

### *On the Introduction of What Is Human into the Godhead, and the Denial of Divine Attributes to the Second Man*

We have seen, in Phil. 2: 4-10, how the unity of the Person of the Lord is carefully preserved throughout. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Under this name, Jesus, given to Him as man, though implying that He is Jehovah, He is spoken of as in the form of God, and as emptying Himself and taking the form of a servant. So in John 6, "*I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: and the bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.*" These passages really give no countenance to the old heretical notion of the preexistence of the humanity of Christ; for in the last quoted passage, the Lord in speaking of Himself, alludes to His *body* as the bread which He gives, and calls it the bread which came down from heaven. Mr. Raven, refusing to admit divine truth, which is infinitely blessed as to our association with Christ in what He was eternally and divinely, through His becoming Man, has been forced (by the endeavor to make out Eternal Life to be "*Something*" in Eternity, which is not essentially divine,) into reasonings, which, if true, would prove nothing less than humanity in the Godhead. He says:

I believe Eternal Life to be *the life of man*" (October 12, 1890 -- also) As to what it is essentially, it was ever in Him with the Father. . . . This certainly could not be said of the Son of Man as to form, but it could and is, as to purpose, and as to all that He is essentially.<sup>19</sup>

All I meant by "in essence" was, that it (Eternal Life) was not *in form* with the Father until the Son became Man, but as I said *the being*, and, in a sense, *the relationship* was, but I judge the thought of Eternal Life always had man in view (July 25, 1890).

But what is, "*all the Son of Man is essentially*" -- or Eternal Life, if it is "*the life of man*"? The "*nature*," "*being*," and, "in a sense, the relationship" were there, something moreover, *inferior* to, and yet *in* His Godhead as the Son. Again he says:

I do not find that the term Eternal Life is employed save in connection with manhood either in the Son or us" (November 2, 1890).

All that in which Eternal Life essentially consists (nature and relationship) *was in the Son ever with the Father*, and manifested in Him when here after the flesh. But the Eternal Son<sup>20</sup> is a much greater thing than Eternal Life" (July 2nd).

The essentials of the Second Man are, a human relationship with the Father, human righteousness, subjection, obedience, dependence, confidence, &c. described by Mr. Raven himself as characteristic of Eternal Life.<sup>21</sup>

Now if these things are true, as existing in Christ before He became incarnate, they make His Godhead altogether distinct, and of a different character, from that of the other persons of the blessed Trinity, who, dwelling in the absolute existence of Godhead, never partook of manhood, and all that is essential to it; so that the unity of the divine nature, in the persons of the Godhead, is completely destroyed. Moreover, these qualities, if existent as constituent elements in the Son, are wholly inconsistent with the true nature of Godhead, and all its essential properties, before manhood was actually assumed; and *the proper Deity* of our Lord Jesus Christ also disappears.

We read in Psa. 2:7, when Christ became man, "Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee"; and again, in Luke 1:35, "Therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of Thee shall be called the Son of God." This tells us distinctly that this "being" or "relationship" only commenced with the incarnation; so that it would be wholly false to say that *anything of the kind* existed in the Son before incarnation; any more than these human

20. [F. E. Raven subsequently denied the eternal Sonship. See Note 3 at the end of this book.]

21. The limitation of Eternal Life, whether in Christ or in us to *manhood*; its admitted pre-existence before incarnation; the assertion also of the existence of all that the second Man is essentially before human nature was assumed, with the one sole exception of form, added to the refusal to admit the ordinary meaning attached by Mr. [A. H.] Rule and others to the Scriptures (John 3:13, 6:62; 1 Cor. 15:47), render unquestionable what Mr. Raven's reasonings involve, and what they are leading himself and others into. What he really holds we do not pretend to say. We doubt if he has even defined this to himself, as he has clearly got out of his depth; but this only increases the danger for those who accept his system, to which these thoughts lead, and without which it cannot be maintained.

19. Mr. R., writing to A. J. P., says he accepts the definition of "essence" -- "*that by which a thing is what it is.*"

properties, of which we have spoken, which are indeed essentials of manhood, and belong to the creature alone, and could not exist apart from creature nature, or its assumption by Christ. If they existed previously, they cannot be true human qualities at all, and all the true humanity of Christ and His blessed association with us, in order to represent us in His manhood, is also lost, with all its infinite results in redemption.

He {F. E. Raven} adds that Mr. {A. H.} Rule “does not understand or evades the force of the scripture, ‘the Second Man is out of heaven,’” being apparently unaware that all orthodox writers from the earliest ages have used these passages as we have cited them; so that they have been spoken of as “the transference of predicates,” that is, that the union of the divine and human in the Person of Christ was so perfect, that what was properly predicated as distinctive or descriptive of one nature, when spoken of either as God, or as Man, could be applied to His Person. Here is where the division of the Person of the Lord (the result of these theories as to eternal life) becomes painfully evident. For in the letter of August 25th, 1890, to Mr. M., given in full in *Some Letters of F. E. R.*, we read:

That which was to characterize man was what had been in the Son eternally with the Father, and was in due time revealed in the Second Man, the One out of heaven. But what characterized the Second Man *could not include* all that was true of a *divine Person*, as self-existent, having life in Himself, omnipotence, omniscience, and many other attributes of a divine Person; and yet it does include what He was morally in righteousness, love, holiness, truth and nearness to the Father.

Yet it is as Man that Scripture constantly and specially applies to Him, the attributes of omniscience and omnipotence; and to detach them from what He is as the Second Man, because of His connection with us, as such, is to destroy the unity of His Person, and to deprive us of all the blessing that flows from what He is. He says, “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but *He that came down from heaven*, even the Son of man which *is in heaven*.” Certainly this applies self-existence, and what is illimitable, to Him as man, as distinctly as when it is said of Him as the Son, using the same term of expression, “The only begotten Son *which is*” (ὁ ὢν) “in the bosom of the Father.”

If this limit is rightly assigned to one of our blessings in Christ, it is applicable to all; for the principle is stated by Mr. Anstey in a general and absolute way, “We may distinguish between Eternal Life and true Godhead in the person of the Son of God; and we must separate them *when we think and speak of what has been communicated to us*.” “If Eternal Life cannot be separated from the Godhead of the Son, then we have it not.” The fact is, Mr. R. and all who accept his doctrine, including Mr. A. and his cosignatories, have shut themselves up to this conclusion. They admit, and it is impossible to deny, that

Scripture speaks of Eternal Life as existing before incarnation. It must be, they say, something distinct from His Godhead, because it is communicated to us. So they affirm there was something in Him before He took flesh that was not Godhead at all, and has to be separated or distinguished from it, and which has also to be distinguished afterwards in His life. This is where their theory has landed them -- the result of denying that “the Eternal Life” is a proper and essential attribute of the Person of the Son. (See p. 81 {pp. 127b, 128a, herein}).

Mr. Anstey has placed, not his opponents, but himself and his friends, who “have full fellowship” in his statements, “upon the horns of the dilemma,” as he expresses it. “If Eternal Life cannot be separated from the Godhead of the Son, then we have it not.” Will he tell us *when* and *how* this Eternal Life which is not Godhead was created, and how that which is not Godhead came to exist in Godhead? His attempt to separate it from Godhead renders it an unscriptural and delusive fable. And when he declares if it cannot be separated from Godhead he “has it not,” we trust that many eyes will be opened to the consequences of his doctrines. We commend to the attention of these teachers the following extract:

But there was that which belonged to the Lord Jesus that was not made -- “In Him was life.” It was not only that He could cause a life to exist that had not before existed, but there was a life that belonged to Him from all eternity. “In Him was life.” Not that this life began to be; all else, all creation began to be; and it was He that gave them the commencement of their existence.

But in Him was life, a life that was not created, a life that was therefore divine in its nature. It was the reality and the manifestation of this life which were of prime importance to man. Everything else that had been since the beginning of the world was only a creature; but in Him was life. *Man was destined to have the display of this life on earth*. But it was in Him before He came among men. The light was not called the light of angels, but of men. *Nowhere do we find that eternal life is created*. The angels are never said to have life in the Son of God. They were kept by divine power, and holy. Theirs is a purely creature life, *whereas it is a wonderful fact of revelation that we who believe have the eternal life that was in Jesus Christ, the Son of God*, and are therefore said to be partakers of the divine nature. This is in no way true of an angel. *It is not that we for a moment cease to be creatures, but we have what is above the creature in Christ, the Son of God* (“The Word Made Flesh,” *Coll. Writings of J. N. D.*, vol. 21, p. 139).

Mr. Raven appears in one passage to make a difference between what He is as “the last Adam, a life-giving Spirit,” and “the Second Man.”<sup>22</sup> It is as the Second Man that he

22. He says,

As I gather the truth, Christ is the last Adam -- a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45), and the Second Man (1 Cor. 15:47). As the last Adam He stands alone as Head (John 17:2; 1 Cor. 11:3). He gives life (who but God could do this?). As the

(ὁδὶα÷ Ὑᾶἀάέ...)



denies that “all that is true of a divine person as self-existent, having life in Himself, omniscience, omnipotence, and many other attributes of a divine person are included” (p. 4). Is there then one part of His humanity dissociated from His Godhead, whilst another part is not so? One part of His humanity, the Second Man, not characterized by omnipotence and omnipresence, because He is thus linked with us; another part *only*, as last Adam, divinely distinguished or characterized by these divine powers? Into how many parts will this unholy reasoning divide the glorious Person of our Lord? We have had first of all essential life and Eternal Life, so divided; and now the last Adam and the Second Man.<sup>23</sup>

All this is indeed deadly and fatal error as regards the Person of Christ, and ruinous in its effect on souls. Can we wonder at one who was recently delivered from these errors, saying, “I have lost Christ; i.e. as the alone glorious Object before the soul!”<sup>24</sup>

Is this separation continuous, and constant, and eternal? The Scripture is as careful to maintain the connection of these things, both in the Person of Christ and toward ourselves, as these writers are to dis sever it. “All things,” says the apostle

(...οοιῦ ÷ ᾧ)

second Man He is the pattern of the heavenly family: “As is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly”

(1 Cor. 15:48). Hence, when I view Him thus (though in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily) I think of Him in connection with the family -- of what is true in Him and in them (1 John 2:8). “As He is, so are we in this world” (1 John 4:17). And this in itself does *not* involve all that is true of a divine person, as self-existence, having life in Himself, &c. &c., or it would be true also of us, which is impossible (Letter of November 25th, 1890, F. E. R.).

23. The argument that, because in this passage we are said to be “as the heavenly,” and hereafter to bear the image of the heavenly, Christ must be limited here to what is human, is another fruit of subjecting the Word of God to these wretched reasonings. In Rom. 8:29 we have it stated that we are destined to be conformed to the image of *His Son*. Are we to infer then that as God’s Son He has not divine attributes either? In Phil. 3: 21, moreover, He is spoken of as the Savior, who shall change our bodies of humiliation and fashion them like unto the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is *able to subdue all things unto Himself*. So that divine power accompanying this action is precisely what the Holy Ghost predicates of Him in this relation towards us.

Then the divine life, of which it is said, “As is the heavenly such are they also that are heavenly,” and which thing “is true in Him and in you” will be perfected in the likeness of Christ, which we shall all bear, and all this is inseparably connected with His divine power, though that power resides and is embodied in Himself alone. “We shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is” (1 John 3:2).

24. “I and My Father are One.” If there is the divine and human nature in Him, there is only one Person. And he who says “I will not adore a man,” is, to say the least, in danger of denying the unity of the Person. He who has seen Him has seen the Father . . . To separate the Son of man and Son of God is to dissolve Christ (see John 3:14-16; see again 1 John 5:20). . . . There is a most striking passage in 1 John 2:28, and 3:1, 2. The inseparableness of personality and the distinction of nature is very striking -- “Before Him at His coming,” “is *born* of Him” in verse 29, so that we are “sons of God” (3:1); and yet the world “knew Him not.” *Sons of God* (v. 2), but we, *like Him*, when He shall appear. All this blessed truth is lost if we dissolve, as I have called it, Christ. And yet I must know Him as a man; that is, the distinctness of the nature. For He prayed to God, and died; and yet He “was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death.” When in the form of God, He “made Himself of no reputation” (εἰς τὸν ἐκενῶσε), yet being thus, He could say, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.” “No man knoweth the Son but the Father.” But he who loses these things loses the Son (*Letters of J. N. D.*, part 13, pp. 130, 132).

(Col. 1:16-18), “were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist. 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 preeminence.” For all the fullness was pleased to dwell in Him. That is, that the Spirit of God links what He is as Creator and Upholder of the entire universe, to the position which He occupies as Man risen from the dead, and Head of His body; the One in whom all the fullness of the Godhead dwells. So in Eph. 4. He who has gone up on high, and led captivity captive, and received gifts for men, after having first descended into death and the grave, is the same that has ascended far above all heavens, that *He might fill all things*. He communicates out of this fullness as Head, all that is needful for the edification of His body, into whom we are to grow up to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of *the fullness of Christ*. From Him the Head (vv. 15, 16) the whole body is supplied and makes increase according to the effectual working in the measure of every part. Everywhere the apostle insists on this divine fullness being enjoyed by Christ as Man and Head of His body, as the source and spring of all gifts and blessings, and the active energy and sustaining power in His members. It is expressly connected with His body and used for it. Even when life and His divine unity with the Father is brought in, no such separation is made (John 14). “The world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me: because I live ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that *I am in My Father*, and ye in Me, and I in you.” For though He is in the Father, we are in Him, who alone is so in the unity of His divine nature; so that we derive blessedness, as well as the revelation of the Father, from His being so.

We have been told indeed before, that the life of Jesus to be manifested in our mortal flesh was human, not divine; but are all the poor bewildered sheep of Christ to be left to the perilous uncertainty and injury of these destructive analyses applied to the Holy One of God? When will the responsible leaders awake to the danger, as well as the dishonor, thus done to the blessed Lord?

The author intimated the similar attack that has been made upon the blessed Person of Christ in *Lux Mundi* (*The Light of the World*), by Oxford professors and clergymen; which has been followed up by other well-known writers in the Church of England. There also they will find it taught that Omniscience does not characterize the Second Man; in other words, that He does not know in His human nature what He is cognizant of in His divine, His Person being thus divided. And this is the leading argument of the Rationalists of the present day, in order to weaken and destroy the foundations of Christianity, which has now (“tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon”) been endorsed by the leaders of this school among “Brethren.”

So that He whose blessed Person we have always been taught was indivisible and indissoluble, is now, by this dreadful dissecting process of the human mind to which it is subjected, divided into two kinds of life, and two kinds of manhood. Mr. Raven alone can tell us when He has these divine attributes, or when or whether they can or cannot be in

exercise toward us or in us, or in what aspect He is divested of them. Will he or those writers inform us what is the meaning of being filled with all the fullness of God, as the result of Christ dwelling in the heart by faith? (Eph. 3).<sup>25</sup>

How can Christ, who is in heaven, be in us life, or sustain that life in us, save as a divine Person? It may be said, perhaps, that it is by the Holy Ghost He does so; but in the Colossians, where we have "Christ in you, the hope of glory," it is emphatically the power of the life of Christ in the soul, and not the aspect of the Holy Ghost's presence and activity, as the Epistle to the Ephesians. Or will these writers say that the Holy Ghost can be in us and sustaining this life in us as God, and that Christ cannot do so, because He is man? though we are specially told in this epistle that "in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead *bodily*"; and "ye are complete in Him" are the very words that follow. Does not "*bodily*" express His manhood? and our being "complete in Him" (πεπληρωμένοι), in whom the fullness (πλήρωμα) of the Godhead dwells {Col. 2:9, 10}, involve, in the most distinct and definite way, our connection with Him in whom we stand as Head? Is not this the Second Man, who Mr. R. says is not characterized by, and does not include the attributes of a divine Person?

We give a further extract from Mr. Darby, on the subject of manhood being out of heaven, and of the unity of the Person of Christ, written when a brother was charged with holding the former doctrine; in consequence of a statement inadvertently made by him in print, subsequently acknowledged and withdrawn, and even the appearance of it repudiated.<sup>26</sup>

Had he (Mr. \_\_\_\_ {C. H. M.}) held the doctrines imputed to him, I for one should have objected to holding communion with him; but, his statements on this point are as plain, as their plainness makes the injustice of his accusers to be evident. But I think His expression objectionable: "The Second Man was, *as to His manhood*, the Lord from heaven." The objectionableness lies in this, that in ascribing the title of the Lord from heaven, it goes beyond ascribing it to His Person, being man; and by the expression "as to" separates the *nature* and applies the title *to it*. Had he said He was Lord from heaven *in His manhood*, he would have been perfectly right, and he who denied it *would be unquestionably a heretic*, but "*as to*" separates the manhood, and thus the words cannot refer to *His person*, who was there in manhood. Dr. C. does not see the difference, and quotes them as "in His manhood," condemning them alike as the same. That Mr. \_\_\_\_ ever asserted that His manhood came down from heaven, is, as far as I can discern, simply a false accusation. The Second Man was the Lord from

heaven. That Scripture states. And it goes a great

25. Mr. Anstey's charge, endorsed by Messrs. J. B. S. and C. H. M., that our Continental brethren and true servants of the Lord hold introduction into Deity, partly because they say that we have all Christ in us and not a part of Him, is strange indeed, for it is thus that Scripture always speaks, "Christ is all and in all"; "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And the reader will see what blessed truth is now being undermined by these doctrines.

26. {This refers to the case of C. H. M.'s having used the erroneous expression involving the idea of a 'heavenly humanity,' in the first edition of his *Notes on Leviticus*, about 1860.}

deal farther (*in predicating of the nature what belongs to the Person*) than the ignorance of Dr. Carson seems to be aware of. "This," says Jesus, "is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat 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." Now I fully admit that this language deals with His human nature, His flesh, having in view the union of the two natures in His person, just as He says, "The Son of Man which is in heaven." He begins by, "I am the living bread," and then passes on to the bread being His flesh. Still this union is so true that He speaks of Himself as the living bread which *came down from heaven*, and declares that this bread is *His flesh*. Hence as mere human expressions, the divine man, and the heavenly man, can be used as expressing what is blessedly true, though they may not have the accuracy of Scripture. The true humanity of Jesus is fundamental, but he who would so separate the natures in the Person as to touch such expressions as the sixth of John gives, is on very slippery ground (*Collected Writings* 10:76-78).

It will be seen that what has been referred to as confounding the Nature with the Person, Mr. Darby calls "ignorance of Scripture," which predicates "of the Nature what belongs to the Person." For in this way Scripture constantly speaks of Him, as regards both His human and divine nature, so that in reality it is condemning its statements. "A man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as river's of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land" (Isa. 32:2); applying thus His divine power and protection, and the blessedness of the shelter found in Him, to that wondrous Man of whom alone such infinite grace could be predicted. This mode of expression is even extended to His body, as not only Mary Magdalene says, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him" (John 20:13); but the angels (who delighted to show the honor in which they held that Person, and how sacred in their eyes was the spot where His body had lain) say to the women at the sepulchre, "Come, see the place where *the Lord* lay." But, above all, this is seen in the words that are used by Jehovah Himself, "Awake, O sword, against My shepherd, and against *the Man* that is My Fellow, saith the Lord of hosts" (Zech. 13:7). And He who is born in Bethlehem -- the Judge of Israel smitten with the rod upon the cheek -- the ruler in Israel -- is the One "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting" (Micah 5:1, 2).

## Chapter 8

### *Current Objections and Their Fallacy:*

*With Remarks on  
the Manifestation of Eternal Life*

*and on Divine Principles*

One charge which is made in Mr. Raven's writings, and constantly reiterated by his followers, against those who differ from him, is founded on a total misconception. In the paper on John's writings (*A Voice to the Faithful* for January, 1891, p. 11) we read,

Those who say the Son of God, or the eternal Son -- the Christ, *and the Eternal Life*, are identical or interchangeable terms (and there are such), have evidently lost *the all-important distinction* between the blessed Lord as a *divine Person* and as *man*.

Here the Eternal Life is again limited to what Christ is as Man, and distinguished from what He is as a divine Person, for on this the accusation is founded of "*limiting Him* to that in which we can be united to Him." So Mr. Raven,

*I strongly object to the talk* about the personality of Eternal Life, because it makes Eternal Life *commensurate* with the person of the Eternal Son; and this I believe to be very wrong (Letter to Mr. Edwards).

But the fact is, that no one divine title or name of Christ is equivalent to or commensurate with another: while He could not bear any one of them unless He was essentially God, He is "Jehovah"; He is "The Son of God"; "The Word"; "The Eternal Life" that was with the Father. But none of these "cover the same ground"; for they express the distinct and divers glories of His Person. As "Jehovah" in the Old Testament, He was in covenant, and in a special relationship with an earthly people, in a way which did not include other nations; nor did He then make known the Father as He did when He came and was manifested as the Son, to all, and for all. As "The Word," He is the expression of the mind of God to all creatures; the one through whom alone the invisible God makes Himself known. Most of these are relative titles, or names, but each has its distinct range, and that in which it differs from others, though forming a constituent part of His divine glory. So, all the beautiful colors in the rainbow, or in a pencil of light refracted by the prism, combine to form the ray of white light which everywhere illumines our earth, and from it, all the varied tints in nature which surround us, are derived. Thus His title, "the Eternal Life," does involve, as has been said, "what He is essentially," "*being a part* of His divine glory," and this has been insisted on, in order to resist the attempt *to deprive Him of this glory*. It is an essential part of the divine glory of the Father to be the Father, as it is of the Son to be the Son -- to be Jehovah, or the Eternal Life.

The assertion that this statement divides the person of Christ, is too obviously false, to affect any saint instructed in divine truth.

Whilst on this point we may notice the use that has so unhappily been made of the Scripture statement that Christ is "the true God *and* the Eternal Life." Now, as God, He is in the divine place of absolute supremacy, right, and authority over all, which belongs alike to all the blessed persons of the Godhead; whilst the titles or names to which we have alluded as "the Son" or "the Word" are relative titles, and belong

either specially or exclusively to Himself. Such is the case when He is spoken of personally as "the Life," or "the Eternal Life." He bears this title in relation to others, because the manifestation of what is divine, is specially through His blessed Person (cp. Prov. 8, where for the same reason He is called Wisdom); for all spiritual life is displayed in, or communicated from, and maintained by Him. For this reason the apostle tells us, not only that He is God, which is true of all the divine Persons, but that He is in addition, in a special way, the one blessed Fountain of life towards us, in whom all its power and fullness is displayed. It no more implies, when Christ is spoken of as "God and the Eternal Life," that the latter is not divine, than that "the Word" is not a divine title because it is also added, "And the Word was God," or than when we say, speaking of the Father, He is *also* "God," that His name as Father is not divine likewise (Eph. 4: 6).

This explanation disposes of other painful and profane arguments, of which some of these objectors are not ashamed to make use. Such as the declaration that *the* life, or the Eternal Life, applied to Christ personally, makes a fourth person in the Godhead, or that we might consistently pray to, or worship, Eternal Life. For the personal glory and manifestation of what is divine, under this title, no more involves another personality than when He is called "the Word," or "Wisdom," or when the titles of "Jehovah," or "Most High" are in Scripture used to designate glories or names of God, in which He is pleased to reveal Himself, as characterizing His relations with men. We worship the Father and the Son by the Spirit, under those titles or names which are fitted to express either supremacy and authority, or special rights over us, as well as enlisting our confidence. "But to us," says the apostle, "there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him" (1 Cor. 8:6). "The Eternal Life," however blessedly expressive of His life-giving power towards us and in us, is not one of these; for the apostle says, "Christ liveth *in me*," and "the life of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." For the same reason we do not pray *to* the Spirit, because He dwells in us, and produces the prayers that we utter, though we own His person and work as divine, and though we are energized by His divine power, and all the work wrought within us for our eternal blessing is His.

But other subtle arguments are suggested by the enemy of souls, to deprive them of the joy and blessing to be derived from the truth, that "the Life," or "the Eternal Life," is used to express the divine personality of Christ. Anything tending to weaken or impair the glory of Christ, passes current at the present moment. Christ however says of Himself, that He is "the way, and the truth, and the life" (John 14:6); and again, that He is "*the resurrection*, and the life." (John 11:25). The objection founded on these passages is, that -- inasmuch as the appellation "the Life," is used of the Lord, along with other designations, which are not supposed to be expressive of His divine glory -- this one has not this force either. This

objection comes indeed but ill from those who have just quoted "He is the true God and the Eternal Life," to show that the latter is something inferior, and not equivalent to the former. Does not the Lord then speak of Himself as the resurrection, as a special expression of His divine power and glory (John 5:21, 28, 29), as well as being "the Life"? Could any one but a divine Person express "the truth" in all its infinite variety and fullness? He became man in order to do so. "For grace and truth *came* by Jesus Christ" (John 1:17). Could the way to God as the Father have been known, or approach to Him given to us, save in and through the Son of God? Again it is said, that "in Him was life" does not imply that personally He was Himself the Life. But His body was the temple in which the divine glory dwelt; as He says, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (John 2:19). Does that imply that He was not God? Does not this system degrade all the divine truth that it touches?

We must however add that the expression, the "personality of Eternal Life," is not strictly accurate, for personality is an abstraction, and Eternal Life is in many instances in scripture used as a general term, and is applicable to spiritual life in earthly saints and their portion (Matt. 25:46; Isa. 4:3), as well as in its fuller and higher sense, to heavenly saints. But to make use of this to deny its application to Christ *personally*, is the enemy's artifice to cloud the glory of His Person and to deceive souls. It is when Christ is spoken of distinctively as "the Life," or "that Eternal Life," or in other similar ways, that the term is specially applied to Him, or used to express what He is personally.

The subject of the manifestation of Eternal Life to the world is important, for though any Christian, from extreme Calvinistic notions, might easily fall into the idea, that there was nothing really in the Son of God for the world, but only for the elect exclusively, the thought certainly robs the Lord of the divine beauty of His character as displaying the Father, and is dangerous because it naturally leads to the idea of life being some mystic thing in the Son of God, instead of what He was Himself, and thus paves the way for a further acceptance of this system.

It should be noted, that in the Gospel of John, in contrast with these views, the intimacy and blessedness of the relations between the Father and the Son, are unequivocally expressed by the Son Himself, as well as by the Father *before all*. This was in order that souls might be attracted, by the evidence of such nearness of relationship and oneness with the Father, or left without excuse, if they will not receive Him to whom all this blessedness evidently and of right belongs. And so perfectly is all this blended in its expression, and so is He addressed in the unity of His Person, both as Man and Son of the Father, that it is as impossible, as it would be irreverent, to attempt to define or limit to one nature, the way in which He is kept before us in these passages.

The visible sign, by which John the Baptist was to recognize His Person, not previously known to him, was the Spirit descending from heaven publicly, and abiding on Him. "Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and

remaining on Him, that same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John 1:31-34). The Father Himself too announces openly before all that He was His Son, the object of His love, and the One in whom He found His fullest satisfaction and delight. The heavens opened over Him, and His own voice declared, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." To this testimony so borne the Lord refers the Jews, as among the varied and unmistakable witnesses which had been rendered to the character and dignity of His Person. "The Father Himself which hath sent Me hath borne witness of Me" (John 5:37; cp. 6:27).

And even the tenderest moments in which these feelings and sentiments found their expression are not, as we might have thought likely, withheld from those surrounding the Lord at the time. "He that sent Me is with Me. *The Father* hath not left Me alone; for I do always those things that please Him" (John 8:28, 29). Again, at the grave of Lazarus we read, "And Jesus lifted up His eyes, and said, Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always; but *because of the people which stand by I said it*, that they may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (John 11:41, 42). "Therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again" (John 10:17). "I and My Father are One." "That *the world* may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave Me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence" (John 14:31). John 5:17, 19, 20 is also a very striking instance of this.

But this wondrous unfolding of His intercourse with the Father extends not only to His own Person and service, but even to the view of the cross that rises before Him in John 12. There (in verses 27, 28) He opens His soul-trouble to the Father at the prospect. "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again." This is *before all*, as well as the reply of the Father to His appeal, when He gives Himself up, to accomplish in death, the Father's glory. Whilst then the Son alone could undertake to sustain what was due to the divine glory, the question, "What shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour," and the answer from the Father that He would glorify His name (by raising Him as man from the dead), shows how what He was both as Son of God, and as Man, had its place at one and the same moment. So in Luke 2 He is seen *as man*, praying, as well as (in Matthew) fulfilling all righteousness. So in the passage cited from John 8 He speaks as the Son who has the Father always with Him, and who alone makes free; yet He is the Son of *Man* who is going to be lifted up, and who (though being the eternal Son) has taken the place of recipient, and does nothing from Himself, but speaks what the Father teaches Him. In John 11 whilst as the Son, His voice calls Lazarus out of the grave, He is seen weeping and groaning to the Father who hears Him always. And lastly, He manifests His *love and obedience* as Son to the Father in going on to death when the prince of this world comes and finds nothing in Him. In all this blessedness

in which as Man He was with the Father <sup>27</sup> is unmistakably displayed before all. The Spirit of God evidently delights to honor Christ in the very way which Mr. R. declares “not only erroneous but repulsive” to his mind.

As an attempt has been made to limit the meaning of the word “manifestation” (φανερώσις) to the thought of a divine effect produced on the soul, as in John 14:21, where the word employed is ἐμφανίζω, we will turn to Scripture to see the word that is usually employed to convey this thought. It will then be seen that where such an effect is intended a different word is used; namely, ἀποκαλύπτω. “Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona,” the Lord says to Peter: “for flesh and blood hath not *revealed* it unto thee, but My Father which is in heaven” (Matt. 16:17); whilst the word “manifest” (φανερόω) is the absolute display of what He is before all, apart from the effect produced. This is not necessarily vital in its character, though of course this display *may* so affect the soul (through divine grace acting on it). It is once *so* used in John 17:6; but in that instance only of the Father’s name. The following passages are conclusive on this point: John the Baptist, speaking of Christ as the Lamb of God and the Son of God, says, “I knew Him not: but that He should be *made manifest* to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water” (John 1:31). This is *to* the nation as such, and not any question of their conversion. Again, in turning the water into wine, the apostle says, “He *manifested forth* His glory. (John 2:11). “God was *manifest in flesh*, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory. (1 Tim. 3:16).

Again, the reason why the heathen are without excuse is that they have the public testimony of the power and glory of God in creation. “That which may be known of God *is manifest* to them; for God hath *showed it* unto them” (Rom. 1:19).

“For this purpose the Son of God was *manifested*, that He might destroy the works of the devil.” “He was *manifested* to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin.” “In this was *manifested* the love of God toward us, in that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him” (1 John 4:9). But still more striking is the fact that the same word is used for the manifestation of Christ and His saints *in glory*. “When He shall *appear*, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is” (1 John 3:2). “When Christ also, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory” (Col. 3:4).

The following extracts from Mr. Darby’s writings will show how he identifies Eternal Life and Divine Life, treating them as one and the same thing, and fully presenting the Son as Eternal Life to man and as by it meeting the need of man, which is all denied by this system.

### *Divine Life and its Effects*

27. This Mr. R. identifies with Eternal Life. (See *Letter to J. S. O. [Oliphant]*.)

### *(1 John 1; 2: 1, 2).*

The subject of this epistle (1 John) is the communication of *divine life*. In the *gospel* we have the *exhibition* of it in the *Person* and character of Jesus Christ; but in the epistles we have the communication of it, as also tests of divine life.

The first four verses exhibit . . . the beauty of *eternal life* outside of us, first as manifested in the man Christ Jesus, and afterwards as communicated through Him from God (p. 1).

The last Adam is the *Son of God*. He became man, and as man manifested the *divine life* here on earth in a way that it never could have been manifested *but for* sin. It could not have been displayed in heaven in this way. The light shone in darkness (p. 2).

Divine life was *adapted to our needs* by being in the man Christ Jesus. He went through all that we have to go through -- “was tempted in all points like as we are” -- without sin . . . But in Him the heart to which life has been communicated can see the perfection of *divine life*. *It could not have been thus seen in heaven*, although it was there with the Father long before. No angel wanted such grace; no angel demanded such patience; *it was for man as a sinner that divine life was manifested*.

Thus we see love adapting itself to us in the person of the man Christ Jesus. Perfection has come to meet us (I speak of those who know Christ, though *all may come to Him as sinners*). The apostle says we have seen Him and heard Him. They learn Him every day; and what was it they saw? -- Eternal life. You may ask many a Christian what is eternal life, and he cannot tell you, *though he has it within him*. Christ is eternal life. John says the life was manifested, and we saw and heard. They saw and heard Christ, and He was eternal life -- first manifested, *then communicated* (p. 3).

For God being holy, and I not holy, Christ becomes my life, and His blood cleanses from all sin. If I received *His word*, I received *Christ*, and *He is eternal life*. Henceforth I hate sin, and the *Son of God is my life*.

In the fourth verse we had, “And these things we write unto you that your joy may be full.” “These things,” as expressed in the opening verses of this epistle are the manifestations of divine life in the Person of Christ, and the communication of divine life through Him to such as believe . . . Divine life has been manifested, divine life has been communicated . . . Christ is my life and joy now, and heaven *has no other life* or joy. Now I have done with self, because I have got another self who is more my real self than I. My connection with the Person of Christ is new life in me (pp. 4, 5).

I can go to the vilest sinner in the country and offer him life . . . Grace puts down man, to give new life which is altogether of God; but we *are responsible*. *Eternal life* has been manifested, and now the message to us is that God is light, and there is no darkness in Him (pp. 5, 6).

The children of Israel said, “Let not God speak to us.” Moses said, “I exceedingly fear and quake.” But in the infinite grace of God, the law was the schoolmaster up to that eternal life *who was with the Father*, and who in the fullness of time was manifested in the world (from *Manchester Series of Tracts*, No. 57).

As to manifestation, we give the following answers to questions addressed to Mr. R. at a reading at Dr. H.’s, January 15, 1889:

Q. Do we get our need met in John 3:16?

A. How do you mean, “our need”? It is very evident that

the lifting up of the Son of God is not in connection with the putting away of our sins, that is the important point.

Q. Take as an instance when He was on the cross and spoke of His mother?

A. I should not say He was manifesting the Eternal life then, but what He did was perfectly consistent with it. You may walk perfectly consistent with the characteristics of Eternal life, but you cannot display it in this sphere.

Eternal life belongs entirely to another sphere altogether.

The system as a system is now complete, and can be viewed in all its parts, in contrast with what we all once held to be of God. The enemy first suggests a doubt as to the Person of Christ -- whether He is divinely and personally and in eternity the "Eternal Life." Then follow speculations as to what Eternal Life is, or what it was in His Person, before the world was, or as manifested in the world, leading to the division of life in His Person; and ultimately these speculations are carried into the Godhead, and all that once thus distinguished His glory is displaced in the soul, under the specious but delusive pretext of more advanced truth. But this effect is only produced gradually, as the truth of God is undermined; so that the loss is unperceived until the system is fully embraced.

But we must add a word as to the important principles of action raised by this question.

Hitherto the principle of association, received amongst us, has always been -- "Separation from evil God's principle of unity." Has it now been accepted that *toleration of evil* is the principle of unity? Does not the Word of God warn us, that "a *little* leaven leaveneth the *whole* lump? And, "Whose word doth eat as doth a canker"? Do saints think to escape the evil, by evading the solemn responsibility, which Scripture presses upon them, as the only remedy, for the prevalence of evil in these last days? "Let *every one* that nameth the name of the Lord *depart* from iniquity." And it is of doctrinal evil the apostle is speaking in this passage. The motto of many at the present moment is, "Stay in association with acknowledged evil." The Lord's command is, "Depart from it," and that to *every one*; for the name of the Lord has its claim upon the soul, and it is due to *Him* to dissociate *it* from evil. Has all the past been it mistake? and are brethren prepared to condemn the line of conduct they have pursued the last five-and-forty years? We have had to separate once because of ecclesiastical failure, a breach being made on the unity of the body of Christ. Since that we have been compelled to sever ourselves from those who upheld doctrines which deprived us of our true blessings and standing in Christ. Now we have a system which not only commenced with something of the same kind, but which robs the Lord Himself of His proper personal glory, dividing His blessed person, and undermining His true Godhead.

Nothing shows more the deplorably low moral state of saints, or the spiritual incapacity to discern the true bearings of that by which God is testing us, than the arguments which are used, and listened to, to justify continuing in association with evil. Greenwich, it is said,

is not to be separated from, because every ecclesiastical form has not been gone through with reference to it. What are ecclesiastical *forms* when Christ is in question, or the saints of God themselves in danger, from the enemy's power? "Have ye never read," says the Lord, "what David did when he was an hungered, and they that were with him?"

When the heir, the object of God's counsels, was rejected, or his title and need was in question, did God hold to the forms or order of His house being maintained? No, the Lord puts His sanction on David's act, when he took of the showbread, which "was not lawful" for him to eat, and gave it to them that were with him. And He adds, "In this place is One greater than the temple." Are these forms to be weighed in the same scale with the Son of God, the Lord of all? Is the superstructure of more consequence than the foundation itself -- the One on whom the Church of God is built, and on whom all its safety, stability, and integrity depends? Under ordinary circumstances it is right enough to enter a man's house with all the deference and respect due to him. But if the house is on fire, and it is a question of rescuing the inmates, nobody thinks of knocking at the door and asking permission to enter. To force a way in and drag them out anyhow, is, at such a time the only right thing. "Others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire" (Jude 23).

We add here some thoughts expressed by Mr. Darby on these points when passing through a similar crisis.

Never let the question of ecclesiastical subtleties swamp a broad principle of right and wrong. But I shall not be brought to such wickedness as to treat acceptance of blasphemers as an ecclesiastical question. If people like to walk with them or help and support the bearing with them at the Lord's Table they will not have me . . . I do not accept the setting aside my spiritual liberty; we are a flock, not an enclosure (*Ecclesiastical Independency*, J. N. D.).

The reader will find another example of the unsettling the soul as to fundamental truths in the confusion between the life communicated to the saint and the divine nature in Christ . . . I call it a work of Satan, when, blessing and testimony having been brought in by the blessed Spirit of God, a systematic effort is made, producing a regular system; an effort which takes up the truth whose power has decayed as to faith really carrying the soul out of the influence of present things, or some neglected truth generally, and, while it seems to adopt it as it stands in its basis, as a fact, *subverts and sets it aside*. . . . Any pretension to the possession of spiritual power is based on Church position, and thus seems to honor the institution of the Church and Christ in it. God is alleged to have set there, in that institution, the seat of blessing, and this also is an acknowledged truth, and the unity of the body of Christ is thereon connected with the institution. But the sovereign operation of the Spirit of God is set aside, and that which acts outside the actually formed institution is condemned as denying the authority of God's institution and schismatical sin. Thus the actual possessors of the power of the institution, in its then state, really take the place of God. His power is vested in them as far as it acts on earth (*Narrative of Facts*, pp. 5, 10, 12-13, J. N. D.).

*Unpublished letter of*

*J. N. D., dated July, 1850,  
and sent from France.*

Dearest Harris, -- I thank you very much for your letter; it has convinced me how much I have been led of God in not taking any part in the affairs of England. Had I been there I could not, of course, have avoided a testimony. Perhaps I should have felt called on to put myself more forward than even I have done -- as it is, I am outside a mass of movements which are but the writhings in false position, of those who cannot see the simplest thing possible.

What are protracted investigations to me as to Bethesda when I do not admit the avowed basis of their meeting as consistent with the first principles of faithfulness to God? They have denied (to me) the only ground upon which the Church of God stands. Hence Bethesda has ceased to exist, to my mind, as an assembly -- on the same grounds on which I am a Christian, they avow they are NOT bound to see whether Christ be denied or no -- I exist because *He is what He is*, and nought else; and they maintain the *righteousness* of the principle,<sup>28</sup> when they avow the doctrine<sup>29</sup> to be such that if it were true, Christ would need to be saved as much as the Church.<sup>30</sup> The further I go, the clearer I am that in not owning Bethesda at all as a saints' meeting, I am going on the first principles of Christian life. All who have countenanced Bethesda have mismeasured their strength, because their path is not of faith. The Lord, I believe, is consolidating souls on the ground of truth. All the investigations possible would not make me own Bethesda. I am satisfied it is no want of *charity* (my charity might be greater), but that which produces it produces my decision in this matter. A person looking simply at Christ and *His* glory cannot say anything, but that it is a question of first principles, as to saints' conduct in this day. I am satisfied a very decided sifting is going on through this means, and that persons who walk on ground incompatible with the unity of the Church, as based on the witness of Christ, will not stand. Were it my duty to be in England at this time, I should feel perfect peace and liberty; but my work for Christ is here I doubt not. What investigation could change a judgment founded on that letter of the ten?<sup>31</sup> That letter is the basis on which I go, though I know some of its statements to be unfounded, and mere subterfuges, but I have investigated that letter, and cannot own what is based on the principles contained in it. The joy, the simple joy of the brethren, is my delight and life. I have no doubt blessing is preparing for those who walk faithfully, in more simplicity than ever. My heart is much with the brethren in England, but I am in peace. L \_\_\_ C<sup>32</sup> will bear a sad burden. It is a sorrowful thing to be the instrument for sifting and chastening God's people, but Christ's love is perfect and unfailing -- feeble as I am *I feel it*. I never directly enjoyed the consciousness of it so much, and the intelligence, the wonderful living depth of the Word of God. I suspect our associations were not enough in Christ. The Church has had a large place in my heart for the past twenty two years. I lived, and

sorrowed, and joyed with it if I could. I believe there was a singular blessing for the brethren, but they took it too much for *themselves*. God would have the Church in more direct association with *Himself*. I feel myself excessively weak and feeble, and unworthy of anything, but full of *hope*. In these dark days it is the time to show Christ's infallible love to His Church -- He Himself bears it according to the counsels of God.

## Appendix A

Containing extracts showing the views held by those leaders among brethren who have expounded scripture teaching on the subject of eternal life, as well as those of other Christians. Also extracts and letters showing the new system of thought now introduced; with the view held by unitarians on the same subject.

### *Extracts from Collected Writings of J. N. D.: Notes on the Gospel of John" vol. 33*

The second quality found in Him is, that "in Him was life." This cannot be said of any creature; *many have life*, but they have it not in themselves. Christ becomes our life, but it is *He who is it in us*. "God hath given us Eternal Life, and this life is in His Son; he that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." This is a very momentous truth as regards Himself, as regards us, and as regards *the life* that we possess as Christians.

But more; this life is "the light of men," a word of immense value for us. God Himself is light, and it is the divine light *as life* which expresses itself *to men* in the Word. It is not the light of angels, though God be light for all, for He is it in Himself, but as it is relative, *adapted* to other beings, it is not to angels; His delights were in the sons of men (Prov. 8). The proposition is one which is called reciprocal; that is, the two parts of the proposition have an equal value. I could say just as well, the light of men is the life which is in the Word. It is the perfect expression of the nature, counsels, and glory of God when all shall be consummated. It is in man that God will make Himself to be seen and known. "God was manifest in flesh . . . seen of angels." The angels are the highest expression of God's power in creation; but it is in man *that God has shown Himself*, and that, morally, in holiness and love. We ought to walk as Christ walked, to be imitators of God as His dear children, and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us; and also "we are light in the Lord," *for He is our life* . . . And this is not a rule, although there be in it a rule (for we ought to walk as He walked), but a life which is the perfect expression of it, *the expression of the life of God* in man. Ineffable privilege! Wonderful nearness to Jesus! "Both He that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one."

Redemption develops and manifests *all the moral qualities of God Himself*, and above His qualities, His nature -- love and light, and that in man, and in connection with men. *We are*, as being in Christ, and Christ in us, the fruit and expression of *all that God is* in the fullness and revelation of Himself (pp. 201-3).

Now the true Light is He who, coming into the world, is light *for every man*, Pharisee or sinner, Jew or Gentile. He is the Light, who, come from on high, is such for every one, whether He be rejected or received; for a Simon or a Herod, for Nathanael or for Caiaphas. He is the expression of God, and of the mind of God for every man,

28. {Bethesda's principle was the denial that fellowship with leaven leavens an assembly.}

29. {B. W. Newton's evil doctrine concerning Christ's person.}

30. . {Bethesda, as such, did not avow this; George Muller avowed it at one point.}

31. {A letter signed by 10 leaders at Bethesda, in 1848, in which the denial that fellowship with leaven leavens an assembly is propounded.}

32. {Perhaps Lord Congleton, an ardent supporter of Bethesda.}



whatever state he may be in. The subject here is not that of receiving the light into the heart. In that case it is a question of the state of him who receives; here, of the fact of the appearing of the Light in this world (p. 206).

But *from this time* quickening power and Eternal Life in the Person of the Son, who revealed the Father in grace, *were come*, so that the dead should hear the voice of the Son of God; and those that should hear it *should live* (John 5:25). This was the great proclamation as to life; *it was there*, and as the Father had life in Himself, He had given to His Son, a Man upon earth, to have life in Himself, a divine prerogative, but here found in a Man come in grace upon earth (p. 276).

As we have seen, the multitude, under the hidden direction of God, had alluded to the manna, asking some similar sign of the Lord. Jesus had said to them (a touching reply), "I am the sign of God's salvation, and of *Eternal Life sent into the world*" (the original French, '*au monde*,' 'to the world'). I am the manna, the true bread, which the Father, God acting in grace, gives *to you*. "He that comes to Me shall never hunger, and he that believes on Me shall never thirst" (p. 288).

Here it is Christ come down from heaven, the incarnation, setting aside all idea of promise; it is the great and mighty fact that, in the person of Jesus, *people saw Him* who was come down from heaven, the Son of God become man, *as we see in 1 John 1*: "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have contemplated, and our hands handled, concerning the word of life . . . , *the Eternal Life* which was with the Father, and has been manifested to us." It was as to His Person, not yet as to our entrance into it, the beginning of a new order of things.

The first great point, then, was *the incarnation*; Christ come down from heaven, the Word made flesh, *life in Him*, and to give *Eternal Life* to him who should eat Him. The second point is that Christ gave this flesh for the life of the world (pp. 289, 290).

It was necessary that a divine and heavenly life should come down from heaven, and be communicated to souls, and that in a Man. It was necessary that this Man should die, and terminate all relation with the fallen race; and risen, should begin a new race, possessing the divine life (inasmuch as they had appropriated Christ to themselves by grace), and which should be raised again by the Savior's power, when the moment should come, "at the last day" (p. 290).

Personally the new thing, as we have already said, was *presented in His Person*, -- a Man, God manifested in flesh; but *He in whom was life*, He who was *this Eternal Life* which had been *with the Father*, and which was now manifested to the disciples (p. 291).

But the Lord says, in verses 40, 47, that He is come that whosoever believeth in Him *may have* everlasting life, and that he that believeth on Him *hath* everlasting life; so that whosoever really sees the Son of God in the despised Man of Nazareth *has* everlasting life (p. 296).

After this we have the doctrine with regard to the Savior, which is connected with the preceding fact: "I am the light of the world" (John 8:12); not yet here the Messiah of the Jews, but the presentation, on the part of God, of light in the world -- light which manifested everything, but which remained alone, for the whole world was darkness, far from God, and the heart of man himself darkness. This light manifested the effect of even the law; it showed where man was, as placed under it. But it was far more. If man followed it, it was "the light of life" (cp. John 1:4); that which made manifest *as the revelation of the divine*

*nature*, but that which *communicated life* to those who received this light. It was an entirely new thing come into the world. *God Himself*, in the power of grace, become Man; rejected, all was morally judged; but, received by grace, *it was the new life, the life eternal*, for Christ is *eternal life* come down from heaven (1 John 1:1, 2) (p. 314).

In 1 John 1 we see definitely what Eternal Life is: it is Christ. That which they had seen, contemplated, and handled from the beginning, it was Christ, the Eternal Life which was with the Father and had been manifested to them (p. 431).

We participate in the divine nature, and we are in the position of Christ: sons according to the good pleasure of the Father's will. *That is the nature of this life*.

Here (John 17) it is presented *objectively*. In fact, in our relations with God, that which is the object of faith is *the power of life in us*. Thus Paul says, "When it pleased God to reveal His Son in me"; but in receiving by grace, by faith, the Savior that he was to preach to others, he received life, for Christ is our life." (p. 431).

Still it is an inward life, real and divine, by which we live, although we possess it in these poor earthen vessels. It is no longer we that live, but Christ that lives in us (p. 432).

***Extracts from paper on  
"Eternal Life" in "Memorials  
of the Ministry of G. V. W."  
Edited by Mr. Dennett.  
Vol. 1, p. 345.***

"From the beginning," a remarkable expression. In the gospel it is, "In the beginning," *there* as connected with *the divine glory* of the One who was the Son of God. There was a difficulty the Spirit of God felt in writing of this subject, because "that which was from the beginning" was also the One of whom John could say, "Which we heard, which we have seen," &c. John had not seen the divine glory in the abstract, but he had seen it in the One who was down here -- God manifest in flesh.

"*The life* that was *with the Father*, and was *manifested unto us*." God never made a revelation of Himself except *through the Son*, whether in creation, in the re-establishing of things after the flood, in His dealings with Israel, or afterwards with the Church. There was no medium through which the divine glory found expression save through the Son. Everything that came out about God came out in the Son (p. 346).

This book is the expression of One who existed in Himself before the world was. God might have sent from heaven a description of Himself, but that was not His way. No; He sent the Man Christ Jesus, the Babe that was born and laid in the manger at Bethlehem. That is *the One John is speaking of* when he says, "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*," showing how completely the Lord had been there among them. John's head had been on His bosom; He could wash their feet. "Concerning the word of life," *of* might imply part of a thing, but this is rather *about* or *concerning*.

In verse 2 he speaks of the life itself. "The life was manifested." They had seen *this person*, and in Him Eternal Life. The One who walked on the sea, who fasted

forty days, He had got {sic} life in Himself, He had the reins of life in His hand. He could command Lazarus to come forth from the grave, and to return to the life which he had before; and so too the widow of Nain's son. He could command them to cast out their nets, and draw all the fish together round the ship. All was under His control. But besides this He had *life with the Father* before the world was (p. 347). Mr. Bellett also, in his treatise on *The Son of God*, distinctly identifies His person with the Eternal Life that was with the Father, and shows it cannot be separated from what He is as God.

### *Extracts from Mr. Bellett.*

There were, I doubt not, different apprehensions of Him, different measures of faith touching His person in those who called on Him. He Himself owns, for instance, the faith of the centurion, in apprehending His personal glory, to be beyond what He had found in Israel. But all this in no wise affects what we hear of Him, that *He was the Son* "in the bosom of the Father," or "*that Eternal Life which was with the Father*," and was manifested to us (pp. 6, 7).

"No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father" is a sentence which may well check our reasonings. And the word, that *the Eternal Life* was manifested to us, to give us fellowship with the Father and the Son (1 John 1:2), *distinctly utters* the inestimable mystery of *the Son being of the Godhead*, having "Eternal Life" with the Father. And again, as we well know, it is written, "The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" I ask, can any but God declare God? (pp. 9, 10).

In the bosom of the Father *He* was -- there lay *the Eternal Life* with the Father, *God and yet with God* (p. 15).

And still further, *in each stage of this journey we see Him awakening the equal and full delight of God*, all and as much His joy at the end as at the beginning, though with this privilege and glory, that *He has awakened it in a blissful and wondrous variety. This blessed thought Scripture also enables us to follow.* As He lay in the bosom through eternity, we need not (for we cannot) speak of this joy (p. 16).

If the soul were but impregnated with the thought, that this blessed One (seen *where* He may be, or *as* He may be) was the very One who from all eternity lay in the divine bosom, if such a thought were kept vivid in the soul by the Holy Ghost, it would arrest many a tendency in the mind which now defiles it. He that was in the Virgin's womb was the same that was in the Father's bosom! What a thought! Isaiah's enthroned Jehovah, whom the winged seraphim worshiped, was Jesus of Galilee!

Let the soul be imbued with this mystery, and many a rising thought of the mind will get its answer at once. Who would talk, as some have talked, in the presence of such mystery as this! Let this glory be but discovered by the soul, and the wing will be covering the face again, and the shoe will be taken off the foot again (p. 19). Mr. J. B. Stoney himself, before these views were developed, bears in 1885 the same testimony, that this Eternal Life was essentially divine, viz., the life that the Son had in common with the Father, which was fully displayed here below, and is given to us.

### *Extracts from Mr. Stoney*

It is in the eternal life only that we could have fellowship with the Father and the Son. It is every way of the deepest importance that we should see that the eternal life is an entirely new *existence*, never possible among men till the Son came, and then it was for the first time manifested. The nature and measure of the life which the saints had before the coming of Christ I cannot determine; all I can insist on is that the eternal life which was with the Father, as the very terms "*with the Father*" show, could not be manifested unto us until the Son came. The Son of Man down here, manifested unto us *the life He had in common with the Father*, and He then, as the "last Adam," gives us *this eternal life* (John 17:2).

We start, then, with the simple fact that the Eternal Life was never manifested in a man until the Son came, and *He was the virtual and actual expression of that life down here* (*A Voice to the Faithful*, vol. 19, p. 56).

Men of God acted for Him here in divine power, according to the measure in which He was pleased to reveal Himself. He was never declared to any of them as Father; until the Son came this could not be. "The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him." *The life of God* is manifested by a Man on this earth (pp. 56, 57).

The Son of man is to be lifted up, crucified, made an offering for sin, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life. This life is heavenly in its nature, tastes, and interests. The blessed Son humbled Himself, and became a Man. He came to do His Father's will. He freely offered Himself. He, who knew no sin, was made sin for us. He vindicates God on our side, that every one believing in Him may be *in His life*; not reinstated in the condition which man lost in judgment, but in the life of the One who bore our judgment, so that where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. This life is consequently entirely outside the ken of man (p. 57).

There was One now here who always did the things that pleased God. He was not trying to stand for God on this or that occasion, but He was in Himself a contradiction to everything that was not of God, as the light in the darkness. *He was the exhibition of every divine beauty in every detail of His life. The life with the Father* was manifested unto us; and that in the One who, because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, "likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death," &c. (p. 59).

I have only to add that it is very evident, from John's epistle, that *very soon the Church lost the true idea of eternal life*; so much so, that the apostle tells us that "these things are written that ye may know that ye have eternal life." Let any one read 1 John 1, and in any degree apprehend the "fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ" (impossible to be enjoyed until the Son had come), and surely he will admit that the eternal life is an existence entirely apart from human ken. Many believers have no idea of this life. They are assured, through grace, that their immortal souls will be happy in heaven -- which they surely will -- but they have no idea of *possessing a new existence*, capable of enjoying God, answering to His nature, and sharing in His thoughts and interests; one, too, in which we have fellowship with one another, and *in which we come out* in the obedience and walk of our Lord Jesus Christ *on the earth* (p. 63).

## *Various Extracts from other Writers.*

Could St. John affirm in plainer words that *the Son* had no beginning of existence, but that *He* abode with and in the Father before His assumption of our nature, and indeed from everlasting, than in those with which he begins his first epistle? He writes thus, "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 show unto you that Eternal Life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us" (1 John 1:1, 2). And then in the conclusion of his epistle he tells us that *the Son is that life* which here, in the beginning of it, he says was not made, but *was Eternal and with the Father*. He writes, "And we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ; this is the true God and Eternal Life." But if the Son is *the Life*, and the life was with the Father, and the same evangelist says, "And the Word was with God" (John 1:1), then it is plain that the Son must be that Word which was everlastingly with and in the Father. And as this Son is the Word, so God must be the Father. Moreover the Son, according to St. John, is not merely "God," but "Very God." And therefore the Word which he tells us elsewhere was God is doubtless properly so too. And the Son Himself declares *Himself to be that Life* which the apostle tells us is *eternally with the Father*. Thus, then, we see that the Son, the Word, and *the Life*, are all declared to be with and in the Father (Athanasius, *Orations against the Arians*).

The circumstance which, in my mind, places the matter beyond dispute is, that the same person is here most evidently spoken of as "the true God and ETERNAL LIFE." It will be granted that a writer is the best interpreter of his own phraseology. Observe then the expression that he uses in the beginning of the epistle, "The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and show unto you that ETERNAL LIFE, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." In these words it is admitted that the Eternal Life is a title given to Jesus Christ. Compare then the two passages. Is not the conclusion of the epistle a clear explanation of its beginning? (*Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy*, by Dr. Wardlaw, p. 59).

I would only ask you to compare with this the confession of the prophet, "Jehovah is the true God, He is the living God" (Jer. 10:10). And here we have another invincible argument that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, very and eternal God. (Comment on the above by E. Bickersteth, Bishop of Exeter, *The Rock of Ages*, p. 77).

So numerous and clear are the arguments and the testimonies of Scripture in favor of the true deity of Christ, that I can hardly imagine how, upon the admission of the divine authority of Scripture, and with regard to fair rules of interpretation, this doctrine can by any man be called in doubt. Especially the passage, John 1:1-3, is so clear; and so superior to all exception, that by no daring effort of either commentators or critics can it ever be overturned, or be snatched out of the hands of the defenders of the truth (Griesbach's *Critical Testimony on this Scripture*, p. 16).

Jesus was the Eternal Life which was at the side of the Father, in communion with Him, in equal intercourse with Him; that life of which all other existence . . . depends for its license to exist. (Dorner's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*.)

Now these extracts from various writers, though they have not authority over us as the word of God has, show what has at all times been the faith of God's elect; and that it has been generally held by Christian writers that Christ Himself is spoken of personally and divinely as the Eternal Life, or as the Word of Life in 1 John 1, and that this especially characterizes what He is, and the relation in which He stands to us. The editor of *A Voice to the Faithful* {J. B. Stoney} shows us plainly, in his paper on Eternal Life, that in February, 1885, he had not adopted the views we are combating, and that they *do not originate from him*, though he has since allowed himself to be drawn into them. On the contrary, he expresses fully, with a sense of their value and importance, the thoughts he now opposes, and guarantees them to us in every important particular. Eternal Life is what Christ had in common with the Father, that He gives us this Eternal Life, that He manifested and expressed this life of God here on this earth, in all its perfections and in *every detail of His life*, that it is a new existence, received by the sinner on believing, and that He is our life. So that the delusive outcry now raised, that this involves participation in Godhead, is just as applicable, if it has any force at all, to all these writers from the very commencement, including J. B. S. who now, in his signature attached to Mr. Anstey's paper virtually condemns himself as guilty of such profanity, in what he then taught. The only writers who have ever questioned these views, or opposed the thought of the Eternal Life being a personal title of Christ, and what He was in eternity, are such as are unsound as to the Godhead of the Lord.

We see, however, in painful contrast with these Extracts in a paper by F. E. R. in *A Voice to the Faithful* for January, 1886, nearly a year after Mr. Stoney's article, the first germs of these doctrines.

I have *doubted sometimes* if it be sufficiently seen that, when life is spoken of in Scripture, it is presented to us as a moral state into which one is brought through faith ("the Just shall live by faith"), to which the nature begotten in the believer of the Spirit by the word necessarily answers.

In Psa. 133:3 life for evermore is the explanation of "the blessing," and it is identified with Zion, and therefore with all the *moral force* of Zion.

I think the passages cited show that the idea of life, in the first revelation of it in Scripture, is a *moral order of things* into which the believer enters through grace.

And in chapter 5, the apostle reverts to the fact of the Eternal Life being in the Son, and ends with the expression, "He is the true God and Eternal Life"; *that is*, that Eternal Life means a *new order of things*, so far as man is concerned, true only in the Son, and in believers *as abiding in Him*.

My impression is that it is in this way life is presented in Scripture; not so much as a deposit in the believer, though indeed Christ lives in him in the power of the Spirit, but as a *state of blessing*, whether in Christ in glory, or under Christ on the earth.

The question is, Are we to give up truth which we have held and valued as the truth of God for so many years, surrendering it for a view which is received by Unitarians alone -- who deprive Him of the proper and essential glory of

His person, which they have seen plainly enough (if Brethren do not) is involved in this question. This will be seen in the statement given in the following pages, made in reply to enquiries by a brother to a late Minister of that body, and since verified by himself.

### *Unitarian Statement on Eternal Life.*

I understand "that eternal life which was with the Father" not to be Christ personally, but to refer to the life that was manifested in Him when on earth. He manifested the life of God. He did not manifest that life to the unbelieving world, but only to His disciples. This I hold to be the explanation of the words, "How is it that Thou wilt manifest Thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" In other words, "that eternal life which was with the Father" was the life of God, lived on earth by Jesus Christ Godward -- never lived on earth before He lived it, and distinguishable from earthly life.

As to 1 John 5:20, I take "This is the true God" to refer to God (the Father), it is His title; but the following words, "and eternal life," are not a title of Jesus Christ, though the eternal life there spoken of was manifested in Him. I believe that God was in Him when He was a babe in the manger, for Scripture says God was Christ, but *that as a babe in the manger* He was not the *Exhibition* of eternal life, nor until some time afterwards, it being necessary in order to the manifestation that He should be understood by those to whom He did manifest it. This required spiritual perception, and eternal life was only manifested to those who had this spiritual perception. There is no doubt but that the language in the first verse of the First Epistle of John refers to a person, and that person was Jesus, whom they handled, looked upon -- with natural eyes, of course -- and heard; but "that eternal life" which was with the Father was not the person. Two things are alluded to in verses 1 and 2 (the latter being a parenthesis), viz., the person of Jesus, and the eternal life which was in Him, but these two things are distinct, i.e., the person is not the life, neither is the life the person.

If the pronouns "that" and "which" could be fairly rendered in the neuter in the Greek, as they undoubtedly stand in our English translation, then it would be sound reasoning to argue that their reference is to the *life* and not to the person; but it all turns upon what the apostle John really said in the original language, and not what we believe about it.

With certain reservations I would admit that Christ was eternal life, i.e. He lived it, and taught men the doctrine of it, He Himself being the expression of it; though I think it would be more correct to say it was characteristic of Him, as *all* His life could not be said to be the expression of eternal life, He having earthly relationships, and duties to fulfil distinct from His mission as a teacher come from God. But while with the above reservations I would admit that Christ was eternal life, yet I would not say He was *The* Eternal Life, still less that eternal life was Christ, because that would be to ascribe a personality to an attribute, and, as I have before said, in reference to 1 John 5:20, I do not hold that eternal life is an essential title of Jesus Christ. Eternal life is not Deity, inasmuch as it could be expressed in the man Christ Jesus, and through Him imparted to men. Deity belongs only to God, and if I were to admit that "that eternal life which was with the Father" was in itself Deity I should

immediately be on Trinitarian ground.

We are far from saying that either Mr. Raven or his followers are Unitarians, but we take the fact of this similarity as affording remarkable evidence of the dangerous character of this system of reasoning, and, along with the further development which has led to dividing the Person, and the apparent intrusion of manhood into the Godhead of the Son, it is enough to show, to any who have their eyes open, where these doctrines are leading and will ultimately land their adherents. God has allowed this warning to reach His saints. Will it be listened to, or refused as other warnings have been? We shall have fulfilled our duty in placing it before them, whatever may be the result.

We are conscious of no feeling but of love toward them, and have no wish either to irritate or pain them needlessly, far from it; but as we expect to meet them in heaven, we would arouse them, if possible, to a sense of the dishonor we are sure they are unconsciously allowing towards the Lord who bought them.

It is on Mr. Raven's letters that we can alone depend with certainty in seeking to ascertain the nature of the views held by him. **Mere verbal statements, drawn out of him with an evident object, by those who have sought to defend his views, are of little worth.**<sup>33</sup> It will be seen that some of the letters here given have not before been printed, they are therefore given in full, with some fresh extracts, which have only reached the author in part, along with other passages from letters already printed, added in order to complete the view of the writer's sentiments.<sup>34</sup>

### *Extracts and Letters from Mr. Raven.*

#### *Extracts Already in Print.*

Eternal Life is *a condition*, but existing and expressed in such a way in a person, that it can be said of Him, He is it.

I should still hesitate to say that Eternal Life is presented as a principle of living" (July 16th, 1890).

I do not find in scripture that the term "Eternal Life" is employed *save in connection with manhood either in the Son or us*. When the Son is viewed, as in the gospel, as a divine Person, other terms are employed (Nov. 21st, 1890, Letter to J. W., Dublin).

It was in essence with the Father in eternity (Printed Letter to J. S. O., Dec. 6th, 1889).

Scripture does *not speak of Christ having been the Eternal Life which was with the Father* before the world was (March 6th, 1890, to W. Barker).

But until He had passed out of the *condition* into which He had in grace entered, where He might die, and had entered on a *new condition* in resurrection, in every way

33. {I have emphasized this statement because this is a common practice by those who defend evil.}

34. As regards his letters, written with the intent to explain his system, Mr. R. says, "I have never wished any of mine to be kept secret!" This, even if it be not too exact, is sufficient reason, under the circumstances, for presenting them to the reader.

commensurate with what He had been spiritually, I could not say He was fully revealed as Eternal Life (Nov. 13th, 1890, to A. L., Dublin).

Scripture does not say that Eternal Life is Christ, but that Christ is Eternal Life, i.e. that the *heavenly condition* of relationship and being, in which Eternal Life consists, exists, and is *embodied and expressed* in Him (*Letter* printed by Mr. Champney, p. 19).

### Other Statements of Mr. Raven.

All I meant by "in essence" was, that it was not *in form* with the Father until the Son became man; but, as I said, *the being* and, in a sense, *the relationship* was there, but I judge the thought of eternal life always had man in view.

Eternal Life is a *condition*, but existing and expressed in such a way, in a Person, that it can be said of Him, *He is it* (Greenwich, July 25th, 1890).

I do not accept the assertion of some, that eternal life is an essential title of the Son of God. I am sure it cannot be maintained. I believe it to be a *term* indicating a *condition*, which, according the counsel of God, was to characterize man, and which has now been made manifest by the appearing of Jesus Christ. That which was to characterize man was what had been in the Son eternally with the Father, and was in due time revealed *in the Second Man*, the One out of heaven. But what characterized *the Second Man* could not include all that was true of a divine Person, as self-existent, having life in Himself, omnipotence, omniscience, and many other attributes of a divine Person; and yet it does include what He was morally in righteousness, love, holiness, truth, and nearness to the Father (August 25th, 1890).

As I gather the truth, Christ is the last Adam -- a life-giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15:45), and the Second Man (1 Cor. 15:47). *As the last Adam* He stands alone as Head (John 17:2; 1 Cor. 11:3). He gives life. (Who but God could do this?) *As the second Man*, He is the pattern of the heavenly family -- "As is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly" (1 Cor. 15:48). Hence, when I view Him thus (though in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily), I think of Him in connection with the family -- of what is true in Him and in them (1 John 2:8). "As He is so are we in this world" (1 John 4:17). And this in itself does not involve all that is true of a divine Person, *as self-existent, having life in Himself*, etc., etc., or it would be true also of us, which is impossible (Nov. 25th, 1890).

As far as I can gather, he (Mr. Rule) regards Eternal Life as *the life of the Son* as a divine Person, as, in fact, equivalent to "*In Him was life*"; while I regard it as a *condition* which, although ever existing essentially in the Son, is presented in Scripture as characteristic of the Second Man . . . I fail to find in any of the gospels the statement that Christ *is eternal life*. On the contrary, eternal life there refers *without exception to something given to man*, or into which man is to enter (Sept. 17th, 1890).

Hence I conclude that eternal life is a truth which is *connected with man, whether in Christ or in us* . . . I believe eternal life is what He is now as man, but then it takes its character from what He was eternally as divine. But I believe eternal life to be *the life of man*, according to the purpose of God, and what has come out fully in Christ in resurrection, though manifested in Him even before. In a word, I believe eternal life to mean a new man in a new scene for man (Greenwich, Oct. 12th, 1890).

It is, I judge, a grave mistake to make any essential difference between Eternal Life as presented in Paul's writings and in John's (Greenwich, Oct. 29th, 1890).

### Questions Addressed in a Letter to Mr. Raven

Is it true that you hold that Eternal Life is an essence or sphere apart from Christ?

Do you believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is and was from the beginning that Eternal Life which was with the Father?

Do you say that 2 Cor. 4:10, 11 is not Eternal Life, and if not, what life is it?

Do you hold that a Christian attending to his earthly calling is not manifesting Eternal Life whilst thus engaged?

Why not, if we do all to His glory?

### Reply to the Above Letter.

June 18th, 1890. "Dear Mrs. S., -- I readily answer your letter. But I must say that I can only characterize the statement (from whoever it may come) that I hold any evil doctrine as to the divinity of the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, as shameful untruth. The tendency of what I have maintained is to keep the truth of what He is as a true divine Person distinct from purpose in Him of blessing for man.

The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, and other titles which speak of the true Deity of Christ, are not interchangeable with eternal life. He is the true God AND eternal life.

To answer your questions. I do not hold that Eternal Life is an essence or sphere apart from Christ, though I have no doubt that the apprehension of the new and heavenly sphere is essential to the entering into Eternal Life.

I believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal life; that eternal life was manifested in Him here, and eternally in Him (in essence, i.e. not in form of man) with the Father.

2 Cor. 4:10, 11 appears to me to refer to life in the sense of character. The life of Jesus (what He was *as Man here*) is to be manifested in our mortal bodies. *Eternal Life* is, that we live in Him where He is.

Eternal life is heavenly (John 3:12), and has in itself nothing to do with earthly calling, &c. For us its form and character is to know the Father as the only true God, and Jesus Christ His sent One. I do not know where Scripture speaks of *any one manifesting eternal life*. What it does say is that it has been manifested, *a special revelation*, so to say, to the apostles that they might declare it.

They apprehended *in some way* the out-of-the-world heavenly relationship and being in which eternal life consists. The more we are in the power of it the better we shall do all here to the glory of God; but all this will pass away, and Eternal Life abide.

(Signed) F. E. RAVEN

July 2nd. My dear brother, -- I am glad to answer your letter; and as to the various points you mention would say that the statement about John 5:26 is untrue, and has no foundation. I refer the passage, as every one else, to the hour that now is.

As to eternal life not being a Person, a Person is eternal

life -- Christ is it; but when it was said that eternal life is a person by C. S. and that school, they meant that the eternal life and the Eternal Son were strictly equivalent. This I believe to be very wrong, and clouding to the glory of the only begotten Son. As the risen glorious Man He is the Eternal Life; but then *all that in which Eternal Life essentially consists (nature and relationship)* was in the Son, ever with the Father, and manifested in Him when here after the flesh. But the eternal Son is *a much greater thing* than eternal life.

I send you an extract from the letter in which the statement "Think of an helpless infant," &c. occurs. I think it speaks for itself. The *exhibition* of eternal life is in the risen Man who has annulled death.

The reference in my printed paper to certain statements having been withdrawn or modified was to statements by \_\_\_\_\_ &c., not to statements of my own.

I think in the beginning of 1 John 1 the apostle gives prominence to the condition rather than the person -- though the condition is inseparable from the person -- at the same time *the person is greater than the condition*.

Believe me,

Your affectionate Brother, F. E. Raven

P. S. -- The moment is a trying one, but made less difficult through the mistakes of those who have acted.

### *To Mr. F. of Salisbury*

The personality of Eternal life I do not understand -- I understand the personality of the Father, Son, and Spirit -- they are Persons; but I judge Eternal life to be a condition (of being and relationship) which was ever in the Son with the Father, and manifested in Him as a man here, and has now its full and proper expression in Him according to the counsels of God, as the risen glorious Man -- "He is the true God and Eternal Life," and we are in Him. The place of Eternal life is "with the Father"; and hence I do not understand its manifestation to the world. Scripture says it was manifested to us (the inspired writers), which implies a special grace to them to enable them to apprehend what was with the Father. Christ was the light of the world, spoke the Father's words, and did the Father's works, but *all that* was a different thing to the manifestation of Eternal life -- God's purpose and promise for man. F. E. R.

### *To J. W. B.*

In regard to Eternal Life it seems to me that it is *a kind of technical expression*, indicating an order and state of blessing purposed and prepared of God for man . . . so that Eternal Life is objective and practical rather than subjective -- *a sphere and order of blessing* (May 1, 1888).

### *To W. Barker*

How you can say that my interpretation of 1 John 1 sweeps away Christ as being Himself the Eternal Life I am at a loss to understand. I admit Eternal life to be *state*, as it has been said, a condition of being and relationship, and this was at least in essence in the Son in eternity (Feb. 10, 1890).

### *Extracts from Mr. Raven's Writings Already printed Expressive of His Views on Eternal Life.*

I should not quite like to say that Eternal Life is the life of God (*Letter*, Oct. 17, 1890, to J. W., Dublin).

Royal Naval College,  
Greenwich,

December 16th, 1890.

My dear Brother,-- I am glad to answer your letter, and I trust to clear up the point you mention. I doubt if the words you quote are exactly what I have written; but I have said more than once that the term Eternal Life in Scripture *always* stands in connection with *manhood*, whether in Christ or in us. To deduce from this that Christ became Eternal Life in incarnation is wholly unwarrantable, and contrary to Scripture.

In declaring that Eternal Life which was with the Father the apostle speaks of what was "from the beginning," i.e. from the incarnation. This indicates that he speaks of the Son *as man*; but then Eternal Life is not what He *took* in becoming Man, but what He *brought* into manhood. As to what it is *essentially*, it was ever in Him with the Father. Hence Christ could say, "No man hath ascended to heaven but *He which came down from heaven*, the Son of man which is in heaven." And again, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up *where He was before*." And Paul says, "The Second Man is out of heaven."

This certainly could not be said of the Son of man as to *form*; but it could and is as to purpose, and as to *all that He is essentially*. What the Son ever was in nature (or moral being) and in relationship with the Father now, gives its character as far as it can to manhood, and is fully revealed in Christ risen, though He is also *the true God*. Hence Eternal Life was with the Father, and ever so. I have objected, and do object strongly, to the *deification* of Eternal Life on the one hand, and on the other to its connection with man in his state as a living man here on earth. It reaches us through death and resurrection, and involves a new order of being.

It has been said by a brother in Dublin *that Eternal Life is the life of God*. This is what I should call irreverence. May the Lord give grace and courage for the defense of the truth. I am sure it is a critical moment.

With love in the Lord, Your affectionate Brother,  
(Signed) F. E. Raven

Written to A. J. P.

Royal Naval  
College, Greenwich,  
October 30th,  
1890

Dear Brother, -- I saw a letter of yours (to Cutting, I think) in which you expressed a difficulty in understanding a sentence in a paper of mine, viz., "It (Eternal life) was ever an integral part of the person of the blessed Son, but such as could according to the divine counsel be connected with manhood and be imparted to man." I thought, therefore, I would send you a line as to it. What is meant by it is this, that while Eternal Life would cover all that Christ is *morally*, it does not include attributes which are properly divine, and which belong to the eternal Son. He has His own proper glory which is given to Him, even though He has become Man.

There are things which are common between the Father and Son as are seen in John 5 and there are things which are common, so to say, between the Son and us; what is true in Him and in us -- as eternal life. In the connection in which things stand in Scripture I do not see that eternal life *ever goes beyond man whether Christ or us*. In the

First Epistle of John it is what was *from the beginning* (the incarnation) in a man (though essentially it was ever with the Father, as the Second Man is out of heaven). When we come, as in John's gospel, to the revelation of Christ's person, other expressions are employed, as, "In Him was life" -- as self-existent -- which cannot be common between Christ and us. It is here what was *in the beginning*.

The same glorious Person who is now the full revelation of eternal life -- the pattern of the heavenly family -- is also the true God; He has life in Himself, we have life in eating Him, but morally *we are as He is*.

I trust this may serve to make the point plain.

I fear you have trying times in the States as we have in England. There is a distinct retrograde movement from the truth.

With love in the Lord, Your affectionate Brother,  
(Signed) F. E. Raven

(To F. L.)

His (Mr. Rule's) object is to identify Eternal Life with the life of the eternal Son as a *divine Person* (in Him was life) . . . The statements as to the Son in the gospels are not all to be merged and lost in the truth of Eternal Life. Mr. Rule in his zeal for Eternal Life seems to me to be fast letting go the true deity of Christ.<sup>35</sup> He says the Eternal Son ever was, is, and ever will be in His glorious person and eternal being the Eternal Life." The phrase is high sounding! but where does he find it in Scripture (Greenwich, Jan. 29, 1891).

### *Extract and Letter of Mr. Darby's on Truths of this Nature are Here Added*

The apostle then tells Timothy of the safeguard on which he may rely to preserve himself, through grace, steadfast in the truth, and in the enjoyment of the salvation of God. Security rests upon the certainty of the *immediate* origin of the doctrine which he had received; and upon the Scriptures, received as authentic and inspired documents, which announced the will, the acts, the counsels, and even the nature of God. We abide in that which we have learned, because we know from whom we have learned it. The principle is simple and very important. We advance in divine knowledge, but (so far as we are taught of God) we never give up for new opinions that which *we have learned from an immediately divine source, knowing that it is so* (Synopsis, vol. 5., p. 222).

N e w

York, Dec. 10th, 1874.

Beloved Brother, -- We must take care not to pretend to know all that concerns the union of humanity and divinity in the person of the Lord. This union is inscrutable. "*No man knoweth the Son but the Father.*" Jesus grew in wisdom. What has made some Christians fall into such grave errors is that they have wished to *distinguish* and explain the condition of Christ as man. We know that He was and that He is God; we know that He became man, and the witness to His true divinity is maintained, in that state of humiliation, by the inscrutability of the union. One

may show that certain views detract from His glory, and from the truth of His person, but I earnestly desire that brethren should not set to work to dogmatize as to His person; they would assuredly fall into some error. I never saw any one do it without falling into some unintentional heresy. To show that *an explanation is false, in order to preserve souls from the evil consequences of the error*, and to pretend to explain the Person of the Lord, are two different things (from the French. *Letters of J. N. D.*, vol. 2, p. 368).

N. B. -- Italics are introduced everywhere to mark important passages.

## *Appendix B*

The following extracts will show the effect of this teaching as regards life or eternal life; how the true scriptural idea of it is destroyed in the soul, and that it only becomes a fact at the resurrection. Christ Himself as the life is also reduced to what is experimental. Such is the result of the new system which was introduced at Witney in April, 1888. This teaching appears to be generally adopted among Brethren in India.

### *"Indian Extracts, No. 21."*

#### *"Please circulate among those in fellowship."*

If I am right then it follows that Eternal Life must not be confounded with the *Person* of the Lord Jesus Christ. *How then* are we to understand, "This is the true God and eternal life"? In the same way as when we identify a man with his experimental life. J. has been converted and he is quite another man . . . What the disciples "handled" was *not* part of the *life*, but it *was* part of the *Word* of life, it was part of *Jesus*. If I am right in my "scriptural facts" it is an absurdity to speak of "the Personality of Eternal life," because it is the personality of "zoeë," which is *experience* and *never person*. But now suppose I am wrong as to my scripture facts . . . Suppose, on further investigation, it could be demonstrated that Eternal Life did mean *His eternal Person*? What is the fault that could be laid to my charge . . . Would it be *the dreadful fact of my rejection of the Personality of Eternal Life*? (pp. 25, 26).

"All the days of our *life*," neither beginning of days nor end of *life*.

It is the exercise, experience, activity of that which lives. "Zoeë" is never that which does live, but always the result produced by living, or I might say it is the *fact of living* (p. 22).

Scripture, as I read it, invariably when speaking of the life says it is *in Christ*, and not it *is Christ*, though Christ (*experimentally*) is it . . . Now is the life Mr. L. leads the person of Mr. L.? Surely not; but Eternal Life is eternal "Zoeë," and so cannot be a person. If an intimate friend of his were to describe his life minutely another might exclaim, "Yes, that is Mr. L. exactly." And it is in this way Darby says Eternal Life is Christ Himself.

Another thing. We must distinguish between *having* life in Christ and *having life in oneself*. The former is having it *in title* or *assured to us*, as, "We have . . . an house . . . eternal in the heavens" (2 Cor. 6). It is ours, but we have *not yet got it* . . . (cp. John 6:50, 51). Yet though the Lord had at least eleven with Him who had been *born again*, His

35. {In view of this remark, it is instructive to note, not only as we have been observing -- F. E. Raven's denial that the Son was eternally the Eternal Life in His own Person, and his affirmation that something of manhood was eternally in the Son -- he also denied that the Son was eternally the Word and eventually he also denied the eternal Sonship. F. E. R. was given over to Satanic delusion.}

words prove that they had *no life* ("Zoeë") in them because they had not eaten His flesh or drunk His blood (p. 26).

### ***Letters by General Haig and J. Dow.***

The final issues of existence (judgment or Eternal Life) were vested in Him, so that one who heard His words and believed in God who sent Him was safe from judgment and *sure* of Eternal Life, and that matter passed at once from the domains of death to that of life, &c. If someone corrects me and says *I must not alter "hath Eternal Life"* to "*is sure* of Eternal Life," *I say* that in the sense as elsewhere in Scripture, e.g. 2 Cor. 5:1, "we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." *It is ours*, but we have *not yet got it*.

Look now into the future and see life in the new creation . . . Now as many as received Jesus had been born of God, God's "seed" was in them; but that "seed" is *never called "life"* in the Bible -- much less "Eternal Life." *The seed was in them*. Eternal Life was *secured to them*. When the Holy Ghost was given them and enabled them to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man and to feed on Him, *then* they had Eternal Life *in them*; but the thought of John 6:47 was not yet effectuated, nor has it been even now -- see verse 40 -- it is connected with the *post-resurrection state*. The Spirit is God's earnest, but John 6:47 contemplates Eternal Life in its *fullness* in resurrection glory (*Letter from General Haig*, pp. 27-29).

So we have called the new birth "the Eternal Life"; and one born of God a "quickened soul," &c.; while all these terms are distinct and entirely separate in scripture use, so the words "personality of Eternal Life," are foreign to Scripture (*Letter by J. Dow*, p. 35).

### ***Extracts from "Notes of a Conference Held at Lahore," December, 1890.***

"Partakers of the divine nature" in 2 Pet. 1:4 has a moral sense, and not the sense in which the expression is very commonly used in connection with new birth (p. 30).

*Quickening* is to give *life*, and we have commonly used the word to mean imparting new birth. He causes them to live. Quickening is not merely imparting a new vital principle, but causing them to live. Those born of God have Eternal Life in the sense of having it *assured to them*. *New birth is never called "life" in Scripture* (p. 33).

The disciples could not have the life of the Son (as Man) with the Father, until they had entered into the work of the cross. Though they were born of God, they could have *no life in them till His death* . . . The outcome of the new birth in the Old Testament saints is *never once called life* in the Scriptures.

New birth is the sovereign action of God, preliminary to all else . . . *It is not our receiving Christ*, though those that have been born of God do receive Him (p. 36).

To refer again to verse 10 (John 10:9-17), "If they had life, how could He come to give it?"

It is clear that they had not life before from what we have already noticed in John 6:53. Note too John 5: 25. "They that have heard shall live," *not "do live."* See also John

14:19.

The new birth is the beginning of the process that leads on to Eternal Life. The new birth makes you as secure as God can make you. You are absolutely secure from that moment. God has given me Eternal Life, but before that I was born again. To be born again involves Eternal Life *eventually*, but it does not necessarily mean *the enjoyment of it here*.

The Spirit is life -- induces life. I believe that life begins from the moment the Spirit is given. The seventh of Romans is *not* what God calls *life* (pp. 38-40).

Neither resurrection nor life is a title, though neither resurrection nor life can be known, save in Him. He produces that result for others (p. 46).

We have been priding ourselves that *we have life*, even in an utter stagnant state of soul out of communion when we are away from God in spirit; it is humbling to find that God does not recognize *that as life* (p. 47).

He gave them their commission to go forth and betoken it with an act of power; showing Himself as the giver of life; then He gives them authority, they could not go forth as sent ones, nor use this authority until the Holy Ghost came down, and *then they had life in them too* (p. 49).

### ***Extracts from "A Few Words on life," by C. E. M. (Winder, Leeds).***

The saints of old must have been born of the Spirit, or they could have had no part in the hopes which God revealed to them. But *life* was still *future*, for there was not yet the man who as a divine Person had *always lived*, and now as *a man could live for ever*, and who could *achieve life* for others, because He could lay down what He had in common with them -- His human soul -- and take it again by a power which was inherent in Himself.

*Life* for them was a *future thing*, not yet brought to light. God had life for them, and in witness thereof took away Enoch, to show that life was somewhere else than here; *He had it for them, but it had not come*. *There is no such thing as life for man* apart from the accomplished fact of a man beyond the reach of death?<sup>36</sup> That and nothing else is life.

Eternal Life, primarily and properly, is the inherent essential power to live for ever . . . In like manner Eternal life and the condition of having it, though inseparable, are distinct . . . Eternal life for man is the privilege bestowed by God, His gift, and beyond all risk of forfeiture of living for ever (p. 6).

Eternal life is the final result of His death and resurrection, but it is the *last thing* administered; that is to say, Eternal Life is *not an actual fact* in the persons of those that are Christ's, *until* the whole man is set by God's power, the same power that raised up Christ *beyond death* for ever.

But at present Eternal life for man exists nowhere as an accomplished fact save in Christ's own person.

Nevertheless now, as a thing *quite outside* ourselves, eternal life is given of God, and possessed by believers. John's Gospel and Epistle teach us how (p. 7).

36. The soul, we all know, exists when separated from the body; but that is not life, for it is when the man is dead (p. 5).



... The Word, in whom is and always was life; that is *the inherent essential power of living*; who as God, and eternally existing, was eternally, by His nature, out of the reach of death (p. 8).

He who has brought what He alone possesses down to us, in His flesh and blood being given for us to eat and drink; -- creature life ended, that we may receive in Him that which is eternal, -- now gives Eternal Life, because as man He has *gone back to what He had* before He became man, and this is Eternal Life (p. 12).

The sent one replaced, as man, in the original glory He had from all eternity. Surely *this* is Eternal Life.

For now that what He has brought down and done for us is made good in Himself. He gives that we should live for ever, in having for ever before us Eternal Life, where only, and as only, it could be in its true character in man and for man (p. 13).

N. B. -- Important passages are put in italics.

We can hardly be surprised at the above statements by the followers of Mr. Raven, when he expresses himself on these important points as below; separating new birth and quickening into distinct things, denying faith, new affections and the reception of Christ to new birth.

As to communication of life, I have no question for a moment that a soul is spiritually alive as the result of new birth: still new birth is only a foundation, and is *not necessarily in itself the reception of Christ*. Eternal life is in Christ, and in receiving Christ eternal life is received, but it is in Christ (the Second Man) "God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son."

I do not regard new birth and quickening as equivalent. In the first, I believe a new foundation is laid by the Spirit in man through the word, while quickening is that a soul is made to live spiritually in the life and relationship of the Second Man. In a word, quickening is the equivalent of "new creation," and the result of it is that the believer has passed out of death into life (*Letter of F. E. R.*, Sept. 17, 1890).

In Scripture new birth is *never connected with faith*, but is the sovereign gift of God. Eternal life is always on the ground of faith, though of course it is also the sovereign gift of God.

Scripture does not connect life with birth. Nature is life in essence, but there is not the whole framework so to speak; i.e. the affections, &c. (*Notes of a Brothers' Meeting at Mr. Oliphant's*, 14th January, 1890).

## Appendix C

Since the foregoing pages were in type, a copy of a letter of Mr. Oliphant's, with Mr. Raven's reply (published by the latter), have reached the author from England. Extracts from both are printed below. From these it will be seen that Mr. Oliphant's remarks verify the conclusions that have been drawn in this and other pamphlets, that Mr. Raven's statements distinctly "imply" the existence of humanity, in some shape or form, before the incarnation. Mr. Raven, in painful consistency with his previous course, declines in his reply to withdraw anything, and denies that he holds what is imputed to him or that his words fairly bear such a

construction. Instead of a simple acknowledgment that they are wrong, he attempts a sort of explanation of them, which only indicates how far his mind was carried into this region by his speculations, though now that they are challenged he would fain avoid the discredit attaching to them.

The reader must judge for himself, from the extracts given, how far Mr. Raven's explanation can be accepted, in the face of his refusal to withdraw the sentences which have given rise to the charge; and his own admission, that he was unwilling to speak in "*too positive* a way on a profound subject, which *is gathered* from the general tenor of Scripture." Speaking of Christ as "last Adam and Second Man," he says, "He was always such in the counsel, and *I could almost say* in the presence of God"; and again, in his letter to Mr. White, cited by Mr. Rule, "In resurrection (1 Cor. 15) He is revealed as last Adam and second Man, though *ever such in His own person*, for the second Man is out of heaven."

Further, at the close of his letter, instead of judging himself, he brings the charge against his brethren of "lack of familiarity with *Scripture habits of thought*," whilst assuming that he and his followers have gained truer and juster views of the real humanity of our blessed Lord!

### Extracts from Mr. Oliphant's Letter,

#### Dated September, 1891.

You say nobody thinks that Christ became last Adam and Second Man till the incarnation, and He was not declared such till the resurrection; and you add, "but I believe that He was always such in the counsel, and, *I could almost say*, in the presence of God, and we find many allusions to this in the Old Testament, Psalms 8, 40." Now no one would have any difficulty about the Lord being the Man of God's purpose, and I have always understood Psalms 8 and Proverbs 8 to refer to God's counsels. But the sentence, "*I could almost say*," shows a want of Scripture basis for the thought; or why not say, "scripture teaches," and then it has the authority of the word of God? As it stands, it bears the meaning that you are venturing on speculation, and then what you do say looks like what Chater is refuting on your behalf, namely, that man or humanity existed in some shape or form before the incarnation, though the Person always existed, of course ... No doubt He who was born brought what He was into the world, but *what* was born was a *new* thing in the world -- "that holy thing which shall be born of thee" {Luke 1:35} -- and neither man, manhood, nor humanity had any existence in fact before the Word became flesh. But this sentence, I must own, gives a handle to those who accuse you of making humanity in some shape or form exist before the incarnation, and I am afraid souls will be stumbled by it, and others kept in a wrong position by it. I wish you could see your way to withdraw it with the letter quoted by Gladwell, as to which I wrote before, and give a distinct and emphatic denial to the accusation that you hold any such doctrine which would weaken the truth of the incarnation.

### Extracts from Mr. Raven's

*Letter, Dated Greenwich,  
25th September, 1891.*

I should be very ready to withdraw the sentences you quote in your letter of September, in deference to your wish; but it is now difficult to take any step in the matter, since, though I have no reason to doubt the sentences are mine, they have not appeared in any published paper, and I have no recollection when or to whom they were written, nor can I readily trace them. My fear is that a construction will be put upon the withdrawal very different from my meaning in it, for though I have no disposition to disregard the judgment of others, the sentences, in my reading of them, do not convey anything contrary to truth and sound doctrine.

The idea that man or manhood or humanity had any existence in fact in Christ until "the Word became flesh," never entered my thoughts, and I do not believe that any sentence of mine, read in its connection, and without bias, could fairly bear such a construction.

In fact the charge against me of making manhood eternal in Christ is monstrous and inconsistent on the part of those who have made it.

I add a word as to the particular sentences you criticize. I believe the title "Son of man" to be personal. It is the way in which the Lord most commonly referred to Himself; and that He said, "Son of man which is in heaven" by virtue of what He was in His own divine Person; but from the characteristic form in which the expression is couched it has seemed to me to imply a contrast to man as created for earth, and if so, the expression carries the idea of a new order, but I should not press it. The use in the other sentence of the words, "I could almost say," sprang from an unwillingness to speak in too positive a way on a profound subject which is gathered from the general tenor of Scripture, and on which I felt there was much to learn.

But we must call attention to the fact that the preexistence of humanity in essence is the keystone upon which Mr. Raven's system rests, to which he is shut up by his own words, and without which the whole fabric falls to the ground. What otherwise was this "something," which existed in Christ before He took flesh, which was not Deity? Nay more, which he calls "irreverence" to identify with Deity. Distinguishing it also by various expressions from His life and His Sonship, as also Mr. Anstey and others have done. That, notwithstanding his disclaimer, Mr. Raven still fundamentally retains the same thought is evident when he says, not only, "In the Word becoming flesh it could not but be, as you say, that manhood received its character from the Word," but further, that "*manhood is not seen as something added to the Word*,"<sup>37</sup> but the expression is, "The Word became flesh" (*Letter of 25th September, quoted above*).

---

37. {That italicized phrase means, of course, that since manhood was not added to the Word, the Son brought that humanity with Him. Thus once again he lied about what he said. This shuffling and shiftiness characterize his writings on these subjects. Moreover, he also held that Christ had no human soul and spirit, as we have. What he believed was that the divine took the place of the real human soul and spirit, and was justly characterized as an Apollinarian. And this accounts for his teaching that something of manhood was ever in the Son -- and imparted the spirit of manhood to the man Christ Jesus. Mr. Raven was amongst the worst blasphemers of the Son to arise in Christendom.}



## *The Blessedness of the Person of Christ in its Unity as Presented in Scripture*

**Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father (1 John 2:24).**

A further demonstration of the nature of the false doctrine brought out by Mr. Raven has come to light. Judging by his correspondence with a friend, in reply to Mr. R. Hunt,<sup>38</sup> he can no longer claim to share the common "precious faith," held by all true Christians since the introduction of Christianity. He now plainly denies the unity of the glorious Person of Christ, the foundation upon which all the superstructure of divine truth and the Church itself is built, as the Lord Himself said to His disciples (referring to Peter's confession of His Person, "Thou art the Christ the Son of the Living God"), "Upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." We should have thought that the charge of undermining the unity of the Person of Christ, already brought against Mr. Raven, founded on his previous letters and statements, would have called forth from him, as it has from his friends, some assurance of his having been mistaken or misunderstood; and that he held *that unity* to be of deepest importance, even if his language seemed irreconcilable with it; or, at least, that for the sake of his friends, as well as his own sake, he would have endeavored to preserve some appearance of retaining it. Far from this, he gives, without any hesitation, his reasons for refusing it, even treating it with a contempt which we must call profane.<sup>39</sup>

It is no longer therefore merely a question as to the nature of eternal life, or when it may be received by those who are made partakers of it, serious as such questions may be, and dangerous as they have proved when carried back to the spring or source of Eternal Life in Christ, and involving thereby both His Nature and His Person. Encouraged, however, in these speculations, by the continued support of His adherent, and still more by the countenance of his friends in the reply to the second letter (addressed to foreign brethren) written by Mr. Anstey, and countersigned by C. H. M. and J. B. S., Mr. Raven has now ventured not only to dissect and

to divide the life which ever existed in the Person of Christ, and to affirm that some of His titles do not include Divine attributes (by which he had greatly disquieted and distressed all who were not previously rendered insensible or indifferent to his earlier irreverent expressions as to the Lord of Glory), but carrying these reasonings still further, he virtually destroys that which is the keystone of the arch of Christianity, and with it the whole *Divine* fabric reared upon it falls to the ground. Nor is this an inference merely drawn by others, for he himself, as will appear, carries this division of the Person of Christ into the past, the present, and the future -- what He was on earth, what He accomplished on the cross, and the present relations or offices He now sustains towards us in heaven, or that He will occupy in the future as Son of Man, the Second Adam, or Head of His body, the Church.<sup>40</sup>

In doing this Mr. Raven has disregarded the double warning given by Mr. Turpin, not only in extracts from Mr. Darby's writings {quoted in W. T. Turpin's magazine} in *Helps in Things Concerning Himself* {edited by W. T. Turpin}, but also his own solemn and earnest entreaty which accompanies it. This disregard however is scarcely surprising, seeing that Mr. R passes by, with total indifference, the check which Scripture puts upon the intrusion of the human mind into the sacred inviolability of the blessed Person of Christ; and in this he is the more responsible, inasmuch as he quotes (page 9) the passage "No man knoweth the Son but the Father"; yet he is not deterred by this from pursuing the inquiry which it forbids. He also ignores (with what has an appearance of an assumed air of ignorance) all that has been universally<sup>41</sup> held and maintained as to the unity of the Person of Christ by pious and esteemed teachers and men of God in the Church of Christ since the days of the apostles; replying to Mr. Hunt's reverent pleading for the unity of the

38. *A Correspondence, Including Two Letters of Mr. F. E. Raven, of Greenwich.* Copies to be had of R. Hunt, Cloragh, Sevenoaks.

39. Mr. Raven says in this correspondence,

If any anyone dares to speak of these things abstractly, he is charged with dividing the unity of the Person of the Son. By such a notion, all is shrouded in mystery, utterly and hopelessly obscured. Where the idea of unity of a person is got from, I know not. It seems to me perfect nonsense.

(See Appendix, p. 46 {p. 147, herein}, where further important Extracts from Mr. R. and other writers are given.)

40. It will be observed that Mr. Raven brings forward no proof from Scripture for all this subversion of Christian doctrine (excepting what Mr. Hunt shows to be a misquotation from Mr. Darby on Psalm 16). It is all his own unsupported argument or assertion. Rashly trusting his own mind upon such a sacred subject, he reasons thus: A Christian "*must of necessity* look at such relations" (of Christ) "abstractly," or "*it would not be possible* to bring the thought of God as such into the particular relation," &c. &c.

41. "Universally"; that is, with the exception of such as Nestorius and his followers, whose doctrines were condemned at the council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, and again at the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, where the statements of his opponents who had erred on the other side and denied the existence of the two natures in the Person of Christ, were modified also.

Person of Christ, with the question, -- where did he get it from? as though it were something novel and unheard of! It is easy of course to say this, and thus to give to those of his followers who are ignorant of the facts, the false impression that the mistake lies in Mr. Hunt's unacquaintedness with the subject, instead of with his own presumptuous rashness exhibited in thus despising the long-established faith of the church of God. But even if he did not think it worth his while to follow the cautious conduct of the apostle Paul, in communicating and comparing his teaching with that of others of weight in the Church of God, lest, as he tells us, "By any means he should run, or had run, in vain" (Gal. 2:2), yet the Athanasian creed <sup>42</sup> (with which any ordinary instructed Christian, not to say teacher, may be supposed to be acquainted) might have stayed so arrogant an expression of impious ridicule as "Where the idea of unity of a person is got from, I know not. It seems to me *perfect nonsense*."

What Mr. Turpin says is this:

The holy mystery of His blessed Person is attempted to be unraveled and explained after a fashion that <sup>43</sup> *one's whole soul shrinks from*; and the end must be that adoration and worship will be superseded by reason and speculation. May God in His great grace and goodness avert such a consummation as this, is one's constant, earnest cry . . . How well it is said (by Mr. Darby), that

we must take care not to pretend to know all that concerns *the union of humanity and divinity in the Person of the Lord. This union is inscrutable.* "No man knoweth the Son but the Father." Jesus grew in wisdom. What has made some Christians fall into such errors is, that they have wished to *distinguish* and explain the condition of Christ as man. We know that He was and is God; we know that He became man, and the witness to His true divinity is maintained in that state of humiliation by the *inscrutability of the union*. One may show that certain views detract from His glory, and from the truth of His Person; but I earnestly desire that brethren should not set to work to dogmatize as to His Person. They would assuredly fall into some error. I never saw any one do it without falling into some unintentional heresy. To show that an explanation is false, in order to preserve souls from the evil consequences of the error and to pretend to explain the Person of the Lord, are two different things.

Again, (Mr. Turpin continues) the same writer says,

I dread dissecting, if I may venture so to speak, Christ; it is not the way to honor Him. Very few will speak so as not to commit themselves; "No man knoweth the Son but the Father." We may know many precious things of Him which enable us to condemn error, but nice definitions of what He was, and how He was it, human language and human thoughts are not competent to, I judge.

(*Helps in Things concerning Himself*. No. 34; pp. 254-256.)

But perhaps it may be doubted by some whether Mr. R. really holds such sentiments, or means what his words appear to convey. Alas! there can be no question on this head; for the system of doctrine elaborated by Mr. Raven is painfully complete in its character, and is carried out in all points in which it could be applied to the Person, the Work, the Titles of Christ, as well as the relations in which He stands to us, or before God on our behalf.

Moreover, this is not only stated and developed, but passages are quoted from his opponents, in which the common faith of Christians is expressed, in order to condemn and repudiate them. Quoting Mr. Hunt, he says:

The phraseology in which Mr. Hunt couches his own belief, such as *God and Man one Christ*, and God becoming the woman's seed, is not the language of Scripture, nor, in my judgment, conveys at all accurately the truth of Scripture. . . . The fact is that those who have left us have no sense of the reality of the incarnation of the Son, and are fast traveling in the direction of the *profane thought* of M. Favez, their leader in France, that the Son of Man is man united to the divinity.

(*A Correspondence*, page 10).

Yet Mr. Darby says, in *Collected Writings*:

"Christ's humanity was united to Godhead, which no one else's humanity ever was" (vol. 15, p. 229).

It may be thought that because Mr. Raven does not deny either the divinity or the humanity of Christ, his views are less serious on that account. But such is not the case, inasmuch as the separation of the natures involves the dissolution and ultimate loss of His Person, and all the blessed results for faith which flow from it, in all that He has undertaken for us. This will be shown in the sequel. <sup>44</sup>

We give some further extracts from Mr. Darby's writings, showing the importance of the subject, as well as his views upon it, not that we own any standard but Scripture, but because of their intrinsic value, and because they are accepted and appealed to by Mr. R's followers, in support of their own views.

If we regard the Second Man, the Lord from heaven, Immanuel, God with us, the One testified unto by Jehovah of hosts as "the Man My Fellow" (Zech. 13:7), Him who fills the highest heavens, and yet was down here a babe in a manger, who could command the waves, and still the storm, but was buffeted by His creatures -- how fearfully and wonderfully made! . . .

"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and today, and for ever," has thrown the efficacy of what He Himself is into *all that He has done*. He offered *one* sacrifice for sins, of abiding efficacy. He has "obtained *eternal* redemption" and brought in "*everlasting* righteousness," He has "*perfected for ever* them that are sanctified." He is "*consecrated*" a priest "*for evermore*" (Heb. 7; 9; 10). *All the value of the work*

42. "Who although He be God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God; one altogether, not by confusion of Substance, but by unity of Person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, *so God and Man is one Christ*." (Athanasian Creed, so called.)

43. {The italics are by A. C. O., in this, and quotations generally.}

44. In this paper, for the strengthening of faith, we have sought to unfold the manifold glories of Christ, and not merely to controvert error; for we have found that these views, even where they were not received as truth, yet often leave a blighting effect upon the soul, as a kind of mist which Satan uses to darken the beauty and excellency of His Person.

*and offices of Christ flows from the glory of His Person* (Psa. 139, *Practical Holiness*, by J. N. D.)

Thus we have a revelation of heavenly things brought directly from heaven by Christ, and in His Person. He revealed them in all their freshness which was found in Him, and which He, who was ever in heaven, enjoyed; He revealed them in the perfection of the Person of Him who made the glory of heaven; whose nature is the atmosphere which all those who are found there breathe, and by which they live; He, the object of the affections which animate this holy place, from the Father Himself, down to the last of the angels who fill heaven's courts with their praises, He is the center of all glory. Such is the *Son of Man*, He who came down to reveal the Father -- truth and grace -- but who divinely remained in heaven in the essence of His divine nature, in His Person inseparable from the humanity with which He was clothed! *The Deity which filled this humanity was inseparable in His Person from all the Divine perfection, but He never ceased to be a man, really and truly man before God* (J. N. D. *Notes on the Gospel of John*, p. 37).

It is a great mistake to suppose that because people have not intelligently received an evil doctrine they have not suffered by it. The plain simple notion of Christ is undermined, and power against evil and for good destroyed, though the soul is unaware of it. The sense of the evil is utterly enfeebled, and Christ practically lost (*Collected Writings* vol. 15, p. 210, note).

There are four great fundamental points on which we join issue with Mr. Raven in reference to the Person of our blessed Lord. And we affirm that on each of these points the Scripture teaches that which completely overthrows Mr. Raven's system of doctrine.

First, as to the union of the divine and human natures in His glorious Person, we affirm that this unity is everywhere implied or expressed in Scripture.

Secondly, as to the names, titles, or designations that He bears, we assert that they all, without exception, include or carry with them Divine attributes.

Thirdly, as to the relations, positions, and offices, between God and man, which He fills, we declare that they all, and in every aspect, imply and involve the whole glory of His Person.

Fourthly, as to the work of expiation which He has accomplished, we appeal to every Christian that the thought as well as the reality of what He was, as God, in accomplishing it, must always and of necessity be brought into it.

Far be it from us to pretend to comprehend or explain the mode or manner of the precious and all-important union of the divine and human natures in the Person of Christ. The very thought of thus subjecting that ever blessed Person to such intrusion of the human mind is abhorrent to us. Love and loyalty alike forbid the thought of thus dishonoring, by irreverent curiosity, Him whom faith, whilst allowed to gaze on His perfections, contemplates with holy adoration and worship. But whilst owning that in the depth of His Person

this Holy One of God is altogether unfathomable,<sup>45</sup> yet we may bring forward the universal testimony of Scripture as to *the fact*, the necessity, and the display of this unity; for all this is distinctly revealed to us.

First, then, as to the union of the divine and human natures in His glorious Person; we affirm that this unity is everywhere implied or expressed in Scripture.

In Matt. 1:23 it is written, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." Here it is evident that under the same designation of "*His Name Emmanuel*," the Spirit includes both the child conceived and brought forth, and the infinite Emmanuel, thus expressing not only Godhead, but God in the new condition of manhood in our midst, that is, God with us. So in Isa. 9:6, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given . . . and *His name* shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God." That the same Person should be both a child born, and the mighty God, is neither conceivable, nor possible, nor can be in any sense true, but by the union of the divine and human natures in that Person. John the Baptist puts this in the most striking light when he says, "After me cometh *a man* which is preferred before me, for *He was before me*" (John 1:30). As to His human nature, the Lord came after John, as to His divine, He was before Him, and He founds His exaltation as Man on the fact that He was before him, the Baptist speaking of Him unequivocally as one Person, both before him, and after him. This could only be on the ground of the unity of the Person. We see the same in the Lord's own testimony of Himself, when He says, "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven" (John 3:13). It is impossible, unless we hold the heretical notion of the existence of the humanity of Christ before His incarnation (and so misinterpret, in a wholly novel way, passages of this kind) to give them any real signification, unless we take them as expressive of the unity of the Person of Christ; this unity being so real, that what was proper to one nature could be thus applied to the other. "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where *He was before*?" (John 6:62).

In Isa. 50 the Lord gives this challenge to Israel, as regards His divine Person when manifested in the flesh, "Wherefore, when I *came*, was there no man? when I *called*, was there none to answer. Is my hand shortened at all, that it cannot redeem? or have I no power to deliver? behold, at my rebuke I dry up the sea, I make the rivers a wilderness .

---

45. Even in our own persons we have an illustration of this incomprehensibility, for we also are constituted of two natures, body and soul being united in one person. But *how* these two natures, the physical and the spiritual, are united, or how they mutually act and react upon one another is beyond our power to conceive or fathom; and though the natures are distinct, to separate them in practical actions is impossible. I take up a child in my arms and embrace it; a man would be a fool to say "You did this with your body, not with your spirit" for, being but one person, none can say how far my spirit entered into the action. If we are thus baffled, and get out of our depth in attempting to penetrate the mystery of our own being, how much more, without making a parallel, must this be the case with the infinite Person of the Son of God.

. . . I clothe the heavens with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering.” And He continues, “The Lord God hath given me *the tongue* of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary” (vv. 2-4). The same Person speaks throughout as “I” and “Me.” He who clothes the heavens with blackness, as the mighty Creator, is the obedient One, who, as Man, has received the tongue of the learned, and submits to His Father’s will, exposing His face even to shame and spitting (vv. 5,6). The same Person in John 8, who, little more than thirty years of age, was about to be “lifted up” as man from the earth, declares “before Abraham was, I am,” thus applying to Himself the eternal self-existent name of Jehovah. In John 18:4, “Knowing all things that should come upon Him,” He presents Himself to those who came to take Him in Gethsemane (responding to the title “Jesus of Nazareth,” which distinctly involved His humanity) with the words “I am (He)”; yet these words sufficed to render them powerless, and they go backward, and fall to the ground. He moreover protects His own, whilst delivering Himself up, that the saying might be fulfilled which He spake, “Of them which Thou gavest Me have I lost none” (vv. 5-9). When He invites the recognition of His Person as “the Son of God,” by the blind man (whose eyes He had opened, and who had owned Him as “a prophet,” a “man” who was “of God,” and who now answers Christ’s invitation to believe on “the Son of God,” by saying, “who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?”), He says, “Thou hast both *seen* Him and He it is that *talketh* with thee” (John 9:17, 33-38). The statement in John 1:14, “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth,” is alone sufficient to establish this unity; for in saying that He who is God, the Word, and the Creator, became flesh, the apostle does not imply that He assumed another personality, but that the Person of the Son, who had existed from all eternity, assumed manhood, and displayed the divine glory in that manhood, and as Man. Thus also, in Phil. 2, He who subsisted in the form and glory of God, “took upon Him the form of a servant, . . . and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” All was *Himself*, and the same person, whether in the form of God, or humbled as a servant here.

In Zech. 9 Christ takes His place as the Shepherd of Israel, who feeds His flock, but is rejected by the nation, and specially by their leaders, and then He is sold for thirty pieces of silver; all this distinctly brings Him before us as man. “And I said to them . . . Give me my price, and if not, forbear. So they weighed for *my* price thirty pieces of silver.” But the prophet adds, “And the Lord” -- that is Jehovah -- “said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that *I* was prized at of them.” For the man so treated, the Messiah and Shepherd of Israel, is Jehovah also (vv. 12-13).

In Isa. 40, when the coming of Christ in glory is announced, Zion is exhorted to lift up her voice with strength, and “say unto the cities of Judah, *Behold your God*. Behold,

the Lord God will come with strong hand . . . Behold, His reward is with Him, and His work before Him.” This is evidently Christ; but the Holy Ghost proceeds to say, “*He* shall feed His flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and *carry them in His bosom*,” etc. (vv. 9, 10, 11); continuing, in the same Person, the shepherd character and tenderness manifested in Him as man, whilst He is God, and acts and judges as such. In Zech. 14:3-5 the same event is in view, and Christ is referred to as appearing, for the deliverance of His people, in divine glory as Jehovah, “Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations; . . . and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with Thee.” But His Person, as man, is distinguished in the words, “His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives,” which cleaves asunder, in testimony to the glory of Him who frequented this spot, in the days of His humiliation upon earth.

In Rom. 1:3, 4 the gospel of God is declared to be “concerning His Son Jesus Christ our Lord.” Here we have His full title. Then His humanity is especially marked as characterizing His person, in the words, “*Which* was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,” as well as His power displayed in resurrection as the Son of God, “and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.” Similarly, in Rom. 9:5, His humanity is *first* brought forward, as marking what He is personally, and quite as distinctly as His divine nature, “Of whom, as concerning the flesh, *Christ came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.” Indeed the passages which indicate unmistakably the unity of the Person of Christ are innumerable. Many of them will be noticed as we proceed. (Compare among others John 20:27, 28; Micah 5:2; Psa. 45:7; Col. 2:9; etc.)<sup>46</sup>

Secondly, as to the names, titles, or designations borne by the Lord, we assert that they all, without exception, include, or carry with them, divine attributes.

If we examine the Word of God, we shall find there is not a single name or title that is there applied by the Holy Ghost to Christ as man, even that which seems to be lowest in its relative significance, which does not involve and embrace the essential glory and power of His divine attributes. For if the unity of His Person is a fact divinely taught us, this is seen to be a necessary consequence, as the preceding section will have shown.<sup>47</sup>

His titles, as the King of Israel, the Son of David, or the

46. See also chapters 3 and 4, in *The Glory of the Person of the Son of God*. Carter, 13, Aldine Chambers, Paternoster Row.

47. Mr. Raven affirms, in letters printed by his friend Mr. Boyt, that “What characterized the Second Man could not include all that is true of a divine Person, as self-existent, having life in Himself, omnipotence, omniscience, and many other attributes of a divine Person” (page 4). And this is repeated on page 6, and fully set forth in page 4, of Mr. R’s letters in reply to Mr. Hunt’s comments, giving us a further enlargement in confirmation of his views. These quotations are now fully guaranteed, either by Mr. R’s own citation, or acceptance of them without objection, or by his reference to them and defense of them, in reply to Mr. Hunt. So that his followers are precluded from saying that they are garbled or unfair extracts, or that they do not really convey his meaning.

Branch (which involve dignities which have specially an earthly character), as well as others, which (though belonging to Him as man) have a wider range and signification, such as the Lamb, the Christ, the Second Adam, yet -- whether more limited in their application or otherwise -- all include, or are invested with, attributes, which no mere creature could exhibit, and with powers which no mere human being could wield, and present aspects of His Person, in which He receives divine worship, or honor, which belongs to God alone.

When offering Himself as King to the daughter of Zion, He claims the ass and its colt from its owners, with the words, "The Lord hath need of them," whilst the multitudes which accompany Him shout, "Hosanna to the Son of David! . . . *Hosanna in the highest!*" This is just what excites the jealousy of the chief priests and scribes, who, when they hear the ascription of praise from the children in the Temple, saying "Hosanna to the son of David!" recognize it to be that given in Psa. 118:25, "Save now" (Hosanna), "I beseech Thee, O Lord" (that is Jehovah); "O Lord" (Jehovah), "I beseech Thee, send now prosperity." They ask Him, "Hearest Thou what these say?" and the Lord, accepting this adoration, replies, "Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast *perfected praise?*" (Matt. 21:3, 9, 15, 16). Their simple faith, which delighted the Lord, may well rebuke these lowering thoughts concerning Him.

In Jer. 23:5 and 6 we are told, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous *Branch*, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His name whereby He shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness.*" It is the King and Branch of David, through whose rule Judah is saved, and who executes judgment and justice in the earth, who is thus called "Jehovah our Righteousness." The Lord indeed intimates this glory of His Person, in the question which He addressed to the Pharisees, which silenced and confounded them. Citing Psa. 110:1 ("The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on My right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool"), He adds, "If David then call Him Lord, how is He his son?" (Matt. 22:44, 45). Moreover, as King in Psa. 45, He is declared to have not only His righteous reward of royalty, belonging to Him as man, but the eternal throne, which is His by right as "God" (vv. 6,7). As Son of man, and King in its widest aspect, He judges the nations, and passes the final sentence on them (Matt. 25:34-41). Also in Isa. 11 we see the accompanying display of Divine power in the "Rod" that comes "out of the stem of Jesse"; for "He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth, and with the breath of His lips He shall slay the wicked" (vv. 1-2). In Rev. 5:6, we learn, that as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and as the Lamb that had been slain, He has prevailed to open the Book, which no man can look upon, and He is seen "in the midst of the throne . . . having seven horns and seven eyes," the fullness of power and intelligence, "which are the seven Spirits of God." As the stone laid in Zion He has also the

same, "the eyes of the LORD" (Jehovah), "which run to and fro through the whole earth" (Zech. 3:9; 4:10).

The title of the Christ, the Anointed (in Hebrew, the Messiah), is of great moment. Attaching to Him distinctly as man upon whom the Holy Ghost descended and abode, it indicates in reality the glory of His Person. We shall find that this anointing is expressly intended to mark out who He is, and His personal worthiness and fitness to bear the honor or dignity it implies. In the Old Testament, the anointing with oil, prefiguring the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, was conferred on those who were thereby constituted prophets, priests, or kings, being thus distinctly appointed by God as such (1 Kings 19: 16; Lev. 8:12 and 30; 21:12; Psa. 139:20). John the Baptist tells us that in this way it was intimated to him who the person, thus distinguished, was, though unknown to him before by any previous acquaintance. Thus was he to discern who it was that bore the personal title of the Son of God, and the Baptizer of the Holy Ghost. "And I knew Him not; but He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John 1:33, 34). So in John 3, contrasting Him with all others, as men who are of the earth, and speak accordingly, he says of Christ, "He . . ." is divine, "cometh from above" and "*is above all*"; "and what He," alone, "hath seen and heard" (compare vv. 12 and 13), "that He testifieth"; so that receiving His testimony, is to "set to" our "seal that God is true. For He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him" (28-34). That is, He unites, in this testimony, His divine and heavenly *origin*, to the fact of the fullness of the Spirit present *in* Him; combining thus, in a double way, what is essentially heavenly and divine. For whilst prophets and others delivered the message given to them, but at other times spoke what came merely from their own minds -- what characterized Him was, that He, being God manifest, never spoke at any time and upon any subject, save the mind of God, and in the words of God.

In the account of the anointing given us in the Gospel of Luke 3:21, 22, Jesus is specially seen as man, "being baptized and praying"; but, in His Person, He is the object of heaven, which opens over Him. The Holy Ghost visibly descends upon Him, and the Father expresses what He is to Him, "Thou art My beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased." For though seen in humiliation, He is the center of all the Father's counsels, and on Him rests all divine interest and affection. Thus it is, that the Holy Ghost testifies by His presence to His title to be thus honored as man, and to His glorious Person, upon which the thoughts and delight of heaven are concentrated. In Scripture, therefore, Christ, or the Christ (i.e. anointed), becomes the title by which His Person is specified or distinguished in its entirety, implying all that He is in Himself, on account of which He is the chosen and anointed of God (cp. Isa. 11:2; 61:1). Hence the Apostle John says, that "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is *the Christ*, is born of God" (John 5:1); and the Lord Himself connects



eternal life with the knowledge of Himself, as bearing this title of "Christ" (John 17:3), which is made the test of the disciples' belief in Him (Luke 9:20); and this title is conjoined with that of the Son of God, as the means of receiving life, in John 20:31 -- "These things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through His name" (cp. Matt. 1:18 and 11:4).

For when we think of the Holy Ghost as God, to whom all creation owes its existence, His finding One upon whom He can rest in His fullness, is the indication of the supreme excellence and worthiness that mark the Person, who is at one and the same time the lowly humbled man, and the true and only Son of God. And this is what gave its character and savor to all that He said and did, as did the frankincense to the Meat Offering. For the Holy Ghost's presence in Him is not as if it were needful to make up some deficiency, but that all the divine persons might have their share in the economy of redemption, as we are told, in Col. 1:19, that all the fullness of the Godhead *was pleased* to dwell in Him.<sup>48</sup> And, in accordance with this, we find that the display of His marvelous grace and greatness flow out from this "fullness" in manhood; whilst He is the image of the invisible God, and the glory of God shines in His face as the Christ (Col. 1:15; 2 Cor. 4:6). And as such He sits on the throne, and exercises judgment, "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of *Christ*" (2 Cor. 5:10). Again, "As I live, saith the Lord (Jehovah), every knee shall bow to Me, and every tongue shall confess to *God*. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Rom. 14:10-12). Thus, where He is presented as the anointed man, the "Christ," or the One who has died for us, He acts in judgment as Jehovah, and as God to whom all as His responsible creatures must give account. Hence, when He is born in Bethlehem, the Angel announces Him to the Shepherds, as "a Savior, which is *Christ the Lord*"; and when re-introduced into the world to come as "the Son," "the *First Begotten*," the Apostle, in bringing forward His personal glory, cites from the Psalms, "Let all the angels of God worship Him"; showing us, that when He receives *this* glory, even as the Son born in time, and recognized as the King and Anointed, He receives divine honor, publicly rendered by these most exalted of God's creatures (Heb. 1:6, 8).

Indeed, creative power, divine virtues, and infinite fullness of grace, are constantly connected with His title as "the Christ," or as "Christ Jesus," and sometimes (because of His intrinsic Deity in the unity of His Person) with His preexistence. "According to the eternal purpose which He

purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph. 3:11). And, again, "Which was given us in *Christ Jesus*, before the world began" (2 Tim. 1:9). This was evidently before the assumption of manhood. "They drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ" (1 Cor. 10:4). So also, "Let this mind be in you, which was also in *Christ Jesus*, who being in the form of God, &c" (Phil. 2:5, 6). The Apostle Paul glories in his infirmities, "that the power of *Christ* may rest (tabernacle) upon" him (2 Cor. 12:9). "Grace and truth," which are declared to be "the glory . . . of the Only Begotten of the Father," "came by *Jesus Christ*" (John 1:14-17); for God had come and was manifested in Him. From Him, as the Head, and as the *Christ*, "all the body . . . increaseth with the increase of *God*" (Col. 2:19, and Eph. 4:15-16). He dwells in the heart by faith, and, through Him, the soul is filled with ("into") "all the fullness of God" (Eph. 3:17-19).<sup>49</sup>

The Lord Jesus is seen, in His title as *the Son of Man*, in Rev. 1 with the divine attributes of the Ancient of Days (v. 14), and with the voice that marks the power of the Almighty God (Ezek. 43:2), "His voice as the sound of many waters": and as having reestablished the rights, and displayed the glory of God on the cross, as regards sin and its reflection upon that glory, He has His place now, as Son of Man, in the glory of God. "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. If God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him" (John 13:31, 32). Then again, as "Son of Man," He comes "with power and great glory," and "in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 24:30), -- always indicative of the supreme power of the Creator; and not only so, but "in His own glory, and in His *Father's*, and of the holy angels" (Luke 9:26). And sitting on a cloud, as "Son of Man," He executes the judgment, and reaps the harvest of the earth (Rev. 14:14).

Lastly, we have His designation as "The last Adam," or "the second man," for these titles are identified in 1 Cor. 15:45, 47, and it has been assumed by Mr. R., in his reasoning, that they do not include those divine attributes which, as we have seen, everywhere else, and under all titles, characterize Him. We are told in 1 Cor. 15:21, that "since by *man* came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead." We grant that here He is spoken of as raised by God,

48. This shows the gravity of Mr. R's error in limiting this to His manifestation in resurrection glory, and his statement that flesh and blood had not revealed to Peter the confession that he made in Matt. 16:16, applied to the condition of the Lord Himself whilst on earth. He says,

The "Living Stone" was Christ, as made known to Peter by the Father as the Son of the living God. Peter confesses Him thus, and the Lord says to him, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven"; which means, I judge, that *the flesh and blood condition even in Christ*, had not itself revealed it (*Lectures on the First Epistle of John*, p. 71).

49. The following extract from J. N. D., sent by a friend after the foregoing pages were written, has just come to hand:

But though Christ be made Lord and Christ, as man, yet through His oneness with the Father, and His being the true God, *it runs up into a divine title*, just as in the case with "Son." He is in the place of Son, as Man, or we could not be with Him. "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" {Luke 1:35}. But it cannot be separated from divine and eternal Sonship. As Man He becomes and enters into -- is, in so far as He is a Man, in -- the relationship with the Father, as divine and eternal Son. In all the works of God we find this cooperation of the Persons. The Son wrought: yet He could say "The Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works," and "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, the Kingdom of God is come unto you" (*Letters of J. N. Darby*, vol. 2, pp. 100-101).

Mr. Darby thus takes, evidently, the same view as has been substantiated above.

as the result of God's acceptance of and delight in that perfect and divine work in which He put away sin, rather than in the exercise of His power as the Son of God in His victory over death (John 2:19; Rom. 1:4); and that His kingdom is also viewed as conferred on Him by God. But there is more than enough to show in this chapter that the notion of any limitation of His power in this, as in other aspects of His Person, is only due to human imagination and unbelief; for He who is seen, in v. 28, to be "the Son," is, in vv. 21-26, as "man," the subjugator of all things in God's creation, and the destroyer of death, which takes place, at the close of all, by His calling the dead out of the graves (John 5:21-23, 28, 29). Mr. Raven's argument, that because we are like Christ, and to bear His image (the image of the Second Man, as we have of the first man), therefore divine attributes cannot be included in this title, or "it would be true also of us," -- is wholly without foundation. For, as "the last Adam," He is "a quickening spirit" (v. 45). Are we therefore "quickenings spirits"? And does not a "quickenings spirit" include divine power? And are we "out of heaven"? (v. 47). For, as Mr. Hunt justly remarks, John's testimony, twice repeated, disposes in a moment of this idea, stating that "He that cometh from heaven is *above all*" (John 3:31). So in John 1:14, the glory of Christ is seen as the only begotten of the Father, "full of grace and truth." And the apostle adds, "Of His fullness have all we received, and grace for grace" (v. 16). Does it therefore follow that we have this fullness as He has? or that we display the glory of the Son as the only begotten, because we are recipients of that which *He* possesses in divine power and infinitude? Or are we to deny this to be a part of His divine glory, because we are made partakers of His fullness? or, as the apostle Peter says, "of the divine nature"? (2 Peter 1:4).<sup>50</sup>

As to this point and the second man not being "characterized" by the "attributes of a divine Person," we may draw attention to the following:

Surely we shall reign with Him; but we shall receive neither the special glory, nor the attributes proper to the Son of man, for they belong to Jesus only.

(*Collected Writings* 28:476).

We see the same combination of glories, when, as man, or the seed of the woman, He bruises the serpent's head, and through death destroys him who had the power of death, delivering them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage (Heb. 2:14, 15). Having, as He Himself tells us, come upon the strong man, and by His strength ("a stronger than he") having "overcome him, He taketh from him all his armor wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils" (Luke 11:22). Though necessarily Man in accomplishing this, yet His divine power shines out at the same moment, as He tells us in the same passage, it is "with the finger of God" (v. 20) He casts out the devils; an expression always characteristic of Omnipotence. "This is the finger of God," said the magicians, when baffled in their

attempt to imitate creative power in one of its lowest forms (Ex. 8:19). And again, "Thy heavens, the work of *Thy fingers*" (Psa. 8:3).

Thirdly, as to the relations, positions, and offices between God and man, which He fills, we declare that they all, and in every aspect, imply and involve the whole glory of His Person.

As to this cardinal point Mr. Raven is most distinct. Referring to Psalm 16, he speaks of "my statement -- that 'Christ is viewed as man *distinct and apart from what He is as God*' -- in that, and other passages" (*A Correspondence*, p. 3).

And in another letter, in this correspondence, he says:

By a most *improper* use of the statement, "no man knoweth the Son but the Father," Christians are virtually stopped from seeking to enter into the import of any particular relation or position which Christ sustains -- for to do this they must of necessity look at such relation *abstractly*, i.e. in what it is in itself *apart from other thoughts* as to the *Person* who sustains it, because it is so revealed -- and is the only way in which man (*being finite*) could take it in. In many cases it would not be possible to bring *the thought of God as such* into the particular relation -- for how could it be said of God over all blessed for ever, that He had "a head," or was "perfected for ever," or "entered in," or is the "mediator between God and men," or "the first born among many brethren?" If any one dares to speak of these things *abstractly*, he is charged with dividing the unity of the Person of the Son. By such a notion all is shrouded in mystery, utterly and hopelessly obscured. Where the idea of *unity of a person is got from I know not*. It seems to me *perfect nonsense*. The idea of "person" does not bring in the thought of either parts or unity (*ibid.*, page 9).

It is most blessedly true that Scripture sometimes brings specially forward, and emphasizes, the reality of the humanity of Christ; for this is its beauty. But where do we find that "Christ is viewed as Man distinct, and apart from what He is as God?" Nor is it true, as Mr. Raven affirms, that Scripture in speaking of Him as 'firstborn among many brethren,' 'second man,' 'Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus,' 'Head of the Body,' 'High Priest,' &c., &c., and in presenting Him to us in these positions, speaks abstractly, i.e. limits itself to what is appropriate<sup>51</sup> to the particular position in hand, and *does not, in so speaking, cover all that is true of the Person who has entered on those positions* (p. 4).

On the contrary, Scripture always presents Him to us as

50. See chaps. 4 and 5 in "*The Glory of the Person of the Son of God*" where this subject is more fully treated.

51. This is partly true and partly false, and thus calculated to mislead the reader. It sounds very plausible to say that Scripture limits itself to what is appropriate to the particular position in hand, which is of course true, but in assuming, as Mr. R. here does without proof, that the whole glory of His Person as divine is *not appropriate* to these positions or relations, because He has become Man in order to undertake them, he takes for granted the point in question, which assumption is a snare and a delusion of the enemy. This moreover is what Mr. R. means, when he says that Scripture speaks *abstractly*. Inasmuch as the Lord necessarily fills these positions as Man, He would *abstract* what is otherwise true of His Person as divine.

a whole Christ, in the blessed unity of His Person, and *never* so limits itself, or speaks of Him as “man distinct and apart from what He is as God,” or without involving the divine in His Person. And it is profane to imply, as this sentence does, that this is not appropriated, and necessary, to *every* position in which He represents us as Man before God. The Scripture does indeed delight, in every way, to bring out the perfect suitability and adaptation of Christ for the positions or offices which He sustains, whether in reference to God or to ourselves. Sometimes, therefore, when His Mediation or Priesthood is in view, we are encouraged by the reality of His Manhood being brought into special prominence, -- His partaking of flesh and blood, and His experimental acquaintance with our circumstances, our sorrows, and our temptation. But this is never, as Mr. Raven affirms, “apart from other thoughts as to the Person who sustains it.” It is, on the contrary, accompanied and interwoven with thoughts and statements concerning His nearness to the Father as Son of God, and the acceptability of His Person, as such, in the exercise of this office. Besides this we have the sovereign grace and dignity with which He upholds the people of God in their weakness, and the glory of God involved in their maintenance to the end, both in their connection with God, and in their conflicts. “Seeing then that we have a *great* High Priest, that is passed *through*” (Greek) “*the heavens, Jesus the Son of God*, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:14, 15).

If we are invited to consider Him as the Apostle and High Priest of our Profession, offices to which He is called by God, and in which He represents us, standing as Man for men in the presence of God, we are reminded that, in this position, He is “counted worthy of more glory than Moses”; distinguished and honored as Moses was in an exceptional way (Num. 12:7). For He who, *as God and Creator*, “hath builded the house hath more honor than the house” He has built (Matt. 16:18); as well as having, beyond the place of a *servant*, the personal interest and rights of a “*Son* over His own house,” in what belongs to Himself (Heb. 3:1-6). So far is the word of God from looking at Him “distinct and apart from what He is as God,” in these relations.

Again, the apostle insists on the greatness of the Lord in Heb. 7, arguing this from the way in which Melchizedek is presented to us in Scripture, “without father, without mother, without *descent*, having neither *beginning of days*, nor *end of life*; but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a Priest continually.” Melchizedek’s fitness to represent the Son of God in the dignity of His Person, thus sets before us figuratively His power to save to the uttermost those who come unto God by Him, in all the exigencies of their spiritual conflict with powers of evil, both within and around them (vv. 3, 16, 25). It is this suitability which has led to His being called or saluted as High Priest, by God Himself, who finds delight or satisfaction in His personal qualifications for this office, as the word “salutes” (Heb. 5:10, Greek) indicates; as does the oath itself by which He is constituted High Priest,

as well as the terms in which it is expressed, “The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. . . . For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh *the Son*, who is consecrated for evermore” (Heb. 7:21, 28).

Christ is also the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the means of access or introduction to the Father (John 14:6). He is likewise the Shepherd, whose love and interest extend to every one of the sheep. But though these relations towards ourselves specially involve and express His nearness and tender approach to us, in His perfect humanity, as well as in His giving His life for the sheep, yet, as the Son, no man takes His life from Him. He knows His sheep divinely, as the Father knows Him and He knows the Father. He has other sheep, the Gentiles, whom *He* must bring. He calls them by name, He gives them infinite and eternal blessings, and no one can pluck them out of His hand, who alone could say, “I and My Father are one” (John 10). If He is the true Vine (John 15) in whom we are to abide, He is the source of nourishment to every branch; and it is only in dependence on His infinite fullness that we are blessed, for without Him we can do absolutely nothing. And when sending forth His disciples after His resurrection, whilst He speaks of Himself as Man, to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth, He adds, “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world” (Matt. 28:20). In like manner he tells us, “Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them” (Matt. 18:20). This blessed and constant ministration of strength, grace, or blessing, by the perpetuity of His divine presence, promised in these varied ways, teaches us that in every relation, position, or character fulfilled by Him towards us, we must bring the thought of what He is, as God, into the particular relation, -- which is exactly what Mr. Raven says we must *not* do. To “look at” “any particular relation or position which Christ sustains” “abstractly,” “is the only way,” he tells us, “in which man (*being finite*) can take it in.” But such reasoning is utterly destructive of all our blessing, and virtually reduces Christ to the measure of our finite minds. What finite man can comprehend how Christ can be thus present with each of His servants, or in the varied assemblies of His saints, or sustain, in grace, in every moment, each soul that looks to Him? The fact is, our confidence is invited, and based upon His capability and qualifications for maintaining the relation and positions assumed by Him towards us, precisely on the ground which Mr. Raven denies. Our profit and comfort would be all destroyed by the admission of such a sentiment into the mind as Mr. Raven suggests. For how could Christ act as Mediator, or High Priest, or Shepherd, without the divine knowledge of each case? This is the very point on which our blessed Lord expressly insists with His disciples when announcing His approaching departure and absence from them on high. “Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe *in God*, believe also *in Me*” (John 14:1). For His care and presence and power, being divine, would be ever used towards them in the same way, and like the unseen power of God, could be apprehended by faith alone. Moreover we need to be assured

that, as our Mediator, He can sustain the dignity of the character of God and His holiness, and assure us of our relations with God being maintained; whilst, at the same time, He comes so near to us, and wins the confidence of our hearts, in having become Man; expressing all His tender compassion for us in our far-off condition. But to do this effectually he must know all the secrets of our hearts, and all our peculiar trials and temptations, as God alone can, so that *all His divine attributes are necessarily involved in the exercise of each of these offices*. There is “one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ *Jesus*,” i.e., “Jehovah the Savior” (1 Tim. 2:5). All this is as unfathomable as His divine Person, though it is the delight of faith to count upon it, and realize it as infallibly true. Mr. R.’s reasoning insists upon attempting to measure what is infinite, and in order to do so, he must reduce the whole to the level of our finite minds.

The assumption of human nature in its weakest and lowest stage by our blessed Lord, His subordination in all things to the Father, and perfect absolute dependence in that condition, has always been used by human reason and unbelief as the occasion for the depreciation of His Person and His glory. And so it has been in this controversy. But the word of God, on the contrary, makes this very humiliation of Himself, so unsparing on His part, the occasion for bringing out more fully His glory, insisting on His investiture, as Man, with special positions and dignities, which should bring us closer to Him and render us more dependent on Him, and beholden to Him, endearing Him the more to our hearts, and making Him thus the object of more honor from man, and even from all intelligent beings in the universe. For it is the Father’s counsel that He should be honored, in that nature in which He has been slighted and despised. Hence Scripture delights to dwell upon what He does as man, and to show the victories or triumphs He has gained in that nature. For now He has, as has been justly stated, acquired, as well as inherited honors. Satan has been overcome by Him, the power of death and the grave destroyed, sin put away, the judgment of God endured, and all this could only suitably be done by Him as man, because it was for man, and as representing man, that all the powers of evil, under which man had fallen, were to be overthrown; whilst the glory of God was to be thus reestablished before the universe (Hebrews 2:9,10,14-16). Hence these same glorious works are sometimes ascribed to Him in His manhood, and at other times ascribed to the exercise of His power as the Son of God.

From all this we may learn, when His manhood is specially brought into relief, not to conclude (from false assumptions of the human mind untaught by the Spirit of God), that when He is spoken of as the “Mediator between God and men, the man Christ *Jesus*,” as “Head of the Body,” as the “Second Man,” that divine attributes are not included as the power by which He acts in or sustains these relations, but that in all the properties or powers which distinguish Him as God and Man, in the unity of His blessed Person, there is a gracious adaptation and special competency, in a double way, for the exercise of these functions, such as is expressed

in the words, “I have laid help upon One that is *mighty*, I have exalted One *chosen out of the people*” (Psa. 89:19). As chosen out of the people, He has the sympathy that links Him with the people of God, in the knowledge of their trials and exercises, and to what the weakness of flesh and blood (unlike the nature of angels) exposes them to, whilst the might that exists in His Person shows His fitness, in another way, to render all the help that we need to be ministered to us, and which He has undertaken to supply. For He does not indeed take hold of angels (*i.e.* by the hand to assist), but of the seed of Abraham He takes hold. In all this we trace not only the perfect grace of God which has considered so perfectly all our need, but we have also God’s own satisfaction in, and appreciation of, the One who is the divinely chosen instrument of our blessing. For Christ’s investment with the highest functions and offices connected with redemption, far from implying weakness or inferiority, is naturally founded, by God’s purpose, on the original ground of suitability, in His capacity and qualifications for what He has undertaken.

A striking illustration of this statement, and one of great importance in the present controversy, is given us in John 5, where Christ is brought before us, both as Son of God and Son of Man. There we learn that all the works expressive of divine prerogative and power are done by the Son in Manhood, equally with the Father. He quickens souls to Eternal Life, giving life, as the Son, to whom *He will*. He raises all mankind, as to their bodies, out of the dust of death by His life-giving voice. And, lastly, He alone judges, and thus disposes, sovereignly, of the eternal destiny of the creature -- “That all . . . should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father” (v. 23). At the same time He does this specially as Man. He “hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man” (v. 27. cp. Acts 10:42, 17:31). There is indeed exquisite adaptation, even in His manhood, for this office, not only because He has been degraded and set at nought, as Man, by man whom He came to save, but also, because there is suitability, in the estimation of the divine wisdom, that the Judge of Mankind should be Himself One who has been manifested and proved, in the midst of human circumstances and temptations -- where the creature has failed; and who, as pure and perfect man, has made experimental acquaintance with all that exercises the human heart. At the same time delegation and commission of these varied powers of quickening, saving, or judging, could alone be entrusted to, or be undertaken or executed by, One who was equal with the Father, who could act with Him in all He does, who is perfectly acquainted with His mind and will (v. 30), and who knows all the secrets of men’s hearts, and reads their whole life and history at a glance. (Cp. Rom. 2:16; 1 Cor. 4:5). Everywhere, when exercising judgment even on the living -- as we see Him, either walking as the Son of man amidst the seven golden candlesticks, or coming with many crowns upon His head (Rev. 1:19), He is represented as having eyes as a flame of fire, which penetrate into everything, and with a two-edged sword going out of His mouth, and He declares that “All the churches *shall know* that I am He which searcheth the reins and hearts” (Rev. 2:23). Power which is expressly stated to

belong to God alone (Jer. 17:10; 1 Chron. 28:9), for, as has been said by another, "The exercise of judicial authority in determining the final condition of mankind is a work which could no more be delegated to an inferior intelligence than could the government of the universe. It requires the highest attributes of Deity for its performance." Hence also, when spoken of in Eph. 4, as man, who "gave gifts unto men" (v. 8), He is also the One "that ascended up far *above all heavens*, that He might fill all things" (v. 10). And again, "He is *before all things*, and by Him *all things consist*. 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 preeminence. For all the fullness was pleased to dwell in Him" <sup>52</sup> (Col. 1:17-19, Greek.) Thus, Scripture, instead of looking at these relations as "distinct and apart from other thoughts as to the Person who sustains them," in every such relation introduces the thought of the Glory of the Person, for our eternal consolation, as well as in view of His proper and peculiar exaltation. Indeed, this is just the difference between Christ and all other beings, however honored, whether angelic or human.

Fourthly, as to the work of expiation which He has accomplished -- we affirm that the thought as well as the reality of what He was as God, in accomplishing it, must always and of necessity be brought into it.

The idea of what Christ was divinely, as God, or as the Son of God, is essential to this blessed work, both as to fact and as to our apprehension of it. Whether He is viewed as sustaining the judgment of God, or as giving infinite value to the sacrifice which He offered, or as displaying the love which was the source of, and in which He accomplished, -- the whole, the full glory of His Person, is the foundation of all.

No instructed Christian thinks of saying that God died, but we can say, because of the unity of His Person, that He who was God died, and all the love manifested in this blessed work, as well as the value of it, is taken out of it or lost, if this is denied. Mr. Raven, however, attempts to separate between the human and divine in contemplating the death of our Lord, but solely on the ground of his own reason, as we have seen in other places, nor hesitating to tread on such holy ground. He says:

But further, besides presenting God to man in His pathway here, Christ presented man in perfectness before God, and this is the view in Psalm 16; and further, as Son of Man, the woman's seed, He bore the judgment of death that rested on man -- *by man* came the resurrection of the dead. How can you import *the thought of God*, as such, into all this, in any *subjective sense*? though all was effected, and could only be effected, in one who is in Person divine. It is really *irreverent and profane*. The truth is, that the moment those who have left us commit themselves to anything, they betray only painful inability to grasp divine

thoughts. . . .

Mr. Hunt fails to carry on his thoughts as to Christ to death and resurrection, and it is *intelligible*, for how are you to bring in the thought of God in any subjective sense there, though nothing could alter the truth of the Son's Person?

(*A Correspondence*, pages 4 and 11).

We will here again quote what Mr. Turpin has brought forward (*in extracts from Mr. Darby's writings*) in order to guard from the danger of such pernicious reasonings.

Who could say but, *there, "God is known in death"*? Is it not there God's love is known, never known really till known there? Yet it is weakness, and as to His place as man, the very end of man. But in Himself *God is known in love by His being down here* with sinful men -- by that love reaching even to us. . . . But what an emptying that was, when *He who was God could come into death -- though suffering, though obeying, bring all that God was in His moral perfection* into death.

(See *Helps*, &c., No. 35, pp. 299-301).

Having quoted these extracts, we will bring forward, in support of what we affirm, first of all the perception of faith, and the testimony, of the Roman centurion, who, as recorded by the inspired writers, being on guard, witnessed the sufferings of the Divine and Precious Savior on the Cross. Converted on the spot, by the powerful effect of beholding Him throughout this solemn scene, we learn from his own lips, that he saw in the marvelous death of our Lord, not only the suffering of one who was perfection itself in manhood, because He was divine, but also the exhibition of a divine power, and of characteristics which elicited from the centurion, in a double way, the same declaration that He was "the Son of God." "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. And the vail of the temple was rent in twain, from the top to the bottom. And when the centurion, which stood over against Him, saw that *He so cried out, and gave up the ghost*, he said, Truly *this Man was the Son of God*" (Mark 15: 37-39). In Matthew we are told that the accompanying divine witness to the glory of His Person in the earthquake, the rending of the rocks, and the opening of the graves, as well as the whole scene, produced the same effect upon him, *and also upon his companions*. "Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, *they feared greatly*, saying, 'Truly this was the Son of God'" (Matt. 27: 54). Whilst the evangelist Luke, who loves to bring before us the true and perfect humanity of our Lord, tells us, "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, He said, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit': and having said thus, He gave up the ghost. Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a *righteous man*" (Luke 23:46, 47). A striking testimony, when taken together with the accounts of the other evangelists, of that perfect union of the human and divine, which leads to the blessing of the centurion, *the divine being brought into it, in the full subjective sense* which Mr. R. denies.

In 1 Corinthians 1 the apostle says that "the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is *the power of God*. . . . But we preach Christ

52. Compare Mr. R.'s statement, detaching what is true of Christ's Person from His position as Head of the body, with the way in which both His divine Power and His "fullness" are associated here with His headship. (*A Correspondence*, page 4, line 4, etc.)

crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ *the power of God*, and the wisdom of God" (vv. 18, 23, 24). Here we have the cross as the expression of weakness, but Christ, even in that solemn moment, was to faith the display of the power and wisdom of God. "Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men" (v. 25); for the preaching of the cross "is the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16), though His apparent powerlessness to save Himself was the occasion of the scorn and mockery of His foes, for the strength of God was there, even in that lowly, humble, and despised form, or we had never known sin put away in the cross, and God glorified in all His holy being and divine nature -- this being done by man, and in the nature of man, or we could have had no interest in it. Who but one who was divine could restore or sustain the infinite glory of God, harmonizing all His attributes, and causing that glory, compromised by man, to shine out before the universe, displayed as it never was before, and never can be again? "Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is glorified in Him. If God be glorified in Him, God shall also glorify Him in Himself, and shall straightway glorify Him" (John 13:31, 32). "I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do" (John 17:4). And here He is speaking as the Son. Take away the thought of the divine Person, the Son of God, who did it -- not only could He not have stood in such a place, but it becomes a mere human act, and all that glory which has accrued to God, and which will soon be recognized, as the means of the reconciliation, and the foundation of the new heavens and the new earth (Col. 1:15, 16, 20), vanishes in a moment.

But the Lord Himself unites these thoughts, which this teaching would separate, and tells us the reality of what takes place on the cross in John 3. He first speaks of the divine necessity of His death, in the aspect of His Person as the *Son of Man* and our representative on the cross, to satisfy the claims of infinite justice; "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the *Son of Man* be lifted up": and then He adds the blessed thought of the gift of God's love in the same act, and of the divine value or worth of His own blessed Person, "For God so loved the world, that He gave His *only begotten Son*, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (vv. 14-16).

In the 1st Epistle of John also we constantly find the Person of the Lord introduced in this connection. After speaking of God in sending "His *only begotten Son* into the world, that we might live through Him," the Apostle adds, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His *Son* to be the *propitiation* for our *sins*" (1 John 4:9, 10). Here it is expressly the Son of God bearing the judgment due to sin, as a propitiatory sacrifice for it, the Spirit of God insisting on this as a display of love, because of the infinite worth and dignity of the Person who so bore it. This corresponds with the statement in chap. 1, "The blood of Jesus Christ His *Son* cleanseth us from all sin."

So the Apostle Paul, contrasting the weakness of the law,

and the hopeless ruin of man through sin, magnifies the powerful effect of the death of the *Son of God*, by which God intervened in love on our behalf; and sin, even in its very principle or root, was condemned to the very uttermost. "For 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" (Rom. 8:3). Here it is in the likeness of sinful flesh, yet as the Son of God, and in His death for sin (that is, by a sacrifice for sin, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*) that this is done (cp. Rom. 1:3 and 5:10), and this also is the bearing of sin in judgment. The sense of what sin is, with the love that dealt with it, is only thus brought out, in all these passages, in connection with the value of the Person of the Son of God, who took the sin upon Himself. Again in the same chapter we have, "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" (Rom. 8:32).

In John 6 Christ is spoken of again and again as the living bread which *came down from heaven*, involving at once His divine nature as Son come down from heaven, though manifested in manhood, and given by the Father for our sustenance, whilst, as such, He gives life unto the world, and satisfies all the boundless necessities of souls, so that those who eat thereof live for ever (vv. 32, 33, 35, 40, 50). But whilst saying, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven," He adds "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (v. 51). For by the value of His Person, as the source of life from heaven, He overcomes death, and gives what is of infinite effect, not only to give life "*unto the world*," but "*for the life of the world*" (vv. 33, 51). So the Apostle Paul says, "I live by the faith of the *Son of God*, who loved me, and gave Himself for me" (Gal. 2:20). In Heb. 10 we find all the sacrifices offered in past ages under the law (superseded because of their inefficacy) giving place to the one perfect and efficacious sacrifice of Christ, which puts away sin for ever. But how is this accomplished? He who undertakes to do the will of God according to the eternal counsels, says, as God, in the holy and solemn act of offering up Himself, "Lo, I come to do Thy will, . . . a body hast Thou prepared me" (vv. 5, 9). According to this voluntary purpose, He assumes human nature, in order to offer up this body on the cross, -- in all the value which the Person so coming, the counsels He fulfilled, and the motives actuating Him in so accomplishing the will and the glory of God, could lend to this act. "For by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). In a similar way His divine person, as the Son, is brought in, in chap. 1, in connection with His work, "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" (Heb. 1:3). For alone, and by His own power, He who upholds all things accomplished this still more wondrous work of purging sins, in the presence of the majesty of God; all of whose nature and being were expressed to the uttermost against sin, at that solemn moment when He bore it, who was made sin for us. Thus constantly is the thought of what He is as God brought,

by divine teaching, into this blessed work.

This power displayed even in His death, which so struck upon the mind of the centurion, is still more to be observed in the gospel of John, where, in ch. 10, it is coupled with the power to reassume, even when in death and the grave, the life He voluntarily laid down for the glory of God. In John 2:19, He said to the Jews, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," speaking of the temple of His body, but in this passage (John 10), He goes further, alluding to the cross; for in that solemn moment of weakness and apparent helplessness of manhood He was free to dispose of His own life. He says, speaking as the Son of God, "No one [οὐδεὶς] taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again"; for His power was as infinite on the cross, as in the sepulchre. His exemption from our subordination to death (since He had title over His own life), with His unfailing obedience to His Father's will, even in death, to establish the rights and glory of His Father, was what constituted its value in His Father's eyes, and was the occasion of special love on the part of the Father towards Him. "Therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, *that I might take it again*" (vv. 18, 17). This act could not have had the same worth were it not as really His own, as when He said, when coming into the world, "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God," "a body hast Thou prepared Me" (Heb. 10: 9, and 5). For though fulfilling the counsels He had undertaken to accomplish, death was not the unavoidable necessity that it is in our case. Hence we read in chapter 19, "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, . . . said, It is finished, and He bowed His head, and gave up the ghost" (vv. 28, 30); putting His seal to the value and perfection of the work, with these blessed words, "It is finished." For in His cross, with His heel upon the head of the serpent, He spoiled principalities and powers. Death was conquered and Satan's prey delivered. Thus when His death is alluded to in this gospel, it is spoken of rather as departing out of this world to the Father, or as finishing the work the Father had given Him to do, or as His being lifted up --as offering His life according to all the devoted purpose of His heart, so glorifying God and bringing a sweet savor to Him out of death.<sup>53</sup>

Even in the other gospels, where He is more seen as Man, yet as God manifest in flesh, rather than as the Son of the Father, we find the perfection of love and obedience in divine power which characterized Him on to the end, and sustained Him through all, even though the sufferings were infinite, and though He felt them all as none but a divine Person could. Yet He never yields or gives way as we do; He takes the cup in unswerving obedience to His Father's

will, and from His hand alone, -- and even justifies Him, and cleaves to Him, when forsaken in the darkness of judgment, in the words. "*My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me? why art Thou so far from Me, and from the words of My roaring?*", adding, "But Thou art holy, O Thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel" (Psa. 22:1, 3). We know from Isa. 50 that He set His face like a flint to accomplish His Father's will. And whilst "they were in the way going up to Jerusalem, . . . Jesus went before" His disciples, -- who "were amazed, and as they followed, they were afraid" (Mark 10:32). In Luke 9 we have "He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem" (v. 51), whilst the dignity of His Person is expressed in the way in which, in the Greek, His death is spoken of, on the mount of Transfiguration, as His *exodus* from this scene (see v. 31). This is further marked in the statement of the evangelist, "when the time was come that He should be *received up*" (v. 51). For He was, in His person, the true ark of God before whom the waters of death and judgment were dried up for us; as of old, when the priests' feet, bearing the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth, touched the Jordan when overflowing its banks, a way was made for the people of God to pass over on dry ground; He Himself alone could encounter the judgment of God and the power of the enemy, and exhaust for us the cup of wrath, as He says to Peter, "Whither I go, thou canst not follow Me now; but thou shalt follow Me afterwards" (John 13:36).

It is evident from the passages we have referred to, that the Holy Ghost sometimes brings into distinct relief the divine power and glory exhibited in the Person of Christ, and sometimes the weakness and dependence of suffering humanity, and this even in the same acts and scenes; and it is not for us to attempt to reconcile these various aspects, because the mystery of His Person and work alike forbid it. Nevertheless, in the latter case, this is always accompanied with expressions of confidence, or fidelity, or obedience, which, in their full perfection, are only possible in one in whom the divine nature was the source of thought and feeling, as well as of power, as Mr. Darby says,

The spring of divine life in the midst of evil, so that His every thought as man was perfection before God, and perfect in that position. This was what marked His state, as being down here, this new thing (*Collected Writings*, vol. 15, p. 231, note).

We have observed this perfection in His language in Psa. 22, where He says, "I am a worm and no man," and "I am poured out like water"; yet He never fails in His confidence and recognition of what was due to God in the place where He was, as the sinless one made sin for us, or the sin-offering burnt without the camp. It is on this account that, in one of the sacrifices for sin, the fat of the sin-offering, burnt like that of the peace-offerings, went up "for a sweet savor unto the Lord" (Lev. 4:31). For even when made sin for us and for the glory of God, there was in Him and in the motives and devotedness expressed in thus offering Himself, what was infinitely acceptable to God and precious in His sight. A perfect picture of human weakness, expressly contrasted with divine strength, and yet in the same blessed Person, is given us in Psa. 102. There the sufferings of the Lord on the cross

53. "As to death: if it be meant He was capable of dying, the fact is evident -- He died, and that death was pressed upon His soul even before; if, that he was under the *necessity* of death in respect of His relationship to God, then it is false. And you cannot, in His Person, separate the sustaining power of Godhead, nor having life in Himself, so as to make a necessity without His will in grace. He laid it down of Himself. The Lord's own words seem purposefully intended to set aside such a doctrine" (J. N. D., *Collected Writings*, vol. 15, p. 234).

are brought before us. From the lips of the Lord Himself we hear the words, "My days are as a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass . . . I watch, and am as a sparrow alone upon the housetop . . . He weakened my strength in the way; He shortened my days. I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days" (vv. 11, 7, 23). But this complaint of utter weakness and desertion is answered by God addressing the Son, "Of old hast *Thou* laid the foundations of the earth; and the heavens are the work of *Thy hands*. *They* shall perish, but *Thou* shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end" (vv. 25-27). Thus the Holy Ghost tells us, in Heb. 1:10-12, these words are to be applied, contrasting His eternal existence and creative power, with His human weakness and shortened days; but both are true at one and the same moment, and of the same Person.

From this we learn the folly and sin of attempting to submit to our finite minds what is infinite; and that it is our wisdom to receive truth on so solemn a subject with reverence, as Scripture presents it, without seeking to dive into the unfathomable depths of strength or weakness in the cross, which are only recorded for faith to apprehend, and as subjects of adoration and praise.

There are some passages where the specially human sufferings of Christ are most tenderly and touchingly depicted, as in Isa. 53, where He is presented as the Man of Sorrows; yet invariably do we find that the Spirit of God, who indited them, introduces at the same time His Person, as that which gives its character to these sufferings, and makes Him the object of the affections of His people. He is the *Arm* or strength of Jehovah, and as such the subject of revelation: "To whom is the Arm of the Lord *revealed*?" (v. 1). And He alone, as such, can bear the griefs, and carry the sorrows of His people, (vv. 1-4). So in Heb. 12, where, as Man, He is looked at as the Author and Finisher of Faith, He also is the One exalted on the throne of God, who alone, amidst a multitude of others, is the *Object* of Faith, and who endured the contradiction of *sinner*s against *Himself*; language which could only be used of One who is divine (vv. 2, 3).

But the passage we have quoted, and also Psal. 16, have been brought forward to prove that Christ is viewed as Man *apart from what He is as God*. We therefore give the following extract:

The state described in this Psalm is that of man considered apart from God (I do not mean of course morally separated, *nor touch upon the union of the divine and human nature in Christ*); but it is man partaker of the divine nature, for so only it could be, but having God for his object, his confidence, as alone having authority over him, entirely dependent on God, and perfect in faith in Him. This could only be in one *personally partaker of the divine nature, God Himself in man, as Christ was*, or derivatively as in one born of God; but, as we have seen, Christ is not here viewed in this aspect, nor the believer as united to Him. The divine presence in Him is viewed, not in the manifestation of God in Him, but in its effect in His absolute perfection as man. He is walking as man morally in view of God.

(J. N. Darby, *Practical Reflections on the Psalms*, "Psalm 16," p. 26).

Thus, from first to last, as the Babe in the manger, born of the virgin, as the Victim on the cross, in His life here below, and in His relations or positions above, the Holy Ghost keeps Him before us, in the unity of His Person, and never for one moment presents Him to us "abstractly," or "distinct and apart from what He is as God."

This quotation may well serve as a warning of the way in which Mr. Darby is wrongly made to appear as a supporter of these doctrines. Not only is the passage misquoted by Mr. Raven, but Mr. Darby carefully guards what he says from the interpretation put upon it by Mr. R. and other writers of the same school. Similarly, the statement of the author, speaking of the use of eternal life as "a *general term*," and distinguishing its application to Christ, personally, by the use of the article, as "*the Life*," or "that Eternal Life," or in other similar ways,"<sup>54</sup> is quoted by a writer of this school as being a surrender of the truth which has been contended for, and the words which immediately precede and follow, *applying the term* "to Christ personally," are *left out by him*, as if in order to give an appearance of truth to the said writer's statement. Godly souls are still pained and distressed by similar utterances amongst Mr. Raven's followers, which appear in various places, showing that the leaven is gradually, though surely, working in their midst, verifying the emphatic testimony of Scripture, that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Who can remain in contact with such teaching, and not suffer from it, even though it works imperceptibly in the soul? "The fear of the Lord is to depart from evil": and in all the errors, whether doctrinal or ecclesiastical, of far less magnitude, that have come in amongst Brethren, this has invariably been insisted upon, and the course pursued in obedience to the word of God, "Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity" {2 Tim. 2}. To dishonor the person of the Lord Himself, and then to plead the claim of unity, would keep one in Romanism, or in association with any other evil system. And all who have taken this course, though at first refusing and repudiating Mr. R.'s doctrine, have become more or less contaminated by it, and many have become defenders of it; for the tone of the soul becomes insensibly lowered, or indifferent to the evil with which it is linked, and there is a direct power of the enemy which blinds the eyes of those who tamper with it, so that the only safeguard is to break with it entirely, and to refuse to listen to the insinuations and arguments of its defenders.

Think of what all this comes to, when "to import the thought of God, as such, in any subjective sense" into Christ's bearing the "judgment of death that rested on man" (which Scripture teaches, and which is believed by all Christians), is denounced by Mr. R., as "really irreverent and profane" (*A Correspondence*, &c., p. 4). We have seen his denial of the unity of the Person of Christ, brought out in various ways,

54. See *The Glory of the Person of the Son of God*, p. 54 [p. 118, herein].



and applied so as to undermine the leading truths of Christianity; but the length to which it is here carried is indeed frightful. That which is so precious to the soul, and on which really hangs its safety for eternity, is to Mr. R. "irreverent and profane." Do Christians comprehend what this means? It is this; that so completely does he divide the natures in the Holy Person of Christ, that *to look upon them as absolutely united and inseparable in that Person, and hence in His death, and in the work of expiation, is profanity.* Of course to speak of Godhead as being united to humanity, in any other person and work, would be profane and irreverent, because it would degrade the Godhead; but such language applied to the Holy One of God, of whom the angel, in virtue of His miraculous conception, says to the virgin, "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called 'The Son of God'" (Luke 1:35), ought to make Christians shudder. We may be thankful for Mr. R's testimony that there are some who "betray only painful inability to grasp" what *he* calls "divine thoughts."

We add a further warning from Mr. Darby:

And though God of course could not die -- no more even could a human soul -- yet there was no separation of the natures<sup>55</sup> . . . Of course, if I think of the Son as a divine Person, He could not die -- no more, I repeat, could a human soul in fact. . . . If Christ was only as a man there, it was no more than another man there, only sinless -- that is, it was nothing. The Son as a divine Person of course could not die looked at apart; but He who was Son died and gave Himself, *not as apart*, but in all the infinite value of His Person and in His divine love to us. I do not say Mary was the mother of God, if I may compare them, but she was the mother of Him personally who was God, and if He was not, His birth was nothing. A person may object to saying the Son died, because he is looking at Him apart as a divine Person; but if it be denied that He being Son died, I have lost the value of His death, which is infinite, both in love and value.

(*Letters of J. N. Darby* 2:224).

The following remarks of a well-known brother, now with the Lord, whose writings have been much blessed, are added as appropriate on the subject:

The ark and the camp were, in some sense, necessary to each other during the journey through the wilderness. The ark, seated in the tabernacle on which the cloud rested, had to guide the camp, and the camp, in its order, had to accompany and guard the ark and all connected with it. . . . Their (mere) journeying through that desert would not have constituted divine pilgrimage. Many a one had traveled that road without being a stranger and pilgrim with God. In order to be such, *the ark* must be in their company.

The mind of the camp, of which I have spoken, might betray its weakness, or forget itself, and this might lead, as we know it did, to chastening again and again. But if its business, of which I have also spoken, were given up, there would be loss of everything. . . . And thus it is with ourselves. We are to maintain those truths or mysteries which the tabernacle and its

furniture represented; and the apostle commits our entrance into Canaan to that. "If ye continue in the faith"; and again, "if ye keep in memory what I have written unto you." Our safety, our rest in the heavenly Canaan, depends on our keeping the truth. This, however, is to be added, that not merely for our own safety's sake, but for Christ's honor, is the truth to be kept.

This is to be much considered. Supposing for a moment that our own safety were not concerned in it, Christ's honor is, and that is enough. Such a thing is contemplated in 2 John 10; the elect lady was inside the house, she was in personal safety, but she has a duty to perform to "the doctrine of Christ"; so that if one come to her door, and bring not that doctrine, she must keep him outside, and refuse to have him where she is. . . .

Mere journeying from Egypt to Canaan will not do. Let the journey be attended with all the trial of such an arid, unsheltered, and trackless road, still it is not divine pilgrimage. A mere toilsome, self-denying life, even though endured with that moral courage which becomes pilgrims will not do. There must be the carriage of the ark of God, confession to the truth, and maintenance of the name, of Jesus. . . .

In the thoughts of this epistle, *Jesus Christ* is always this *divine One*, so to speak, *the eternal Life* manifested. With St. John "Jesus Christ" is "the true God," Jesus is the "He" and "Him" in the argument of his first Epistle; and this "He" and "Him" ever keeps before us One who is God, though in *assumed relations* and *covenant dealings*. . . .

This, I judge, is the mind and import of the required confession that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." I here speak of God under the name of Jesus Christ, and it is, therefore, the demand of a confession to the great mystery of "God . . . manifested in the flesh."

The very adjunct (as another has written to me) "come in the flesh," throws strongly forward the deity of Christ; because if He were a man, or anything short of what He is, it would be no such wonder that He should "come in the flesh." And 1 John 1:2, 3 guide us to John's thoughts in the use of the name "Jesus Christ." "That which was from the beginning," *the "eternal Life* which was *with the Father*," was *the Person* he declared to them. The words "with the Father" are important, making it evident that the Son was the eternal One, the name of this eternal Son being Jesus Christ. And it is interesting to compare the close with the commencement of this epistle. "This is the true God and *the*" [with the article] "eternal life." (From "Brief Expositions by J. G. Bellett," printed by Mr. Reid, of Edinburgh, in *Bible Witness and Review* 2:275-279).

Leprosy is spoken of in Lev. 14 as that which God Himself might put in a house as a test, bearing, as in the case of the individual, a figurative character: "When ye be come into the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession, and I put the plague of leprosy *in a house of the land of your possessions*" (Lev. 14:34). The house, like the assembly now, is identified with the position of Israel in the land, and with the responsibility to maintain holiness to the Lord in the heavenly place in which He has set it. The suspicion of leprosy called for priestly judgment, and the stones, apparently affected, were to be carefully taken out and

55. {See Note 1 and Note 2 at the end, concerning F. E. Raven's Apollinarianism and how this dissolves the incarnation.}

replaced by others, and the whole house to be carefully scraped and plastered throughout. Has there been anything corresponding to this?

If the plague broke out again, what was the required prescription? Not only all who entered the house, whilst it was shut up under priestly examination, were defiled, but there was no other remedy to prevent the disease spreading, but the entire leveling the house to the ground, and casting the *debris* out of the city, into an unclean place.

We may add that we are not charging Mr. Raven with what he disavows; but it is clear that his whole teaching does divide the *natures* in the Person of Christ. Probably he is not aware of what he is doing, and still less of the injurious consequences of his speculations, as he appears to follow his own reasonings in ignorance of much that has been written and has passed on this subject in the Church of God at large.

In conclusion, we subjoin the following reflections as meeting some of the deceptive arguments of the present day:

One of the most alarming symptoms in the religious world at the present day is the idea, that there is power in the truth to preserve. There is no power in the truth to preserve; but the question is, whether the soul holds fast the truth. Unless my thoughts, my heart, are in the truth, there will be no power in the truth to me. It is very certain that God will keep His truth; but is my heart kept? If not, it is the mere confidence of man's mind; for "greater is He that is in you than He that is in the world"; the only ground of victory is the power of the *Spirit of God*, in the affections and consciences of the saints, and then the heart will be set on Christ, and the things of Christ, to love Him, enjoy Him, and serve Him better. The conflict and difficulty are rather when the truth is brought in question, than when it first goes forth in power.

It is false religion that suits the world better than truth, because it suits itself to man, and the mass will ever follow error, so Paul had to say, "All in Asia are turned away from me." The Apostle did not expect that truth would have power over the world, but plainly declared that error would. So we see when the Lord allows the sifting of a large body of people on a point of truth, the greater number will adopt the error. . . .

What we have all to seek is, to be occupied with the truth every day, knowing more of delighting and feeding on Christ as *the true God*, and as *the perfect Man* subject in all things to His Father; and all this not so as to be able to write an essay on it, but as the Christ in whom I know God and man, the One who lived by the Father, depending on the Father. Then everything that is not of Him strikes upon my soul. It is THAT Christ who is *touched*, and it affects the whole harmony of the soul. Be sure of this, if it is not the living power of a living Christ known and enjoyed in the soul, you cannot withstand error. It must be truth held *in connection with the Person of Christ*, or it will not guard you against error; the mere truth is no match for Satan. I would not venture to meet Satan on the truth if I were not called to do it to warn the saints, and for the glory of God, because I should be afraid; but I know God will keep me when in His service. But I do not therefore cast myself down from off the pinnacle of the temple, because it is written in the Word. "He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways."

(From J. N. Darby, *Nine Lectures on the First Epistle of John*).

It is our earnest prayer that these weighty words as to the power of the truth, and the importance of its being held in the soul in connection with the Person of Christ, may have their due effect upon the hearts of many. It is time surely to awake out of that lethargic sleep in which Satan seeks to lull so many now, recalling the state of the Jews, shortly before the Chaldaean invasion, whose false prophets cried "Peace, peace," when there was no peace, and the people loved to have it so.

## Appendix

### Containing Further Important Quotations from Mr. Raven and Others

In Mr. Hunt's first letter we have the quotations from Mr. Raven's writings touching the Person of Christ, as well as Mr. Hunt's ground for his objections to them, firmly, yet temperately expressed, as follows: --

Mr. Raven himself has written as follows: -- "What has characterized the second man could not include all that was true of a Divine Person." . . . Mr. Raven has repeated this assertion in a stronger form in the same well-known letter, expressing his surprise that any one could think "that the second man covers all that is true of the Son," and in a later letter (May, 1892, apparently) to Miss B---, he writes; "I need scarcely to refer you to the many passages in the Word in which Christ is viewed as man and apart from what He is as God." . . . But the serious fact, which arrested me three years ago, still confronts me -- more clearly established by later evidence -- that without denying that Christ is God, and that Christ is man, Mr. Raven and, as I must conclude, the brethren who support him, have been tempted to look on this awful truth as admitting, at least, of distinction. The effect of this process, unavoidably, is to place certain words and acts of the Lord under one or other heading, and to take away the weight of the Divine from what is held to be only human.

(*A Correspondence*, pages 2 and 1.)

It is impossible to misunderstand language so definite and distinct, pointing out how the foundation of all truth is imperilled by it. Mr. Raven, however, in his reply, takes no exception to Mr. Hunt's statement of his views, nor to the citations from his letters; but, on the contrary, insists on the correctness of his views, as so expressed, adding, as explanatory, the following statement:

As regards the main point of the letter, I affirm that *the Person of the Son is what He ever was and is eternally and unchangeably as divine* -- the Son in distinction from the Father and the Spirit. But the Son has *become* man, and as such (having died and risen) He has entered into relations, in regard to men, into which He could not have entered simply as a divine Person; such as "first born among many brethren" -- "second man" -- "mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus" -- "Head of the body" -- "High Priest," &c., &c., and Scripture in presenting Him to us in these

positions speaks abstractly, *i.e.*, limits itself to what is appropriate to the particular position in hand, and *does not in so speaking cover all that is true of the Person who has entered on those positions*. I cannot imagine any thoughtful person contesting this (page 3).

This, however, does *not* bring in the *human nature* of Christ, as having its distinct part and place *in the unity of His Person* after He became Man. Consequently it does not in any way afford an answer to Mr. Hunt's charge, if one may so call it, but rather the contrary; for if, when Incarnate, the human nature of Christ had and has its full part in the unity of the Person, "the thought of God" could not be excluded from what He is, and does as man. Neither could it be in any degree irreverent and profane to introduce the thought of God in a "subjective sense" into the value of the offering on the cross.

Further, although Mr. Raven says that, as to His offices as man, "all was effected and could only be effected in one who is *in Person divine*," yet, in his subsequent letter, he maintains, that if we admit "*such A NOTION*" as that of the unity of the Person of the Incarnate and Divine Son, "all," as to these offices, "is shrouded in mystery, utterly and hopelessly obscured" (*A Correspondence*, page 10).

Yet we find Mr. Darby, with whom Mr. Raven professes to be in full accord, expressing a very different thought, when he speaks of "The union of the Divine Person of the Son and of the humanity," and, in the same passage, of "His Person as Son of the Father and man" (*Collected Writings* 33:452), in these following words:

But we have something else to remark here. First, *the union of the Divine Person of the Son, and of the humanity* of the Savior. . . . The glory that He had, as loved of the Father, before the world existed . . . is the precious truth, which is like a thread uniting all the chapter; but here, that which is put more forward, is *His Person, as Son of the Father, and Man*, and the association of the disciples with Him."

(*Collected Writings* 30:452).

The following extracts from the well-known Dr. Owen, vice-Chancellor of Oxford, will show the views of orthodox Christians on this subject:

He (Satan) raised a vehement opposition against the hypostatical union, or the union of these two natures in one person. This he did in the Nestorian heresy, which greatly, and for a long time, pestered the church. The authors and promoters of this opinion granted the Lord Christ to have a divine nature, to be the Son of the living God. They also acknowledged the truth of his human nature, that he was truly a man, even as we are.

But the personal union between these two natures they denied. . . . That the Son of God assumed our nature into personal subsistence with Himself -- whereby [the?] whole Christ was one person, and all his mediatory acts were the acts of that one person, of him who was both God and man -- this they would not acknowledge. And this pernicious imagination, though it seem to make great concessions of truth, doth no less effectually evert the foundation of the church than the former. For, if the divine and human nature of Christ do not constitute one individual person, all that he did for us was only as a man -- which would have been altogether insufficient for the salvation of the church,

nor had God redeemed it with his own blood.

. . . Who shall undertake to declare what are the chief instances of this incomprehensible effect of divine wisdom? "What is his name, and what is his son's name, if thou canst tell?" (Prov. 30:4. See Isa. 9:6). It is enough for us to stand in a holy admiration, at the shore of this unsearchable ocean, and to gather up some parcels of that divine treasure wherewith the Scripture of truth is enriched. I make no pretense of searching into the bottom or depths of any part of this "great mystery of godliness, God. . . manifest in flesh." They are altogether unsearchable.

There is required . . . an influence of power into all the actings of the souls of believers; an intimate, efficacious operation with them in every duty, and under every temptation. These, all of them, do look for, expect and receive from him, as . . . head of the church. This also is an effect of divine and infinite power. And to deny these things unto the Lord Christ, is to raze the foundation of Christian religion. . . . The same may be said concerning his *sacerdotal office*, and all the acts of it. It was in and by the human nature that he offered himself a sacrifice for us. He had somewhat of his own to offer (Heb. 8:3), and to this end a body was prepared for him (Heb. 10:5). But it was not *the work of a man*, by one offering, and that of himself, to expiate the sins of the whole church, and forever to perfect them that are sanctified, which he did (Heb. 10:14). . . . We can have no due consideration of the offices of Christ, can receive no benefit by them, nor perform any act of duty with respect unto them, or any of them, unless faith in *his divine person* be actually exercised as the foundation of the whole. For that is it whence all their glory, power, and efficacy are derived. Whatever, therefore, we do with respect unto his rule, whatever we receive by the communication of his Spirit and grace, whatever we learn from his Word by the teachings of his Spirit, whatever benefit we believe, expect, and receive, by his sacrifice and intercession on our behalf, our faith in them all, and concerning them all, is terminated on his divine person. The church is saved by his offices, because they are his.

(*Works of John Owen*, D. D. "A Declaration of the Glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ." Johnstone and Hunter, London, &c. M.DCCC.L. Vol. 1., pages 40, 44, 99).

*{This article has been added for the second edition}*

## *“The Man Christ Jesus”*

*1 Timothy 2:5*

*Remarks on a Tract*

*Entitled*

*“The Person of the Christ”*

*Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, if they are of God . . . Every spirit which confesses Jesus Christ COME IN FLESH is of God; and every spirit which does not confess Jesus Christ COME IN FLESH is not of God (1 John 4:1, 2, 3).*

*Reprinted from the edition of*

*W. Walton, Southampton,*

*ca. 1895,*

*with additions of page numbers of modern editions of J. N. Darby’s writings placed in the footnotes in braces { } to assist in finding the references. Other things added are placed in braces.*

### *Preface*

In presenting the following pages to the saints of God the writer earnestly beseeches his brethren to allow no reasoning upon the

Person of the blessed Lord to dim the infinite grace and beauty which marks HIM *wherever* or *however* He is seen: whether in the lowly manger, trusting in God upon His mother’s breasts {Psa. 22:9}, or thence onwards to the Father’s throne in glory. It is HIMSELF we should see *wherever* or *however* we behold Him. Moral glories surely there were shining forth in *all* His words and ways, but, above and beyond all that was *of* Him, there is HIMSELF to fill the heart and to cause the affections to overflow in praise and adoration. HIMSELF, a Person, truly God and truly Man; no less God because in the fulness of the time He became Man and no less Man because He is eternally God; but uniting both Godhead and Manhood in the unity and indivisibility of His holy and inscrutable PERSON.

No personal question is here raised. The truth alone is involved, and the author of this paper has no feelings towards any of his brethren other than those of love and earnest desire for their blessing. May the Word and Spirit of God be their guide. It matters not who it is that speaks, for it is written

To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to *this Word*, it is because there is no light in them (Isa. 8:20).

# “The Man Christ Jesus”

1 Timothy 2:5

## Remarks on a Tract

### Entitled

### “The Person of the Christ”<sup>1</sup>

I am quite aware of, and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one person . . . the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in one person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth; but the moment you *deny* personality in the Man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors. What is really denied is Christ’s individuality as a man.<sup>2</sup>

This extract from Mr. Darby’s paper “Christological Pantheism,” applies with equal force to Mr. R.’s {F. E. Raven} doctrine upon “The Person of Christ” and to those teachings of which it was written. Christ’s human personality is, we shall find, denied by the teaching of the tract before us, as really as it was by the doctors of whom the foregoing sentence was written. To insist upon “Christ’s *individuality*<sup>3</sup> as a man,” is not to teach “two individualities,” nor does “the simple faith that Jesus was *God and Man in one person*” in any sense involve “a dual personality.” In Him Godhead and Manhood are united in His holy and blessed Person; God in person and Man in person: yet but one Person -- “the Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever.”

The Person of Christ is a theme alike of endless beauty and attraction to those in whom His love has awakened a response: an object of boundless praise and adoration for the heart that knows *Himself*. The heights of glory and depths of humiliation so intimately connected therewith, appeal at once to the heart, and engross the mind taught by the Spirit of God.

Not only do the counsels of God, whether in grace or government, center around that Person, “according as He has chosen us in Him before the world’s foundation,” or,

“according to His good pleasure which He purposed in Himself . . . to head up all things in the Christ”; but beyond these blessings and glories which in the purposes of God are associated with His Person, the Holy Ghost occupies us with the pre-eminence that intrinsically belongs to His *Person* -- the especial glories of His *Person itself*.

And it is worthy of remark, as showing the mind of the Spirit of God, that, in the Scripture which, more than any other perhaps, is full of these glories of His *Person* (Col. 1 and 2), we learn the truth, that occasion has been taken of His humiliation, to signally honor, according to the purpose and pleasure of the Godhead,<sup>4</sup> by a special and distinctive glory, the *Person* who thus became Man.

God has invested His *Person* as become *Man* with a peculiar glory, which distinctively belongs alone to Him: all the fulness of the Godhead dwelling in His Person (Col. 1:19), and this in so inscrutable a *manner* (Col. 2:9), that *bodily* that fulness dwells in Him. Thus we see that when, with a view to God’s glory, the eternal Son takes a place where His Deity might be questioned and denied (i.e., in becoming Man), there is this glorious answer to His humiliation, in that *thus come down* all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him. His *humanity* was and is the *bodily* expression of the *Godhead* -- God has been manifested in flesh. All that God is, is seen there, in a bodily form, in the Person of Christ.

It is not merely that the Godhead was and is there morally, shining through the humanity He had assumed, as if “in becoming Man He gave character to manhood” (this Mr. R. insists on): it is that there, in that blessed *Person*, the fulness of the Godhead *corporeally* dwells. Though *purposing* thus to dwell in the Son become Man, the fulness of the Godhead had never before thus dwelt in a Person. This is the foundation of Christianity in the *Person* of our Lord Jesus Christ. This (whatever Mr. R. may seem to say to the contrary elsewhere) the teaching of the tract denies; merely “admitting that, morally, Christ’s manhood had its unique and blessed character from God.”

Nor is it simply these statements of the author which imply the denial of this great reality of the incarnation. In the tract we are about to consider we shall see that this truth is *systematically* set aside. It is utterly impossible that the Divine Person which it presents in manhood condition can thus be, in His *Person, bodily* the fulness of the Godhead: there can be no objective *corporeal* expression of *Godhead*, seeing that Christ’s *humanity* is, by the author, so separated

1. {“The Person of the Christ” is a paper published by F. E. Raven in 1895.}

2. {*Collected Writings* 29:212}

3. The italics are not necessarily in the originals, throughout the quotations; nor the capitals.

4. “Was pleased” implies *purpose* and *intention* in Col. 1:19, and not that which was in any way necessarily true of Him, as belonging by right to His place in the Godhead. To interpret it thus is to lose *all* its meaning, as unfolded by the Spirit of God.

that it may be viewed distinct from His *Person*.<sup>5</sup> In his teaching, humanity is assumed in order that Christ “may be viewed objectively as man”: in Colossians, on the contrary, the humanity of Christ is presented as that whereby the Godhead fulness dwells in Him, that GOD may thus be presented *objectively* in Man. In the author’s view of humanity it is man, and man *objectively* only, that is seen therein: in the other it is the whole Godhead *bodily*. Could anything show more clearly the terrible character and extent of this heresy?

The tract entirely destroys the truth revealed in Luke 1 as to the conception and birth of *Christ*. We see there that, even as to His birth as man, real and true as His humanity is, He was called *the Son of God*: so miraculously did the power of God act upon the vessel He had chosen, and become the divine source of the life of “that holy thing” which was born of the Virgin {Luke 1:35}. Terrible thought indeed it is, how “very derogatory to the truth of the Son” no pen can describe, to vainly imagine that the Manhood of Christ -- “that holy thing” -- could dishonor the *Person* of Him who *thus* became Man. God is the source of His *being* as man. Yet He is the seed of the woman.

In the words of another:

It was a child really conceived in Mary’s womb, who brought forth this child at the time which God has<sup>6</sup> Himself appointed for human nature . . . He was really and truly man, born of a woman as we are -- not as to the source nor as to the manner of His conception, of which we are not yet speaking, but as to the reality of His existence as man. He was really and truly a human being . . . She inquires *how* it shall be accomplished, since it must be done outside the order of nature. The angel proceeds with his commission, making known to her the answer of God to this question also . . . The birth of Him who has walked upon this earth was the thing in question -- His birth of the virgin Mary. He was God, He became man; but here it is the manner of His conception in becoming a man upon the earth. It is not WHAT He was that is declared. It is He who was born, *such as He was in the world*, of whose miraculous conception we here read. The Holy Ghost should come upon her -- should act in power upon this earthen vessel, without its own will or the will of any man. God is the source of the life of the child promised to Mary, *as born in this world* and by His power. He is born of Mary -- of this woman chosen by God. The power of the Highest should overshadow her, and *therefore* that which SHOULD BE BORN OF HER should be called the Son of God. Holy in His birth, conceived by the intervention of the power of God acting upon Mary (a power which was the divine source of His *existence on the earth, as man*), that

which thus received its being from Mary, the fruit of her womb, should *even in this sense* have the title of *Son of God*. The holy thing which should be born of Mary should be called the Son of God. It is not here the doctrine of the eternal relationship of the Son with the Father. The Gospel of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, that to the Colossians, establish this precious truth, and demonstrate its importance; but here it is that which was born by virtue of the miraculous conception, which on *that ground* is called the *Son of God*.<sup>7</sup>

Of this miraculous manner of the conception of this holy Person, who was to have the title of the Son of God “even in this sense,” the tract knows nothing: it knows only human “*condition*” in contrast to a Christ who is *personally* and in the fullest sense man; the real human nature of Christ being lost by separating His manhood from His Person.<sup>8</sup>

That Christ may be looked at with infinite profit to our souls in His ways and character *as Man*, and in the various places and offices He fills *as Man*, always remembering that it is *One Person* -- God and man -- who is so viewed, is truth that we need to be reminded of.<sup>9</sup> But this is altogether another thing from a system which separates His *Man-hood* from His *Person*, or as Mr. R. clearly puts it, to view Him “as man distinct and apart from what He is as God.”<sup>10</sup> What He *is* as God and what He *is* as Man, can never be divided or seen apart. It is a distinct partition of

7. *Synopsis*. Small (Third) Edition. Vol. 3, pp. 245, 249. (263, 267. L. E. 294, 298, See note on p. 37). {Pp. 263, 267.}

8. The remark at Quemerford (*vide* Revised Note) which makes a distinction between “actual condition” and “mere form” (page 125), is a plain proof of the state and workings of deception which are characteristic of that which is false. “Form or condition” as its use in the tract we have before us shows, is, as far as the truth in question is concerned, one and the same thing, and to hold that the Lord’s humanity is not what He became “*in person*,” but only a “*condition*” of humanity which He assumed, is as effectually to subvert the truth of His real and true Manhood as to hold that that humanity is “a mere form.” Yet such is the deception at work that the following statement is ascribed to “F. E. R. I suppose they (the Gnostics) held that the Lord’s humanity was not actual condition, but a mere form.” And this reply went well-nigh unchallenged. Solemn commentary on the influences at work. Had the reply been “They held that the Lord’s humanity was not actually what He became ‘*in person*’, but a mere form or condition of humanity which He assumed,” the *substance* of the reply would have applied with equal force to Mr. R’s teaching and to that of the Gnostics: for each heresy equally denies that, as J. N. D. says, “He was really and truly a human *being*.” What a demonstration this affords of “leading and being led astray.” That which was brought out at the “Reading” on Heb. 1 and 2, modifies in *no way* our judgment of this teaching, nor does it affect in the slightest degree the truth of the charges which we have made in our remarks. Indeed, it *fully justifies* those charges.

9. See Appendix.

10. It will be seen as we proceed, that, as Mr. R. limits His *Person* to what He is as *God*, this is only another mode of expressing the real drift of his tract, which is, to separate His *humanity, i.e., what He is as man*, from His *Divinity, i.e., what He is as God*. It is the refusal on our part to do so, which leads him to charge us with “confusion of thought as between *person* and *condition*.”

5. {It is helpful to keep in mind that the eternal Son took humanity *into* His Person.}

6. {The present edition reads “had.”}

His Person incarnate, leading here as we shall see to the fatal consequences of the denial of His humanity as being now essential to His Person, and the limitation thereof to "human condition."

To view Him there as God or here in the grace and perfection of His humanity, here acting as a Divine Person or there according to the place He has taken or received as Man, is surely after the manner in which the Holy Ghost delights to present Him to us. But this in no way leads to the denial of the "absolute *unity* of His Person, though in a taken *nature*,"<sup>11</sup> the truth which the teaching of the tract entirely destroys.

It is the *Person* who gives value to the work -- gives dignity to the offices He fills, and enhances the beauty of the scene wherever we view Him. There is no dual personality, and most assuredly the Person is not changed, although He is really *Man* in Nature and Being and Person; but He that is such is *God*; and human intellect, in Mr. R. as elsewhere, refuses this holy mystery of One *Person* both God and Man. That is, his doctrine does not allow (whatever he may hold theoretically) of the *union* of the two *natures* in the *Person* of Christ. It allows *only* that He is a Divine Person in human "*condition*" as opposed to "*person*."

The author of the tract in question need not tell us that he does not respect orthodoxy -- everyone who reads what he has written may see that for himself -- but to talk as he does about "expressions found in hymns, and the like, which have been used simply and devoutly by Christians without any very strict inquiry into their real force," is positive misrepresentation of well-known facts. It is matter of common knowledge that the doctrine treated in the tract, and the truth which the "expressions found in hymns" feebly present, are so far from being the mere vague expressions of pious feelings, that they have ever formed the subjects of the most searching inquiries and of the hottest controversies amongst Christians. The existence of the so-called Athanasian Creed proves it.

No one questions the responsibility of a Christian to examine received doctrines in the light of God's Word, and the necessity of rejecting them if proved false is equally unquestionable. In such a case rejection cannot be too distinct and emphatic. But if orthodox views of Christ's Person *be false* we challenge the author to state it without reserve, so that all may know his mind. Let there be that truthful candor which points out (if exposing error) the material and irreconcilable nature of the conflicting teachings. Let him *distinctly avow*, that which it is evident he teaches, namely, that of the union of the Godhead nature with human nature *in the Person* of Christ he knows nothing and will admit nothing; so that many who now

support him and apologize for his ambiguity of expression, in ignorance of his real belief, may no longer be deceived. Let him boldly say "You have all been wrong for eighteen hundred years and more, and your doctrines are those of the apostasy,"<sup>12</sup> and let him not affect to "judge," what he must know is not the case, that those who withstand his doctrines do not know the "real force" of language which expresses, in a human manner and measure we own, the deep and unfathomable truth (as we believe) which forms the basis of orthodox teaching concerning the Person of Christ.

Such a course is utterly unworthy, to say the least, of one who attempts to teach upon so important and fundamental a subject. The author knows well enough that it is no mere question of "expressions found in hymns, and the like," which he with pious pity can set aside as the swaddling-clothes of devout ignorance and pious simplicity. He knows that these "expressions" are not isolated or accidental utterances, but that they express a doctrine which is to be found clearly and forcibly stated in the writings of orthodox teachings everywhere. In none perhaps more clearly than in those of "brethren" so-called.

Or does he see, in this subtle method of depreciating "orthodoxy" by labeling it "confusion of thought" and treating it as the product of ignorance fostered only by inexact and indefinite "expressions," his most powerful weapon for disarming opposition and spreading his erroneous views? for there is nothing so successful to-day as learned ridicule and lofty contempt as a means of discrediting the truth of God. Consequently "development" makes rapid strides on every hand. This tract we are considering is itself a terrible and condemning proof of the working of the corrupt "gangrene" in places where *once* (alas! that it is so no longer) *the truth* was held. The grace of God which has so signally recovered to us the truth in these last days is itself turned into an occasion for deceiving souls by suggestions of fresh light or new truth.

We solemnly charge Mr. R. with presenting teachings utterly subversive of the doctrine hitherto taught and received amongst us as *the truth* concerning the Person of Christ: and, under the pretext of removing the offshoots of pious ignorance, with secretly sapping the foundations of the common faith of Christians.

Our endeavor will be, the Lord helping us, so clearly to trace to its fountain-head this evil stream of anti-christian doctrine, as to put the simple soul on its guard against its seductive downward current, and set the warning lamp of Scripture so plainly before the eyes, that the Christ-dishonoring results, to which its rapids hurry the

11. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 419. (See note on p. 37). {P. 298.}

12. At Quemerford F. E. R. virtually took the ground that orthodox teaching as to the unity of the Person of Christ *is false*: and that Christians in this day with increased knowledge are simply refusing what "Men of less intelligence" ignorantly constructed into creeds. But what of the teachings of those only lately taken from amongst us?

unwatchful, may be seen before it is too late. If the light, which makes all things manifest, shines fully on the source and spring of error, we shall the more easily trace the course whither it tends, and be enabled the better to see how it is that so many have been engulfed in its dangerous waters, who, finding themselves involved in it only on its emergence from the bewildering recesses which ecclesiastical craft had cunningly wrought for it, little suspected the nature of the source or the fearful catastrophe towards which the stream was carrying them, even *shipwreck concerning the faith*.

It is another than Mr. R. who is the originator of this stream of evil doctrine, another than he who excavated its fountain-head and brought forth thence this devastating flood: one who knowing fully the relation of cause and effect throughout the whole of its course of error, and thoroughly aware of what he aims at in it, has known how to bring it forth and present it to the eye in the way most deceptive to the saints of God. He has used the more effectually to achieve his ends, much that appears like the truth, both in substance and form, but so perverted or removed from its right connection with the Truth Himself, and the doctrine of His Person, that it absolutely falsifies the truth. But God has fully provided in His Word everything we may need both to escape from error and that we may not be ignorant of the devices of Satan. As to the instrument employed by the enemy to open the floodgates of error, it is likely enough that it is only little by little that he has become aware of the springs and upper courses of that which he was at first employed to let loose.

Two words used by him in connection with his treatment of the Person of Christ on page 3 of his tract are plain evidence of the fatal character of his teaching upon the question at issue. And it is important to notice that these words are used not unadvisedly nor without due consideration, but the contrary, for, as the italics show, special attention is directed to them. The author knows that the "real force" of *these* words, at any rate, and their bearing upon the subject matter of his tract, is a point of the last importance.

Mr. R. charges those who maintain "that the truth of *Christ's Person* consists in the union in Him of God and Man" with "confusion of thought as between *person* and *condition*," and, in his attempt to sustain this charge, he abandons what in all ages has been the common faith of Christians. Let us see what the doctrine is which he thus assails and rejects.

We, in common with all orthodox believers, believe that Christ is God as to His *Person*: we also believe that he was in the form (or condition) of Godhead.<sup>13</sup>

We believe, in common with them, that Christ became Man as to His *Person*, ("the Word became flesh") without

thereby ceasing to be God, or affecting in any degree the unity of His Person: we also believe that He took upon Him the form of a servant, *i.e.*, human condition.<sup>14</sup>

We distinguish in the case of His humanity, as in that of His Divinity, between "*person* and *condition*," nor is Mr. R. warranted in calling this "*confusion*."

We believe that in the *Person* of Christ the Divine and human natures are inscrutably united, each, but without separation or confusion, essential to what He now is as "the Christ": and that this wondrous truth forms the *mystery* of the *incarnation*, and is the truth of the *Person* of Christ. "Man taken into union with God in one person."<sup>15</sup>

We believe that Scripture, by the enlightening power and grace of the Holy Spirit, teaches in the most unmistakable manner, to the simple soul, these unfathomable truths concerning the Person of Christ, and that, although *no change* has taken place in His eternal Being and Nature, no change of the Person -- He is the same Person, the Son -- yet that this Person *has become*, in assuming humanity, that which He was not before -- He has *become Man*: nor do we confound this truth with that which is inseparable therefrom, and is indeed collateral therewith, namely, the *status* or *condition* or *form* of humanity He took.

Mr. R. repudiates this doctrine as "confusion" begotten of ignorance: and he asserts that the thought "that in becoming man a change has taken place as to His Person -- He is *in person* something which He was not before" is "very derogatory to the truth of the Son." He teaches that to hold that Christ became "*in person* something which He was not before," that is, *Man as to His Person*, is inconsistent with the truth that He is "the same Person," who was "eternally with the Father," *thus confusing His personal identity with His Person*. These truths are in no way inconsistent the one with the other: there is no antagonism whatsoever between them. Nor, be it noticed, unless it be to remove the *mystery* of the incarnation, is there any need to deny that Christ is in person Man as well as God, and thus, to limit His humanity to "*condition*," as we shall see Mr. R. does in his tract.

We fully accept and, by grace, tenaciously hold the truth both of the eternal and unchangeable personality of Christ, and of that which is expressed by the words "form or condition" in their connection with the Person of Christ. The truth of Phil. 2, that He who subsisted in the form of God, emptied Himself, and assumed a servant's form, is

14. Matt. 1:21-23; 11:27; Mark 1:1, 3, 11; Luke 1:31, 32; John 1:14; 8:58; 6:51, 62; 17:3-5; Acts 2:30-36; Rom. 1:3, 4; 9:5; 1Cor. 1:9; 2 Cor. 4:4; 5:19; Gal. 1:16; 2:20; Eph 4:9, 10; Phil. 2:5-11; Col. 1:19; 2:9; 1 Thess. 1:9, 10; 2 Thess. 1:7-10; 1 Tim. 3:16; 6:14-16; 2 Tim. 4:8; Titus 1:3, 4; 2:13; Heb 1:1-3; 2:9, 14; James 2:1; 1 Pet. 3:22; 2 Pet. 1:2, 17; 1 John 1, 2; 3:8; 4:2, 3, 9, 10, 14, 15; 5:5, 20; Rev. 1:8, 18; 19:13-16; 22:13; Psalms 2:7; 45:6, 7; 102:23-27; Isaiah 7:14; Zechariah 13:7.

15. *Coll. Writings*, Vol. 2, p. 226. {30:151 and 17:261.}

13. John 1: 1-3, 18; 8:58; Heb. 1:2, 3; Psalms 102:25; Phil. 2: 5-7.



only rightly apprehended when the truth of His human as well as Divine Being is acknowledged. The truth, that the personal identity of the One who was in the form of God and who assumed a servant's form is unchanged, is absolutely essential to the truth of His Person. It cannot be too strongly insisted on. But together with it the truth must be maintained, that He whose personal identity is unquestionably unaltered and unalterable, who was, when He became Man, the same Divine Person that He was from eternity, yet this *Person* is He who became something -- "was made flesh" -- He *Himself* became "something which He was not before."

But this is not included in the thought of "form or condition." The form of God belonged indeed to the very same Person who took the form of a servant, but to assert that His humanity is that of "form or condition" alone, and not of *nature* or "*person*" is no less evil than to teach that His Divinity was that of "*form*" alone and not of *nature* or "*person*." Yet this is what Mr. R. necessarily does, and, practically and in effect limits, as will be shown in the sequel, His humanity to "condition" or "form."

These truths are collateral but not identical: another has brought them together in one passage, equally insisting on each. He says

But here is One who was in the form of God, the very *status* and condition of Divinity, and takes another form and goes down to death, even the same Divine Person, never proved more so than in His humiliation, but *who became something* ("was made flesh").

With a quality that is impossible --

it (the quality) is always the identical idea it was before, if not, it is not it. The Word became flesh, did not cease to be the Word, but was what it was not before -- *became something* -- and subsequently took manhood into Divine Glory. Personal identity can change its state or form -- ideal identity must remain what it is or identity is gone.<sup>16</sup>

Here we have a Divine *Person* who not only acted "in regard to His form or condition, divine or human"; (Mr. R. will allow this much, and, in effect at least, *no more*;) but here we have *also* the fact clearly insisted upon that this Divine *Person* became something which He was not before. Of this truth Mr. R. says "This is not the teaching of Scripture, nor do I think that it can be entertained."

Having thus before us the distinct denial of the truth that the Lord became "*in person* something which He was not before," that is, clearly, *Man*, we will now see what the character of His humanity is according to this teaching. The author owns (and here we should not object) that the distinction "between *person* and *condition*" as he puts it, exists in respect to the *Divinity* of Christ, for he speaks of "the form of God" as distinct from "A divine Person," and

says "We have thus a divine Person presented, even apart from the question of form," so that thus far the ground appears to be common; yet with this his application of the thought of "*person*" ceases, and the Lord's humanity is placed upon a lower plane, as a thing of "*condition*" alone, from which what He is HIMSELF "*in person*" is carefully separated.

All thought of "What He was in His Person as Man" <sup>17</sup> to use again the words of another, is refused unequivocally by Mr. R. <sup>18</sup> and where this is denied, it is plain that, as he says, it "is not a question of unity of a Person." To speak of "The absolute unity of His Person," <sup>19</sup> He must have become in His Person man, or no question can arise as to the unity of His Person. In the following sentence we have the clear and positive enunciation of his doctrine. Mr. R. says, "The truth of a divine Person assuming human condition, the Word becoming flesh, and in such wise as that He can be viewed objectively as man, I believe; but that is not a question of unity of a Person. It is a Person in a condition in which He was not previously."

Thus plainly is the truth denied. As J. N. D. said of Mr. Sen:

The true Christ in both parts of His Being, *i.e.*, the Divine and the human," <sup>20</sup>

is not held; but is set aside in one essential respect by this destructive teaching, which admits a divine Person, and a divine Person *only*, and persistently separates therefrom the *humanity* of Christ: distinctly alleging that

the idea of the unity of the Person in the sense asserted is not found.

It acknowledges only *one* part of His Being, *i.e.*, the Divine, and really sets aside the other part of His being, *i.e.*, the human. Is this the "Christ whose Person, God and Man," <sup>21</sup> has formed the substance of the teaching which we have heretofore received? The same writer, from whom I have just quoted, has said of the First Epistle of John, "The way in which God and man in One Person are united

17. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 25. {P. 17}.

18. If Mr. R. would be consistent he must drop J. N. D. altogether. To boast "in another's rule of things made ready to hand" is at all times to be condemned: but to use another's name to destroy the very things which with his whole soul he built up, and that other now passed away, is such, that no words can be found sufficiently strong to denounce it. The writer of the tract is surely not unaware of the fact that J. N. D. taught that in John's Gospel "We always find Christ *personally as Man*," and yet F. E. R. at Quemerford, in reply to the question "Why is He not *personally* man?" replied, not with J. N. D. that He was so, but that, "He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one." Did then J. N. D. teach "the idea of two personalities"? Mr. R. knows he did not. Yet he taught distinctly and unequivocally that He was personally Man. Why then the effort to square these contrary teachings? They distinctly clash.

19. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 419. {P. 298.}

20. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 394. {P. 280.}

21. *Ibid.* Part XXI., p. 83. {*Notes and Comments* 6:58.}

16. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, pp. 398, 399. {P. 283.}

and presented in the blessed Lord in this Epistle, strikes me more and more, so that it is impossible to<sup>22</sup> apply them distinctly; 1 John 5:20, giving the clue to it.”<sup>23</sup> And he again speaks of

the wonderful bringing together of God and Man in the Person of Christ,

which we get “in the end of ch. 2 and beginning of ch. 3.”<sup>24</sup> Will the author assert that “the idea of the unity of the Person in the sense” of His being “God and man in One Person”<sup>25</sup> is not found here? He dare not do so. Will he then tell us plainly that he has abandoned that which this honored servant of Christ ever insisted upon as the foundations of the faith? That he *has* done so, whatever he may *think or say*, is alas! but too plain from what we have already seen.

But these are not all the proofs this tract supplies us with of the fact that this system denies the Christ of God: for, consistently with the denial that Christ became as to His “*person*” man, and the consequent limitation of His *humanity* to “*condition*” under point two, it severs the *incarnation* from the *Person* of the Son under point one: the one error being but the counterpart of the other. It is a solemn and pregnant testimony to the unsoundness of this teaching that it renders it an imperative necessity to separate the Scripture “No one knows the Son but the Father,” from the *Person* of Christ in order to prevent the overthrow of the system thereby. For, if it be applied to the mystery of His *Person* as become incarnate, then it proves that His humanity, as well as His Divinity, belongs to His *Person*, and the theory fails.

Another has remarked upon this Scripture

Now that He has clothed what is Divine in human nature none can fathom it.<sup>26</sup>

The teaching of the tract studiously ignores all thought therein of His *Person*, the *substance* of the teaching in connection therewith on page 1, paragraph 5, being, No one knows the Son in His two aspects as man -- Apostle and High Priest -- i.e., so as to grasp these two thoughts at one and the same time, save the Father. Thus the union in *One Person* of Godhead and manhood is again denied, and a counterfeit duality of two “wholly distinct conceptions” of Christ *as man* is presented in its stead; His Divine Person being scrupulously eliminated therefrom. And these two aspects of Christ *as man* are set forth, apparently, as the author’s “great reality of the incarnation,” the charge against us being, substantially, that, by maintaining that what Christ *is* as man cannot be seen apart from what He *is* as God, i.e., by maintaining the

truth of the indivisibility of His *whole Person* -- “God and man in One Person”<sup>27</sup> -- we betray “a singular inability to apprehend” one of these two “essential” aspects of it. Whether any other aspect thereof is considered *essential* is not stated, but one thing is very clear, namely, that the doctrine “that the truth of *Christ’s Person*” -- the *mystery* of the incarnation -- “consists in the union in Him of God and man,” i.e., of Godhead and manhood, forms *no part of it whatever*; neither essential or non-essential.

Let the reader make no mistake, or imagine that there is any misapprehension of the author’s meaning. It is in direct support of his first proposition, (which necessarily involves the partition of Christ’s *Person*, *if the incarnation* be what we have *ever held* it to be,) that he proceeds to present as “the great reality of the incarnation,” etc., these two aspects of Christ *as man*, two aspects which can be here in no way essential to His *Person*, as he insists on page 3 that Christ’s humanity is that of “*condition*” as opposed to “*person*.” There can be no misunderstanding the teaching here, if carefully read, for although the last clause of paragraph 5, “The one presents God, the other, man,” looks marvelously like, The one presents Christ *as God* -- a Divine Person, in contrast to the other presenting Him on the other side of His *Person as Man*, it will be plainly seen upon examination of the whole clause, in its relation to the first proposition, and in its connection with the teaching of the third page, and indeed, of the entire tract, which wholly denies this truth, that no such thought is *intended* or can be *entertained*. “The one presents God, the other, man” is not His Godhead Being in contrast to His Manhood, but forms a brief summing up of Christ viewed in the two aspects *as Man*: i.e., *Apostle* -- His place *as man towards men revealing God*: *High Priest* -- His place *as man towards God*. So Mr. R. explains

As Man He is both Apostle and High Priest. In other words, in the Apostle God has, so to say, come out, and in the High Priest man has entered in.

These two thoughts of Christ *as Man* form together his “great reality of the incarnation,” etc., to which he applies Matt. 11:27: two thoughts which he says “cannot be grasped at one and the same time by any finite mind” for “No one knows the Son save the Father,” but he adds

Now these two thoughts, though realized in one Person, must of necessity be separately and distinctly apprehended.

These two “distinct conceptions” take the place in this system of the union in the *Person* of Christ, of both God and Man -- the *mystery* of the incarnation; which is refused by this teaching.

Thus the writer not only betrays his inability to apprehend the great reality of the incarnation, *which he has*

22. {The present edition adds the words here: “separate and.”}

23. *Ibid.*, Part XXI., p. 74. {*Notes and Comments* 6:52.}

24. *Ibid.*, Part XXI., p. 76. {*Notes and Comments* 6:54.}

25. *Ibid.*, Part XXI., p. 74. {*Notes and Comments* 6:52.}

26. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 396. {P. 281.}

27. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Part XXI., p. 74. {*Notes and Comments* 6:52.}

clearly assumed to do, and, by presenting “two thoughts . . . realized in one Person” for the apprehension of the “finite mind,” destroys the *mystery* of the incarnation, which in Scripture is presented as the truth of the *Person* of Christ, “God and Man in One Person”:<sup>28</sup> but it is worthy of note, in connection with his charge against us, that, by thus subverting the truth of Christ’s *Person*, His real human *nature* is lost which fits Him for our High Priest, i.e., for His place as man Godward: and at the same time the reality of Christ’s *Person* is set aside, as the Word become flesh dwelling among men and revealing God; the One in whom all the fulness was pleased to dwell. For the incarnation, or coming in flesh of Jesus Christ, is separated from His *Person* and presented only as a *means* by which “He can be viewed objectively as man.” And thus for the purpose of viewing Christ “as man, distinct and apart from what He is as God,” or in other words, apart from what He *is in Person* (for these words have plainly this meaning in the tract), His holy *Person* is ruthlessly dissected, the reality of His humanity totally destroyed, and the mystery of the incarnation absolutely denied.

We find from the *Revised Notes of Meetings at Quemerford*, May 1895, which have come to our hands, that there this teaching was reiterated, and is now sent forth apparently with the sanction (for the distinctly pronounced doctrine went uncontradicted) of that representative Conference as “Truth for the Time.” And not only so, but to support this terrible heresy an utterly false interpretation of J. N. D. is credited to Mr. R.: for in explanation of a statement by “A. H.” that “J. N. D. says, Christ is God, Christ is Man. He is Christ as both”: “F. E. R.” is reported to have replied,

Yes; but you must think of what was meant by it. He is not man in the sense that He is God. J. N. D. said many times, He could not change His *Person*. In *Person* He is God, in condition He is man.

Now, if this is not deliberate misrepresentation, it is at any rate the fruit of the most culpable negligence, for, the sentence from which it is quoted, cannot by any possible means be contorted into meaning anything but the exact opposite. The Scripture of which he is writing is also made void, for the Holy Ghost presents in Colossians a Divine *Person incarnate*, and not merely “a divine *Person* in the condition of human life down here” whose “Manhood in His case derived its character from what He Himself was.”<sup>29</sup> What J. N. D. says is,

Also it must be remembered, that that which is said is said, when He was manifested in the flesh, of His *complete person, man upon earth*. Not that we do not in our minds separate the divinity and the humanity; but even in separating them we think of the *one person* with regard to whom we do so. We say Christ is God,

Christ is Man; but it is Christ who is the *two*.<sup>30</sup>

But, in express contradiction to this truth, Mr. R. insists that “there could be no difference between the eternal Son<sup>31</sup> and the Son born in time except as to His condition.”<sup>32</sup> There is thus no meaning whatever in speaking of “the *one person*” whose divinity and humanity we may in our own minds think of separately. And the sentence in the Synopsis is reduced to an absurdity. By the rejection of the thought of “the unity of the person” J. N. D. is rendered unintelligible, when he thus speaks of “the *one person*,” for it is a question of divinity and humanity in His *Person*. The Word of God speaks of One, whose humanity so essentially belongs to His *Person*, that corporeally -- *bodily* -- the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him. It is not only a question of that “which came out in Him morally . . . a divine *Person* in the condition of human life down here,” as Mr. R. would make it; it is a question of “WHAT HE HIMSELF WAS” in His *Person*, as having become flesh, AND ONLY AS SUCH: the *Person* -- “Man upon earth” -- in whom the fulness was pleased to dwell; thus presenting “HIS COMPLETE PERSON” for our wonder and praise -- “the *one person*,” who was as to His *Person* both divine and human. Can Mr. R. be really ignorant of the fact that J. N. D. is unquestionably speaking of “The true Christ in both parts of His Being, i.e., the divine and the human,” when he says of Him, “Christ is God, Christ is man”?<sup>33</sup> and that he taught in Christ’s *Person* humanity “was united to Godhead.”<sup>34</sup>

The truth of the *Person of Christ* is not only the immense fact which underlies it all, namely, that He is a Divine *Person* in the Godhead, as is also the Father and the Holy Ghost: but besides this there is the mighty truth that Christ the Son -- One of the *Persons* in the Godhead, has taken human nature into union with His own -- “the Word became flesh”; nor is even this *all* -- blessedly true as it is:

30. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Ed., Vol. 5, p. 15. (16, L.E. 18.) {*Synopsis* 5:16.}

31. {By 1898 F.E.R. denied the eternal Sonship, thus essentially completing his system of doctrine attacking the truth of Christ’s person. For documentation, see *The Eternal Relationships in the Godhead*, available from the publisher.

32. *Truth for the Time*, 1895. p., 137.

33. To quote, as one leader has done, from J. N. D.’s teaching on the 16th Psalm, in order to support this doctrine of the separation of the Divine and human in Christ, when Mr. D. plainly guards against this by saying, “I do not mean, of course, morally separated, nor touch upon the union of the *divine and human nature* in Christ,” is guilty carelessness. For if Mr. R.’s teaching does not mean that he does *thus separate* then it means nothing at all. Mr. R. will *not* allow the truth of the *Divine and human nature* in the *Person* of Christ, and any other so-called union or oneness can in no sense be “The absolute unity of His *Person*,” which J. N. D. insists upon. Two thoughts coming close together, instead of the “Christ whose *Person*, God and Man” we adore, can satisfy no heart, however much the fancied possession of the highest truth, the brightest light may inflate the *mind*. Nor is it at all a question of the *place* Christ has taken, which this teaching raises; it is altogether one of *Person*.

34. See *Coll. Writings*, Doc. Vol. 4, pp. 228, 229. {P. 147.}

28. *Coll. Writings*, Doc. Vol. 3, p. 521. {P. 331.}

29. *Truth for the Time*, 1895. p., 129.

for Scripture shows that in the *Person of Christ* we have also GOD MANIFESTED -- God in all that He is in the unity of the Godhead -- Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. "No one has seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, HE hath declared Him." GOD "who only has immortality, dwelling in unapproachable light; whom no man has seen, nor is able to see"; who, as to His essential Being or substance is undiscoverable, is revealed in the Son, "who being the effulgence of His glory and the expression of His substance" {Heb. 1:3}, has been down here in this world.

But to thus manifest God He became a Man. "In *Him* all the fulness was pleased to dwell," associating thus the whole Trinity in the work of redemption -- "by *Him* to reconcile all things to itself." It is this peculiar and distinctive glory of Christ, the INCARNATE SON, "who is image of the invisible God," which marks Col. 1:19. It is not *how* the fulness dwells in Him, but the *Person* in whom it dwells. It is not the Father or the Holy Ghost: the Holy Ghost in His jealousy for the especial glory which, as to His *Person* (His special *place* and *authority* are other things), distinguishes the *Son* become Man, leaves no room for such a thought. It reminds us of Matt. 11:27, where the Father holds the secret of the Son's *Person*: so beautifully do we see the Father and the Holy Ghost unite to cover and maintain the glory of the *Person* of the *Son* become man. It is not at all a question of what belongs necessarily to each as Persons in the Godhead, but it is the peculiar glory connected with the *Son* as become *Man*. There is no mention of "bodily" in Col. 1, lest it might be suggested that all the fulness *dwells* equally in the Father and the Holy Ghost, only not *bodily* so.

{ . . . in him all the fulness [of the Godhead] was pleased to dwell (Col. 1:19). }

It is the *Person* in whom it dwells -- CHRIST, the SON: and that as become *Man*.

The *manner* of its dwelling in Him we have in Col. 2:9:

For in Him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead *bodily*;

for this was in order that God's "substance" might be expressed. It is not merely that the fulness was in His body, as if, to use a figure, His humanity were a casket (a lovely casket) enclosing a gem of priceless worth. Such a doctrine as this would as effectually destroy the truth of His *Person* as the most emphatic denial thereof.

This Scripture shows that *that* which expresses the Godhead (i.e., Christ's *humanity*) so *essentially* belongs to his *Person* who expresses it, that it is *itself* spoken of as that which it expresses. This doctrine is practically demonstrated when the Lord says to Philip, "He that has seen Me has seen the Father." We might add that in point of fact Colossians goes deeper than Christ's being *bodily* the *expression* of the Godhead: it teaches what is necessary in order to its expression, namely, that the fulness of the

Godhead *is* in Christ and that in a *bodily* or corporeal *manner*. This truth is the *basis* of its expression.

In itself Godhead subsisted and ever subsists, as we have seen, in unapproachable light. In the *Person of Christ* as become Man it subsists corporeally: by men and angels the fulness of the Godhead has been seen *bodily* in Him in this world -- here engaged in the work of redemption: and is now *bodily* in Him in the glory of God. Nor can all the mystic philosophy of the mind of man, led astray by Satan, supplant the tangible reality, for a soul who, "rooted and built up in *Him*," is "assured in the faith." No.

That which is said is said, when He was manifested in the flesh, of His COMPLETE PERSON, MAN UPON EARTH.<sup>35</sup>

It is not said of a mere "condition" He assumed. This touches in no way the Divine Person of the Son, who was ever absolutely complete in Himself (as are the other Persons in the Godhead,) and who could be nothing less than this, nor does it touch the truth that would make it heresy to say that His *Person* was completed by His Manhood. But it is what the Son is as become Man -- the Son incarnate -- that is set forth in Col. 1; the glories of His whole and complete *Person* -- God and Man in one *Person* -- as He is made known to us in coming in flesh. It reveals the truth concerning His *Person*, not only in respect of His eternal Deity, though necessarily declaring this as the basis of all else, but it unfolds the glorious *Person* of the Son -- the Creator -- as having become Man, "the image of the invisible God," in whom it was the good pleasure that all the fulness should dwell. This is "His complete person, man upon earth" of which J. N. D. speaks. To leave out His *humanity* as this evil system does, i.e., in its *reality* as *essential* to His PERSON, is to have, not a *complete*, but an *incomplete* Christ, however much may apparently be made of His Deity. Scripture shows that what He *became* is as essential to His *Person* as is His eternal Being: so that whether I think of His Godhead or of His Manhood, it is *He Himself* who is before my mind: and *each* thought of *Him* calls forth the worship of the heart that thus knows *Him*. Whatever the *mind* of man may invent, the *heart* of the believer is satisfied with no *Person* but this.

The Son, in His very person, in His nature (and for us as in the bosom of the Father), is He who makes God known, because He presents Him in His own *person* and in a full revelation of His being and of His character before men and in the whole universe; for all the fulness of the Godhead dwells *bodily* in Him. Nevertheless He is a *man*. He is *thus* seen of angels. We have seen Him with our eyes or by faith. *Thus* He is the *image* of the *invisible* God. The perfect character and living representation of the invisible God have been

35. *Synopsis*, small (Third) Ed., Vol. 5, p. 15. (16, L. E. 18.) {*Synopsis* 5:16.}

seen in Him. Wondrous truth for us with regard to the *person* of our Savior!<sup>36</sup>

Marvelous truth! Matchless grace! He has become (thus being “God and Man in One Person”<sup>37</sup>), *that* which He *took* in order thereby to reveal God. This is the mystery of His *Person*. Unutterable and holy secret of infinite wisdom and grace. Nor, whilst maintaining (alas! in the face of its denial) the truth of this mystery, would we attempt -- far be the thought -- its solution.

The Christ Mr. R. presents is not this *Person*. His Christ is not a real Christ. *Corporeally* He is not a *Person*. His *humanity* is not *Himself*, i.e. it is not essential to what He is “*in person*.” Christ is lost, Christ, in all the reality -- the tangible, corporeal reality -- of a *Person* in whom *bodily* the fulness of the Godhead dwells. Thus to unite His *humanity* to His *Person* would dishonor Him, he tells us, for He would thus have become “*in person* something which He was not before,” a thought he refuses as “derogatory”; so that, *of necessity*, he must separate, consistently with the teaching of his tract, “the fulness of the Godhead” which dwells in Him “*bodily*” from His *Person*. The conclusion is inevitable, that the Christ he presents is not the One “in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells as to His *Person*”;<sup>38</sup> or, as the same writer expresses it again, “God, in His perfect fulness, in Christ as *man*.”<sup>39</sup>

Who will give up this *Person*, a real true Man, yet God withal, for a system which *denies* that His *Person* includes His Manhood, and substitutes a Christ who is not “God and man in one person”?<sup>40</sup>

We might multiply quotations from the same writer, and will add here a few extracts to show how fully he taught the exact opposite of this doctrine in respect to Christ’s essential humanity. Of John’s Gospel he writes<sup>41</sup>

He is made flesh, is full of grace and truth, as a living *Person down here as a Man*, (and) this is important in John, for while showing He was I AM, yet we always find *Christ personally, as Man*, the recipient of all from God; we always find Him as made flesh, and speaking as such, whatever that Man might be.

There is no meaning whatever in these quotations unless the writer held a directly contrary<sup>42</sup> view of Christ’s

Person to the teaching of the tract, *i.e.*, unless he held that the incarnation -- the humanity of Christ, is essential to the truth of His *Person*: or, as Mr. Darby himself expresses it, that “He had true humanity, but united to Godhead.”<sup>43</sup> To deny this fundamental truth is to deny the faith. This is the position (unwittingly we trust) of the writer of the tract.

We say it advisedly and with a sense of the gravity of the charge, that the mystery of the incarnation -- “the Word became flesh” -- becoming that which He was not before, i.e. becoming man: this immense foundation truth he unequivocally refuses, and says of it, “This is not the teaching of scripture, nor do I think that it can be entertained.” The “unity of the Person” he scouts as an “idea.” And summing up the truth of the Person of Christ as become man, he says

It is a Person in a condition in which He was not previously.”

This denial of the mystery of the incarnation forms the root of his teaching. This controversy is no mere strife of words: it is the outcome of a subtle and determined attack upon the truth, which, by overthrowing the real humanity of Christ, touches Him vitally in His Person, His Work, His Service, and His Glory. With much talk of Christ as Man, and much apparent zeal for Him as a Divine Person, *the truth* of His *Person* is effectually undermined. There is no PERSON who has BECOME MAN, in this system.

Let us then turn to Scripture that “It is written” may be the authority both for the presentation of the truth and for our denunciation of these doctrines.

Matt. 11: 27; John 6:51; Luke 1:35; Col. 2:9; present

42. (...οοιῦ ÷ ἁέα)

means from the beginning of Christ’s path down here. But the importance of this is very great. It is the true beginning, not, I need say, of that which has none, nor, what is important to notice, of the provisional and first presented scheme of creation (though what abides was first in purpose) as to that. In the beginning ‘was’ and then came creation; this is the historical statement of the Gospel, before declaring what the Word, the Creator, was *in Himself*, AND *as made flesh*. But here the history, before speaking of the communicated effects in us, takes up exactly what the Gospel has brought out -- the manifestation, the first manifestation of God Himself, of a Divine Person as the Beginning and to be the center of all that is eternal. *God manifest in the flesh* then FIRST ‘was’.” And he adds a little lower down “Christ’s *Person* . . . was the beginning of the whole system of the revelation of God.” *N. & C.* Vol. 5. pp. 272, 273. {Pp. 192, 193.}

Let us ask the reader, Is it here Christ’s essential Deity and that alone, His Person as in pre-incarnation, which J. N. D. had before him? Impossible. He could not say of *this* that it “then first ‘was’.” His Divinity was from everlasting -- “in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God.” This cannot be then. So that here we have a Person presented who, *as such*, “Then first ‘was’,” but this is a Person for whom no place can possibly be found in this tract. It is indeed the same Person who “was in the beginning with God,” but He HAS become “*in person* something which He was not before.” This is the true Christ. The Christ the tract presents is false. There was the beginning of *nothing* which was not before, as to His Person, when Mr. R’s Christ assumed human condition.

43. See *Coll. Writings*, Doc. Vol 4, pp. 228, 229. {P. 147.}

36. *Synopsis*, Small, Third, Ed., Vol. 5, pp. 11 and 12. (L. E. 14.) {*Synopsis* 5:12.}

37. *Coll. Writings*, Doc. Vol. 3, p. 521. {P. 331.}

38. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Ed., Vol. 5, p. 27. (28, L. E. 32) {*Synopsis* 5:28.}

39. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Ed., Vol. 5, p. 27. (28, L. E. 32) {*Synopsis* 5:28.}

40. *Coll. Writings*, Doc. Vol. 3, p. 521. {P. 331.}

41. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 5, p. 253, 254. {P. 178.}

42. We add a further passage, showing what J. N. D. taught on 1 John 1. He says “I have long remarked that ‘from the beginning’ in 1 John 1, (ὁοῖα ÷ Ἰᾶόαέ.)

the Christ, whose Person *as become incarnate*, is therefore indissoluble and inscrutable -- whom "No one knows but the Father."

John 1:14; 6:32-58; 1 John 4:2; show us the Christ whose *humanity* of necessity belongs to His *Person*, forming thus an *essential* part of this unfathomable *union* of Godhead and Manhood.

1 Tim. 2:5, 6; 1 John 1:7; Acts 20:28; Heb. 1:2, 3; present the Christ whose work is the work of a *Person* of *infinite* value, yet it is the work of Christ as "the *Man* Christ Jesus."

Heb. 2:17; 4:15; Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8; tell us of the Christ who was made as man in all things like to His brethren, having a real human *nature*.

John 5:21-27; 17:24; Eph. 4:9, 10; Col. 1:15-20; contemplate the Christ who, Himself a Divine Person, yet receives Divine *attributes* and *glory as Man*.

In each of these important respects, the tract presents a view of Christ professedly *as Man* in which these characteristics of the true Christ are wanting. If we sum up its contents as far as we have examined them in the light of these Scriptures, we shall find that it gives us; --

1. A view of Christ, in which Manhood is *not* indissolubly and inscrutably united with Godhead, (a union which Mr. R. calls error,) but, instead, into which the very thought of His Divinity would be an intrusion, as "it is utterly impossible to introduce the idea of Deity in its proper character and attributes." It tells us that "Christ's Manhood had its unique and blessed character from God," but in His Person, as become Man, the Godhead could not *bodily* dwell, as this necessarily involves humanity *united* to Godhead in His *Person*, which we are told, is "confusion" between His "divine Person" and His "human condition."

2. A view of Christ, without real humanity, for though He is spoken of "as man," yet He is not man *personally*, but "a divine Person assuming human condition," who, as to His Person, might have an existence apart from that condition. There is no real humanity -- no individuality as a man.

3. A view of Christ, which disqualifies Him for the work of redemption, for as "the unity of the Person" -- "God and Man in one Person" -- is denied, He -- "the Man Christ Jesus" -- *cannot give Himself*, but can only, as a Divine Person, lay down that which is *outside* His *Person*.

4. A view of Christ, without real human *nature*, for as *nature* is inseparable from "*person*," and the tract not only denies that "He is *in person* something which He was not before," but also virtually limits His humanity to *condition*, it is clear that there is no place, in this system, for a real human *nature* of Christ,

which, if He has taken, is of necessity united with Godhead in His *Person*. For a mere *condition* has not true *nature*.

5. A view of Christ, in which His receiving *as Man* Divine attributes and glory is denied, for on the contrary it is stated that "His place as man" is "distinct and apart from the glory and attributes which belong only to God, and in which Christ has part as Himself being a Divine Person."

The first denies the *inscrutability* of Christ's Person: the second degrades His *humanity*: the third depreciates the value of His *work*: the fourth destroys His *Priestly* service: and the fifth despoils His *taken* glory. The *reality* of His Manhood, with all its mighty consequences, is forfeited in the vain endeavor to sustain this charge of confusion "between *person* and *condition*."

Let it be owned that He has taken Manhood into union with Godhead in His own *Person*, and these precious truths, which this tract sets aside in all their Divine reality, take their true place in relation thereto. The *Person* of Christ is that upon which everything turns. The truth concerning His *Person* -- His *whole* Person -- is of paramount importance. This truth the tract refuses, for the reader must not be misled by the term "the whole truth of His Person." This is not, for the author of the tract, the same as the truth of His *whole Person*, as the latter necessarily involves "the idea of the *unity* of the Person." For it is by reason of the union of Godhead with manhood in the *Person* of Christ, that the question of the *unity* of His *Person* can be raised.<sup>44</sup>

The maintenance of the truth of Christ's real and true *humanity* as essential to His *Person* establishes the inscrutability of that Person: it exalts His *humanity*: it magnifies His *work*: it preserves intact His *Priestly* service: and it recognizes His glory as *Man*. But we will examine each of these points in detail.

{1.} First, then, as to the inscrutability of Christ's Person. Is not the *mystery* of the incarnation the truth of the *Person* of Christ? We have seen that it is denied, first, by substituting in its stead, two aspects of Christ as man, and then, by refusing to acknowledge that He became "*in person* something which He was not before." Thus by reducing His humanity to "human condition," the way is

---

44. The mystery of the union of manhood with Godhead in the *Person* of Christ, yet in the absolute *unity* of that Person, leads Mr. R. to reason that there must be either a *dual personality*, or that He had not *true humanity united to Godhead*. He has chosen the latter heresy: and, because reason can see no escape from the dilemma, he charges his opponents with the former. Faith bows to the truth of God as revealed in His Word, and refuses either avenue of escape to the difficulty discovered by unbelief. Christ's manhood is as real as His Godhead. Yet, on the one hand, there is no dual personality, nor, on the other, is His manhood merged in His Godhead by fusion or identity. There is but One Person, who is both God -- really and truly God in Nature and Being and Person, and who is also Man -- really and truly Man in Nature and Being and Person.

paved for the appalling assertion that

the idea of the unity of the Person in the sense asserted is not found.

We quite allow that it is *not found in the doctrine of this tract*, and for the very simple reason that, from beginning to end, it is a careful and premeditated denial thereof. All possible pains have been taken to destroy the truth which alone makes the doctrine of the "unity of the Person" of Christ intelligible. It has no possible sense unless He be both "God and man in One *Person*." <sup>45</sup> If He did not really and truly become Man in Being and Nature and Person, when He took part of blood and flesh, then to talk of the "absolute unity of His *Person*," <sup>46</sup> or "of Jehovah, come down in the *Person* of *Jesus*" <sup>47</sup> is a delusion and a snare -- it is a deceit of Satan; and the teaching of J. N. D. which clearly insists upon this unity -- this "absolute unity" -- is *false*. We *insist* upon this. If He -- the Word -- in becoming flesh, did not become "*in person* something which He was not before," then to talk of the Word of God "bringing together God and Man in the *Person* of Christ" <sup>48</sup> is in the highest degree reprehensible. It cannot be too strongly condemned. This is the point at issue: let it be sharply defined. We wish no misunderstanding of what is stated here. We have no motive for stating *our* belief upon these all-important questions in any way obscurely. Either Scripture teaches that the *Person* of Christ is incomprehensible by reason of His having taken human *nature* into union with His Divine Being, or it does *not* so teach. If it *does* so teach, then, without gainsaying, it is "a question of unity of a *Person*," the denial of this tract notwithstanding. We affirm unhesitatingly that it *does* so teach, and that in no uncertain manner.

What and who is it that God has inscrutably hidden from the creature but the manner of the union of the Divine and the human in the *Person* of Christ become Man -- the knowledge of the Son Himself? God, as it were, says, I have so covered up with an impenetrable veil the One who became Man for My glory, that no creature mind shall be able to solve the mystery of His *Person*, or to divide His *Person* as Man from His *Person* as God. It is of this *mystery* of the incarnation that J. N. D. has said

the Divine glory of His Being is maintained and secured, when He became incarnate, by the incomprehensibility of His *Person*." <sup>49</sup>

And again he says, in distinguishing His *Person* incarnate from His *Deity* alone,

But the gospel of John gives us large communications on this *humiliation* of Christ. His *Godhead* shines in every page of all the gospels, but John, as everyone knows, in a peculiar way gives us the *Person* of Christ -- the Word *made flesh*. <sup>50</sup>

This is no *mere* assumption of human *condition* by a Divine *Person*. It is *incarnation*, with all its infinite and divine depths of mystery and meaning.

In John 6:51, the Lord distinctly presents *Himself* -- a *Person* -- when He says to the Jews "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." Yet immediately He turns to His *humanity* and adds "the bread that I will give is My flesh." To which will the writer deny the truth of "*person*"? To which will he put his limitation of "*condition*"? If to the latter, which is according to the teaching of his tract, what will he say to the former? The bread is His flesh, *i.e.*, what He *became*, and yet to this He unites intentionally the truth of His "*Person*" when He says of Himself as Man in this world, and only as such, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven." Will Mr. R. assert that His *humanity* came from heaven? If he will not, then there is but one explanation, and that is, that here we have presented, as another has said of it, "The object of faith, but still the *Person* of the Lord, but *as Man*, the bread came down from heaven." This fundamental truth of Christianity the tract before us denies.

Let Mr. R., holding as he does that Christ's *humanity* is not (as become incarnate) essential to His *Person* -- that He who was God as to His *Person* did not also become as to His "*person*" man when He assumed "human condition," see if he can explain, that which is with Divine wisdom, designedly put before the unbelieving Jews in this chapter. If his theory is true it is the "confusion of thought between *person* and *condition*," which he deprecates in his tract. Will he then dare attempt even to *distinguish* them *here*? much less *separate* them as he, in effect, does in his teaching *there*.

Here in this Scripture we have that which is true of Himself "*in person*," so thoroughly identified with His *humanity*, *i.e.*, with what He *became*, that to attempt even to define them would be fatal to the truth of His *Person*. Yet this is the "confusion" which the writer of the tract decries as derogatory to the truth. It is to *this* truth -- to His *Person* as thus become *incarnate* that Matt. 11:27, "No one knows the Son but the Father," applies. This truth of the union of Divinity and humanity in Christ's *Person* is the very essence of the mystery of the incarnation. The denial of it forms the source from whence flow the false teachings as to the *Person* of Christ, which are presented in this tract. Teachings which deny the Christ of God.

The same unbelief that led the Lord's hearers in John 6, who looked at the human apart from the Divine, to

45. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Part XXI., p. 74. {*Notes and Comments* 6:52.}

46. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 419. {P. 298.}

47. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Ed., Vol. 3, p. 58. (62, L. E. 70.) {*Synopsis* 3:62.}

48. *Notes and Comments*, Part XXI., p. 76. {*Notes and Comments* 6:54.}

49. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 396. {P. 282.}

50. *Ibid.*, p. 237. {P. 169.}

question “how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven”? {John 6:42} leads Mr. R. also to stumble at the truth of His Person, and, by denying that His humanity is what he became “*in person*,” to separate the human from the Divine. It is not difficult to show the common origin and character of these opinions. Each originates in the unbelief of the human heart refusing to own the wondrous grace that God -- the Son -- could become in His *Person* man. So, to unbelief *then* it was impossible to acknowledge the Divine relationship of the One who was a man in their midst. His *humanity* degraded Him to their minds and they refused to own His Divine claims. Unbelief *now* discovers the same difficulty in respect to His *humanity*, and sees in the fact of His becoming (“*in person*”) *Man*, (thus being God and man, but in one Person), a thought very derogatory “to the truth of the Son,” and as a consequence refuses to own His *real humanity*.

The stumbling-block to the human mind that lies in the way of the acknowledgment of the truth of the mystery of His *Person*, is the same now as then: only then no refinements of thought could possibly succeed in inducing His hearers to doubt the *reality* of His *humanity*. But *now* as *then* unbelief whilst professing to be able to judge of what is suited to God in respect to the One who “came down from heaven,” only exposes the utter incompetency of the human mind to discover the Son *Himself* become MAN.

For each of us the question is again repeated “Doth this offend you?” Faith bows before this inexplicable mystery refusing to attempt to look within. The suggestion of unbelieving intellectuality is “This is a hard saying: who can hear it?”

Faith neither seeks to understand the mystery of the Person of the Lord, nor, because it is incomprehensible, does it refuse its acceptance. It bows unreservedly, yea with adoration, to the Person thus presented in the Word of God. Unbelief refuses a *Person* both Divine and human -- “God and man in One Person.”<sup>51</sup>

The Scripture, “I am the bread which came down from heaven” {John 6}, can be received only by accepting the truth that, as His humanity is essential to His Person, so His Divinity is essential to His Person: and, as His Divinity is essential to His Person, so His humanity is essential to His Person. This truth meets thus, on the one hand, the unbelief of the Jews, as also of Unitarians, and, on the other, the objections of this tract. “He was God, He became Man”;<sup>52</sup> -- “truly though miraculously, born as man. To those who could understand His name it was

Jehovah the Savior.”<sup>53</sup>

Having thus seen that Scripture establishes the received doctrine of “orthodoxy” as to the inscrutability of Christ’s Person, we will now look at the four remaining views of Christ presented in this tract, in the light of the truth which the Word of God has thus cast upon them.

{2.} That the second view stands or falls with the first is evident. To acknowledge the truth of the *mystery* of the incarnation is necessarily to own His *humanity* in its proper position as essential to His *Person*, as having now become Man. To us the fact that He became “*in person*” man, (i.e., by taking manhood into union with Himself) is, next to the atonement, which indeed it underlies, the most precious and fundamental truth of Christianity. To Mr. R. the thought of “*person*” attached to what Christ *became*, is “very derogatory to the truth of the Son.” To *us* His *Person* exalts His *humanity*: to *him* Christ’s *humanity* would degrade His *Person*, if united therewith. What then will he say to the persistent identification of His *humanity* with His *Person* which is characteristic of John 6? We will leave the answering of this question to him. He has the Word of the living God to deal with: rather would we have it that it dealt with him, manifesting to him, even now, the awful depths of the evil doctrines to which he has been instrumental, in the hands of Satan, in beguiling saints of God.

{3.} In the third view of Christ which we have seen the tract presents, we find that the *Person* of Christ having been touched, His work suffers incalculable loss thereby. As we have learnt the truth from Scripture, it is, that He Himself the Eternal Son, having, by the assumption of Manhood into personal union with Himself, thus become MAN, thereby effectually gives the value of *His whole Person* to His redemption work. He lays down His life (not a mere humanity of “condition”) -- a *Person* who is both God and Man: Man really and necessarily, yet He is also God. “It is written” in the Word of God, that “the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.” And again “it is written” of “the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood,” or blood of His Own {Acts 20:28}. Who can separate Divinity and humanity here without detracting from the infinite value of redemption? Who will have the temerity to assert that the One here spoken of is not, as to His *Person*, God? But Scripture, elsewhere, says it was “the *Man* Christ Jesus; Who gave *Himself* a ransom for all” {1 Tim. 2:6}. Who then will deny that *this* One is not, as to His *Person*, Man? Yet this is the same work and accomplished by the same Person. Restore the truth that Christ became, as to His Person, Man, thus being both God and Man, but *One Christ*, and all the dignity and value of His Deity attaches

51. *Coll. Writings*, Doc. Vol 3, p. 521. {P. 331.}

52. *Ibid*, p. 248. (266, L. E., 297.) {*Notes and Comments* 3:266.}

53. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Ed., Vol. 3, p. 248. (265, L. E., 296.) {*Synopsis* 3:265.}



to His work as Man: for “it is Man who offers Himself.”<sup>54</sup> It is “this *Person* who died for our sins,”<sup>55</sup> and “this *Person*” the doctrine of the tract refuses. It knows not a Christ who is personally Man. It knows only an *appearance* -- “in such wise as that He can be *viewed objectively as man*,” and HE HIMSELF is separated from His Manhood, so that His work as “the Man Christ Jesus” is destroyed.

In connection with this subject Mr. R. made a most remarkable statement at Quemerford, for in explanation of a remark by “J. P.” that “Christ died,” and having doubtless perceived that he has by his doctrine laid himself open to the charge of destroying the death of a Person, he said,

He is designated in that way as Christ, but Scripture says we are reconciled to God by the death of His Son. He took a condition in which He could die. It was that Person who died, and it was the fact of His being that Person that gave all the value to it.

What a mixture of that which is true and that which is false we have here. For surely if He were not the Son of God His death would be valueless: that is the *truth*.

But He must be a man in order to suffer for men, and to represent men. And this He was.<sup>56</sup>

Not as to “*condition*” only, in contrast to “*person*” or being, for this is where this teaching is *false*. No!

He was *really* and *truly* MAN, born of a woman as we are -- not as to the source nor as to the manner of His conception, of which we are not yet speaking, but as to the *reality* of His existence *as man*. HE WAS REALLY AND TRULY A HUMAN BEING.<sup>57</sup>

It is *Himself*, as He was, a *man* on earth -- the PERSON whom I should have met every day had I lived at that time in Judea, or in Galilee.<sup>58</sup>

Thus does another speak of *His person as man*, “in the *nature* He has taken in grace,”<sup>59</sup> and to limit this to the correlative truth of “*condition*” is to deny the Christ of God. To say that J. N. D. means “*condition*” here, would be utter folly, or worse. We learn from Scripture that the act of a Divine Person assuming a mere form or condition of humanity and laying down this form to take it again would be valueless in accomplishing redemption, for it would not be the act of a Man. See Heb. 2:14. The death of a Man, the resurrection of a Man, a Divine Person withal, but a Man who has triumphed over Satan as the

seed of the woman, can alone cancel guilt and bring eternal glory to God. If He be *only* a Divine Person -- the Son of God -- in human *condition*, and does not also become man in Nature and Being and Person when He takes the body prepared for Him, then He is in no *real* sense the *seed of the woman* who could go down into death, to receive in His own *Person* the wages of sin. The sword that awoke against Jehovah’s Fellow, awoke against the *man* Christ Jesus: but to speak of a Divine Person in the mere *condition* of humanity as THAT MAN is useless, for the effect of such teaching is to reduce the humanity of the Redeemer Son of God to a form of humanity such as that in which Jehovah appeared to Abraham, and the reality of Christ’s death is lost. It is a Divine Person laying down human condition: and it is nothing more. There is no real death. It is utterly impossible that One Who is, as to His Person, simply Divine and not also human, “should *taste death*” for sin. Fallen man lay under the *sentence of death*. Human condition alone cannot suffice. It is vain to present a Christ merely *called* man, for the sentence of death had to be met for sinners, and by *Man*. Sins were to be atoned for, sin to be put away. The work of redemption was a reality, and the blessed Savior, the Man who wrought it, was a real Person:

The MAN Christ Jesus; who gave HIMSELF a ransom for all {1 Tim. 2:6}.

We see no such Christ in Scripture as Mr. R. presents.

But we see Jesus, who was made some little inferior to angels on account of the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; so that by the grace of God He should taste death for everything {Heb. 2:9}.

Again:

By *one man* sin entered into the world, and by sin death {Rom. 5:12}.

Such is the offence. The act of favor -- the grace of God -- is also “by the *one man* Jesus Christ.” He was as truly *man* as was Adam; but Adam, though innocent, fell, and thereby brought in sin; Christ, who knew no sin, “Appeared to put away sin by HIS sacrifice.” And again we read in the Word of God,

For since by *man* came death, by *man* also resurrection of those that are dead {1 Cor. 15:21}.

To reason as at Quemerford, that the Scripture “we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son,” excludes the thought of His humanity pertaining to His Person, and makes it the act of a Person to whom Deity alone essentially attached, is to set aside the reality of the incarnation entirely: for as to His conception and birth as Man, as well as in His eternal relationship with the Father, He was to be called the *Son of God*, as Luke 1 {35} plainly shows.

That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God

was spoken of His humanity, as conceived by the Holy

54. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 23. {P. 16.}

55. *Ibid*, p. 403. {P. 286.}

56. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Edition, Vol. 5, p. 137. (142, L. E. 163.) {*Synopsis* 3:273.}

57. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Edition, Vol. 3, p. 246. (264, L. E. 295.) {*Synopsis* 3:264.}

58. *Ibid*, p. 241. (258, L. E. 289.) {*Synopsis* 3:258.}

59. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Edition, Vol. 3, p. 256. (273, L. E. 306.) {*Synopsis* 3:273.}

Ghost. So indissoluble and inscrutable is this union. But it is plainly seen that the incarnation in this sense has no place in Mr. R's system. On the one side is a Divine Person in a *condition* of humanity: on the other God Himself -- the Son -- become Man in Person. Will saints reject the truth of the latter for the unreality of the former? If Christ is not personally MAN there is no redemption. But to return to our consideration of the tract.

{4.} Thus, again, in connection with His Priestly service. If not *Man* therein, and that, too, not merely in "human condition" but in Person and Being and *Nature*, He is unfit for the office of Priest: one who can have compassion, who can feel and sympathize, coming "near to the miseries of men" as one has said. The teaching of the tract makes it impossible that the Christ therein presented can be such an One. For, as *Nature* is inseparable from "*person*," it is plain that to deny that He is "*in person*" man, is to deny that His humanity is true human *nature*. And this tract, although it speaks of "Christ's Manhood" and of His human "form or condition" yet consistently with the system it does not mention His human *nature*. This fatal omission is necessary in order to support his charge of confusion "between *person* and condition," which involves the refusal of humanity in Being and *Nature* and Person; otherwise it falls to the ground.

Another has said of the Epistle to the Hebrews,

Ch. 2 while showing Christ made higher than the heavens, insists on His being made like unto His brethren -- truly a man in flesh and blood so as to feel" [a humanity of "*condition*" alone could not FEEL] as a man for the saints in their trial. Ch. 4 on the other hand specially looks at Him as gone up on high, a High Priest who has gone up through the Heavens, and speaks only of 'was' as to His suffering, being tempted.

Now a humanity of "*condition*" alone could not be TEMPTED, it MUST be a *Person* who is tempted, and clearly, if Christ is not "*in person* something which He was not before" -- if in Person He is not *man* -- then He could not be tempted. It rests with Mr. R. to tell us who that *Person* was who was thus *tempted*. He merely presents a divine Person "viewed as acting in regard to His form or condition, divine or human"; but if Christ be *only* a Divine Person in human condition He *could not suffer*, being tempted, nor would He possess a real human nature to feel for us. It must be a *Person* who feels -- a real man in nature and being -- and who can sympathize.

Thus it is with Jesus, when exercising His priesthood. He is in every sense beyond the reach of pain and trial, *but He is man*; and not only has He the *human nature* which in time suffered grief, but He experienced the trials a saint has to go through more fully than any of

ourselves.<sup>60</sup>

He has Himself been through this scene of sin and sorrow, tempted -- a real Man -- in like manner as we are, sin apart; but He resisted all the attacks and advances of the enemy, (for Satan found nothing in Him that answered to his wiles) and He *suffered* in thus meeting evil. He was *as really tempted* as Adam: hence was *as really man*. This the tract in principle denies. Let it be owned that He *also* became Man in Person, (as well as being God) "and was *Man* to be qualified for it,"<sup>61</sup> and the truth of His having been tempted is re-established. Thus

He would become a priest, being able, through His life of humiliation and trial here below, to sympathize with His own in all their conflicts and difficulties.<sup>62</sup>

For "A human heart feels it, and Jesus had a human heart."<sup>63</sup> But to deny that He became "*in person*" man, is to set aside the truth that *as a person*, He was tempted, and suffered, and feels. And this the tract does.

Having thus seen how the limitation of Christ's humanity to "condition" compromises the truth in regard to the *inscrutability* of His *Person*: to the *reality* of His *humanity*: to the *perfection* of His *work*: and to His *qualification* for the function of *High Priest*: we have still to see the manner in which it touches His *glory* as *Man*.

{5.} We will now point out in what way the denial of Christ's humanity as that which He became "*in Person*," *i.e.*, the denial of Godhead and Manhood in *One Person*, renders it a necessity also to deny to Him as *Man* Divine attributes and glory. It is precisely the same as in the previous view -- a *Person* is needed -- human "*condition*" is not enough. His place of exaltation as *Man*, is by virtue of redemption; which, having accomplished in first descending "as man even into the darkness of the grave and of death";<sup>64</sup>

He takes his place as man above the heavens.<sup>65</sup>

Glorious truth, which belongs at the same time to the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, and to the work of redemption accomplished by suffering on the cross!<sup>66</sup>

Glorious truth indeed: and yet more glorious *Person*. But this system has no place for the One "who was made some little inferior to angels on account of the suffering of

60. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Edition, Vol. 5, p. 260. (269, L. E. 308.) {*Synopsis* 5:269.}

61. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 428. {P. 305.}

62. *Synopsis*, Small (Third) Ed., Vol. 5, p. 247. (256, L. E. 293.) {*Synopsis* 5:256.}

63. *Ibid*, p. 248. (256, 257, L. E. 294.) {*Synopsis* 5:256, 257.}

64. *Ibid*, Vol. 4, p. 402. (417, L. E. 481.) {*Synopsis* 4:417.}

65. *Synopsis*, Small Ed., Vol. 4, pp. 402, 403. (417, L. E. 481.) {*Synopsis* 4:417.}

66. *Synopsis*, Small Ed., Vol. 4, pp. 402, 403. (417, L. E. 481.) {*Synopsis* 4:418.}

death,” and who is *therefore* “crowned with glory and honor.” This truth can only apply to one who is man *personally* -- the Son of Man -- and it is spoken of a *Person* -- Jesus. If it be applied to a Divine Person who chose to assume human form (as God did of old) but who did not become *personally* man, it would be virtually to say, not only that God could be less than God, but that He could be less than the creature. It describes the relative position in nature and being of men towards angels -- “Some little inferior” -- and “Jesus,” as Man, *personally* enters into it in grace, thus to take hold by the hand, not of angels, but of the seed of Abraham. The Spirit of God delights to dwell thus upon His humiliation; it is the basis upon which rest the glories of His *Person* as Man and Son of Man. *For this* He was made “inferior,” He became man in nature and being, that through death He might take His place over all. But is this derogatory to His Person? Far be the thought. The mind of man cannot measure these divine truths. It mars everything it touches: and reduces that which speaks of the most marvelous grace, to its own measure and its own folly. Mere human “*condition*” will not do. He must be man in *nature* and “*person*.” For it is evident that if as *Man* He receives Divine attributes and glory, and exercises Divine prerogatives -- if as *Man* He acts and wills from *Himself*: gives life, raises the dead, executes judgment, receives the kingdom, and delivers it again to the Father, then it must of necessity be as a *Person* that He does so: for to thus act is the evidence of a *Person*. Hence the denial that Christ is “*in person*” both God and *Man*, compels the author to do violence to this truth also, and to imply that as *Man* He has not Divine glory and attributes. A divine Person acting in regard to a human form or condition, said to be *His*, but in no way essential to His *Person*, is neither the Christ we have learnt in humiliation, and suffering, and death, nor the *Man* whom we, by faith, see now at God’s right hand “crowned with glory and honor.” It is not the Christ who was a real, true *Man*, in absolutely holy humanity surely, but yet of Israel (the seed of David) “as according to flesh, the Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever.” This Christ Mr. R. distinctly denies in his tract. He knows no such *Person* in his system as the Christ who is both “God and Man in One Person.” <sup>67</sup>

The reasoning upon the Lord’s names and titles, on the last page, is thoroughly misleading. For although on the surface the illustrations used are *apparently* parallel and similar, they are *actually* very far from being so. To reason from ordinary human beings and titles up to the Lord, whose *Person* is *unfathomable*, leads to deductions of the most serious character. The premises may be correct enough perhaps if applied only to us: they are radically wrong when applied to the Lord, and result in the partition

of His Person. It is, indeed, but another result of the logical application of the principle which separates His *humanity* from His *Person*. In becoming “The Queen,” “The Colonel,” “The Doctor,” the *person* whose dignity or office or profession is thus described is in no way affected. You can say of such “before she was Queen,” or “before he was Colonel,” or “before he was Doctor,” and you do no violence to the *person* of whom you thus speak: for the title is not essential to, or is not, in the words of the tract, “descriptive of the person,” who is so designated. But this is not so with Christ’s Person and names. Herein lies the immeasurable difference. Another has said upon this,

His *Person* comes out strikingly in such passages as “The Son of Man who is in heaven” . . . John distinctly uses it in the way and for the reason mentioned in connection with His *Person* -- the MAN *down here*, yet “The Son of Man who is in heaven” {John 3:13}. <sup>68</sup>

This has no possible meaning if the name “Son of Man” does not describe the *Person* of Christ. Who will attempt to explain this away?

The titles “The Christ” and “Son of Man” not only describe the offices He fills as such, but they also describe “the person that holds the office.” In becoming man and assuming that *nature* which alone could make those titles good, He attaches them essentially to His *Person*. If this were not so, the passage “The Son of Man who is in heaven” {John 3:13}, which brings His humanity and His Divinity so inseparably together in His *Person*, would have no force whatever. We repeat the words of another, “John uses it in the way and for the reason mentioned in connection with His *Person* -- the MAN *down here*, yet ‘The Son of Man who is in heaven.’” “The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father,” yet *Man* down here in this world. Again we repeat, “His *Person* comes out strikingly in such passages as ‘The Son of Man who is in heaven.’” The name describes His *Person*. To deny this is to strike at the integrity of His *Person*, and whilst this denial fits in with, and is necessary to uphold, the teaching of the tract, it is contrary to the Word of God, and subversive of the truth. We may say “before He became man,” because *here* “man” is not the *Person* He is but the nature He took.

The teaching of the tract is not only in *flat contradiction* to the writer we have quoted, but it makes *utter nonsense* of Scripture: for if the Scriptures

The Son of man *came* to minister {Mark 10:45}:

What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up *where He was before* {John 6:62}:

The Son of man which is *in heaven* {John 3:13}, do not involve “any question of the unity of the Person” of

67. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Part XXI., p. 74. *Coll. Writings*, Vol. 3, p. 521. {*Notes and Comments* 6:52; *Collected Writings* 3:331.}

68. *Notes and Comments*, J. N. D., Vol. 2, p. 418. {P. 297.}

Christ, why then did the Lord Himself use the second Scripture quoted for the express purpose of emphasizing the truth of His *Person* which had stumbled His hearers in John 6? But the teaching of this chapter -- its special and distinctive doctrine -- is ignored, and replaced by a Christ whose Divinity alone is essential to His Person. This is the sum and substance of the entire tract.

The Christ therein set forth is a *false* Christ, and bears no resemblance to the *Person* presented in the Word of God by the *Holy Ghost*, whose one object is to honor that blessed *Person* become Man. From beginning to end the tendency of the tract is to depreciate the humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ under the guise of maintaining and presenting the truth of His Person. It is true the *term* "the Word *becoming flesh*" is used, but the relation in which it stands explains the *sense* in which it is used, namely, as an equivalent expression to "a divine Person assuming human condition." The REALITY of it -- a PERSON becoming that which He was not before, *i.e.*, BECOMING Man -- BECOMING flesh, is utterly refused, and concerning it the assertion is made that "This is not the teaching of Scripture, nor do I think it can be entertained."

Let not the inspired warnings of the Apostles be unheeded:

Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, if they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the *Spirit of God*: Every spirit which confesses Jesus Christ *come in flesh* is of God; and every spirit which does not confess Jesus Christ *come in flesh* is not of God: and this is that [power] of the antichrist, of which ye have heard that it comes, and now it is already in the world. Ye are of God, children, and have overcome them, because greater is He that is in you than he that is in the world. They are of the world; for this reason they speak as of the world, and the world hears them. We <sup>69</sup> are of God; he that knows God hears us <sup>70</sup>; he who is not of God does not hear us. <sup>71</sup> From this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error (1 John 4:1-6).

There shall be also among you false teachers, who shall bring in by the bye destructive heresies, and deny the master that bought them (2 Pet. 2:1).

For the time shall be when they will not bear sound teaching; but according to their own lusts will heap up to themselves teachers, having an itching ear; and they will turn away their ear from the truth, and will have turned aside to fables (2 Tim. 4:3, 4).

See that there be no one who shall lead *you* away as a prey through philosophy and vain deceit, according to the teaching of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ. For in Him dwells *all the fulness* of the *Godhead* BODILY (Col. 2:8, 9).

But ye, beloved, building yourselves up on your most

holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, awaiting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life (Jude 20-21).

May saints be aroused, and see to it that they are not robbed of Christ in all that He is as a real, true *Man*, yet God withal; the expression bodily of the substance of the Godhead. Inscrutable in Person as incarnate, having united Godhead and Manhood: human as well as Divine as to His Person, having become ("*in person*") Man, and thus God and Man, but in One Person: accomplishing the work of redemption, as the Man who united in His own Person all the value of His Godhead with the humanity that He took that He might give Himself up: exercising Priestly service towards us in virtue of having taken human *nature*, in which He could suffer and be tempted, and by means of which He is "able to sympathize with our infirmities": receiving Divine attributes as Man, even in humiliation, and going back as the risen Man into the Divine glory.

The "doctrine of Christ" is departed from where these truths are denied. They rest upon the truth concerning the *Person* of Christ, which this teaching subverts. The issue is clear. It is *not* a question of "confusion of thought as between *person* and *condition*," for there is *none*. It is a question of *person* OR *condition*. It is a question whether, "In a word, it was the power of God present in grace in the *person* of the Son of God *taking part in the* NATURE, and interesting Himself in the lot, of a being who had departed from Him." <sup>72</sup> It is a question of whether "GOD HAS BECOME MAN." <sup>73</sup> The one underlying principle of the tract is to deny that He has.

It may be well to point out here that the sequence of Mr. R.'s system in his teachings on *eternal life* and the *humanity* of Christ is clear: as is also their common origin and disastrous results.

What marks the first is:

1. The separation of *eternal life* from the *Person* of the Son.
2. The limitation of *eternal life* to a *condition* characterizing Him as man.

What marks the other is:

1. The separation of His *Manhood* from the *Person* of Christ.
2. The limitation of His *Manhood* to the *condition* of humanity He assumed.

They originate, however little the instrument may be conscious thereof, in the deadly hostility of the enemy to Christ, and they subvert the truth of His *Person*. The *Person* of Christ is the sum and substance of all grace and

69. *i.e.*, The Apostles.

70. *i.e.*, The Apostles.

71. *i.e.*, The Apostles.

72. *Synopsis*, Small Ed., Vol. 3, p. 259. (277, L. E. 310.) {*Synopsis* 3:277.}

73. *Synopsis*, Small Ed., Vol. 3, p. 258. (275, L. E. 308.) {*Synopsis* 3:275.}

blessing, only His work was needed for our participation therein, God being glorified thereby and all that was in the way, through sin, removed. But if His Person -- His *whole Person*, in all its glorious integrity of absolute Deity and *real* and spotless human *nature* be infringed, then His work is naught -- the blessing void.

The denial that He is in *Person* "that eternal life" is to remove the scriptural basis -- "*I am* the bread of life" -- upon which through death, He imparts life to us. "That eternal life which was with the Father" {1 John 1:2} was a Man here in this world, in order not only to show, but to communicate life -- His own life -- to men. Thus even as to the communication of eternal life to us, *the truth is* that He, Himself, is it, or we have it not; for

except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you {John 6:53}.

But if separated from His *Person* the flesh and blood are valueless. All hangs upon His *Person*. This *Person* who had life in Himself as the Son become Man could quicken whom He would. It is He *Himself* -- the last Adam, who is a quickening Spirit {1 Cor. 15:45}. But with *Himself personally* this system allows no link.<sup>74</sup>

The denial that He is in *Person* Man, as well as God, robs His work -- the work of "the Man Christ Jesus" -- of all its atoning value by separating it from His Person. By His Manhood alone the work of redemption could not be accomplished. His Godhead is needed to give value thereto. It is the work of *His whole Person*: the infinite value of His Godhead Being in a taken nature -- God and Man -- being essential to the working out of atonement. He brings all the value of all that He is -- He in whom was life -- into His humanity. This glorious Person -- the Son of God -- the Man Christ Jesus -- unites all the infinite worth of His Divine Being with the ability which was required for one who offers Himself to God as a sacrifice in death to accomplish redemption. He gives Himself up in all the infinite meetness and holy perfections of his inscrutable *Person* "for the putting away of sin by His sacrifice."

The two errors mentioned, undermine the truth of life and propitiation so blessedly brought together in 1 John 4:9, 10, "God sent *His only begotten Son* . . . that we might *live* through *Him*," and "God . . . sent *His Son* a *propitiation* for our *sins*." The whole fabric of the glad tidings is overthrown with the denial of these truths. The *Person* of Christ having been touched *nothing* is left untouched.

Are saints *willing* to give up *the truth* of the PERSON of Christ -- His *whole Person* -- for the systematized error

of men? or will they not rather awake to the significance of this shameless rejection of Divine truth, and in a day when men "will not endure sound doctrine," be found through God's mercy among those who "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints?"

"Philaethes" {A. C. Ord}

## Appendix

To view the Lord Jesus *as Man* in all the perfections and beauties of His ways as such in the pathway He trod in this scene, or in the varied offices He fills, and the place of glory He takes *as Man* according to the counsels of God, *cannot* be too largely insisted on. But this raises no question of His *Person*, if it is the Spirit of God who directs our thoughts. The very fact of such questions being raised here should lead those who raise them to judge that their minds were leading them astray, and cause them to pause and judge their folly. His *Person* in itself is altogether outside the sphere of our meditations whether we contemplate Him in His Godhead or His Manhood. Not of course by this do we mean His *Person* in all its infinite value and beauty and grace and perfections; but His *Person doctrinally*, i.e., the truth of *who He is* and *what He is* in Being and Nature whether as God or as Man. *This* is not a subject which can be divided or defined or comprehended; as J. N. D. has written

How beyond all our wonder and praise is the Person of the blessed Lord! As an Apostle could say and more because he knew it better 'Great is the mystery' . . . No man knows the Son yet He lets us see that He is that which no man knows.<sup>75</sup>

As to His ways and as to His relationships, in the offices He fills and in the activities of His grace, in His sufferings and His sorrows, in His joys and His glories, we may well be engaged with Him *as Man* or as God.

We may look at Him as the weary *Man* at Sychar's well, grieved with the heartlessness of His people, wearied with the journey His love must needs take in order to reach a poor sinful woman, outside the limits of God's earthly dealings, but do we view Him "apart from what He is as God"? or do we not necessarily recall to our souls the truth -- wondrous beyond description as we see Him there -- of *who He is* and *what He is* as God? To abstract what He is as God from our view is to reduce the picture to a bare cold study of the mind: the *heart* cannot thus afford to lose *Him* for a single moment, when we are near Him. We see Him there *a Man* -- weary, thirsty, hungry, grieved at heart with the indifference of His people yet even then finding His joy as Man in making God known to a wretched and unsatisfied heart -- making *Himself* known -- the One who could say "If thou knewest . . . who it is."

74. For as, according to this teaching, Deity *cannot* be connected with manhood, there is the absolute necessity of separating eternal life from the *Person* of the Son, or there is nothing *eternal* brought into manhood at all. And thus, in order to maintain this destructive system, the life which can be imparted to men is separated from HIMSELF.

75. J. N. D., *Notes and Comments*, Vol. 2, p. 111. {P. 78.}

Adorable Person! become a *Man* that He might thus reveal Himself to such poor sinners. We contemplate Him there; we worship that One -- that *Man* who is God.

We may gaze upon Him a *Man* in the home at Bethany, that sweet retreat for His aching heart: retiring from the coldness of the world He made and into which He had come in grace -- from His own people to whom He had come according to the special love He had towards them -- retiring hated and unknown -- to enjoy for a moment the company of those He loved, who gathered there, and whose love to Him He so fully appreciated {John 12:1-3} -- He the lonely *Man* in a contrary scene. Yet what fills to overflowing our cup of joy and praise as we too, in spirit, enter into the sweetness now of that which then filled Mary's heart? Is it not the wondrous yet *unknown* depths of His peerless Person which cause us, together with her, to expend upon Him the worship of our hearts, His worthiness filling the house and ascending to the Father? the fragrance of His Person -- the Man of Sorrows, retreating into the fellowship of those who through grace loved Him -- that gracious One -- the ever blessed God, come down thus to make us know Him in such a manner, in order by the Spirit to produce and draw out this love towards Himself: this love which formed the holy atmosphere at Bethany, as indeed of heaven itself.

What is it gives surpassing beauty to that scene in Simon's house, where we see the Lord as *Man* partaking of the hospitality of the one who had invited Him? Do we see it if we close our eyes to *what He is as God?* or as we see the woman of the city finding a heart she could trust -- finding One she could approach and who would not spurn the love of such an one -- would not gather up His garments as we in our self-righteousness and exterior carefulness would have done -- do we not of necessity remember that *that heart* was the heart of God -- *that One* was God Himself? The mighty fact that He, the thrice Holy One, could thus draw a poor vile sinner to Himself, restful in the confidence of the love He had Himself produced, gives the marvelous charm, in the eyes of those who have in any measure tasted such grace, to this Divine picture of the heart of Jesus.

We may view Him as *Man* asleep on a pillow: as before we have seen Him, wearied with His journey, sitting on the well. What perfections shine in all! Was ever Man, amid such surroundings, like this? Absolutely man, yet so entirely dependent upon God that He can sleep restfully amid the storm of wind and waves: perfect man, utterly cast upon God with no care of circumstances whatever they may be. But is this view complete? Do we shut out the other side -- the background as it were of this lovely picture of human dependence and of Divine power? Should we gain here (even if we could have it) by taking a view of Christ "as man, distinct and apart from what He is as God"? or shall we not find infinite beauty imparted to the scene by seeing *Who He is* -- *what He is*, as God? the

Creator, the Upholder of all things, Who can still the storm, saying "Peace be still," yet having taken the place of man -- "firstborn of every creature" -- in that place trusts God unreservedly, <sup>76</sup> to keep Him in all His ways: moving not a finger for Himself, though how ready to exert His power to remove the faithless fears of His own.

See Him a *Man* in the wilderness tempted of Satan. Fully tested as *Man* in every respect (sin apart), in the scene of the first man's utter failure and ruin. In *nature* and "*in person*" man too, or the testing were incomplete and wanting, yea impossible. *There* really and truly *man*: and found absolutely perfect as *Man*: subject, dependent, obedient. Living by every word that proceeded from God's mouth. Not a movement of will of His own. But who is He who is thus exposed? Who is He who has thus taken *voluntarily*, that God may be glorified, this place of unparalleled testing and trial? What mere *creature* dare expose himself thus? Who is there amongst the most exalted who could do more than be preserved himself through obedience in his own place? None! It is God who is there -- there a *Man* -- and as a *Man*. But He is God -- the Son, who had said, "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God." And the recollection of this gives it its perfection.

We may learn of Him as *Man* when we view Him as the perfect servant -- the subject Son, here in this scene of proud self-will -- a self-will that rejected the lowly Jesus. In the midst of it all, in perfect submission, He says "I thank Thee, O, Father," *even for this*, "because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes" -- "for so it seemed good in Thy sight." *Rejected*, He was to give, and delights to give, *rest* to poor, heavy-laden, burdened sinners: thus, too, show the character of the yoke which was His -- a yoke of perfect, willing service to the Father: doing only His will and *delighting* to do it, though it led in such a path. What yoke of *law* could cause the soul to *delight* therein? but this is the yoke of a Person who wins our poor hearts, and, making the Father known, makes His fellowship ours. What a *Person*! With title to all, yet the rejected one -- the servant Son: delighting to do the Father's will if thereby, not "the wise and prudent," but "babes" might be brought into the same place of favor, and relationships, and subjection, that was His, as *Man*. But even such, lowly -- rejected -- Servant -- whatever the place which, according to the counsels of God and in grace He had taken, how beautiful to see the jealousy of the Father as to His *Person* -- He "the Son," whom though thus come down -- yea, *because* thus come down -- "NO MAN KNOWS BUT THE FATHER." Glorious Person! Philosophy and vain deceit are powerless, where the truth concerning *Himself* holds the mind in subjection.

---

76. See J. N. D., *Practical Reflections on the Psalms*, pp. 26 and 27, in contrast to Mr. R.'s teaching of Christ viewed "as Man distinct and apart from what He is as God."

We add a few extracts from *The Son of God*, J. G. Bellett, 1891 Edition, that it may be seen that the truth Mr. R. sets aside by his teaching has been insisted upon as fundamental truth, *in the very language he refuses*, by more than J. N. D., and thus to show also that no forced interpretation has been made in our quotations, as if to bolster up a “creed” which only unintelligent “orthodoxy” insists upon, and which brethren now passed away rejected as much as F. E. R. In view of the facts it would be *impossible*, consistently with truth, to take such ground as this; and to continue to do so in face of the *multitude of distinct* statements, whose *unquestionable* meaning it is impossible to explain away by any theory of “*person and condition*” such as the tract supplies, would be to lead to doubt as to the sincerity of those who would thus tamper with the *plain meaning of plain words*, uttered by men who can no longer contend for the truth which they so dearly prized and so clearly taught.

“The Person in the manger was the same as on the cross. It was ‘God manifest in the flesh’” (p. 63). “He was as truly ‘God manifest in the flesh’ when on the journey to Egypt in His mother’s arms, as when in Gethsemane, in the glory and power of His person, the enemy coming to eat up His flesh stumbled and fell. He was as simply Emmanuel as an Infant in Bethlehem, as He is now at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens” (pp. 71, 72). “The Person is the same throughout, God and man in one Christ” (p. 168). “That Person will be ‘the eternal wonder and ornament of the creation of God.’ Some may own, in general, the manhood and the Godhead in that Person. But we are also to own the full unsullied glory of each of these. Neither the soul or moral man, nor the temple of the body, is to be profaned. The whole man is to be vindicated and honored” (p. 76). “The person of Christ, and therein His human nature, shall be the eternal object of divine glory, praise, and worship” (pp. 113, 114). “Faith acquaints itself with this whole path of Jesus. It owns in Him the Son while He tabernacles in the flesh among us; and when His course of humiliation and suffering had ended here, faith owns the once rejected and crucified Man glorified in the heavens -- the one Person; God manifested in the flesh here, Man hid in the glory there. As we read of Him and of His blessed, wondrous path: ‘God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory’ (1 Tim. 3:16). He was, indeed, very Man and very God in one Person. *All depends on this ‘great mystery.’* The death of the cross, would be nothing without it, as all would be nothing without that death” (p. 78). Again Mr. Bellett says, “‘His glorious meetness,’ to use very much the language of another, ‘for all the acts and duties of His mediatory office is resolved into the union of His two natures in the same Person. He who was conceived and born of the Virgin was Emmanuel; that is, ‘God was manifest in the flesh’: ‘Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; . . . and His name shall be called Wonderful,

Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace’ (Isa. 9). The One who spake to the Jews, and as a Man was then only a little more than thirty years old, was ‘before Abraham’ (John 8). The perfect and complete work of Christ in every act of His office, in all that He did, in all that he suffered, in all that ‘He continued to do, is the act and work of *His whole person*’. This is the mystery” (p. 101). “By the apostle John . . . the Spirit very specially reveals or declares the link between ‘God’ and ‘flesh’ in the person of Jesus” (p. 86). “And this is the mystery: the assumption of flesh and blood by the Son, so that He became the Kinsman of the seed of Abraham, and then the assumption of that wondrous Person into heaven: ‘God was manifest in the flesh -- received up into glory’” (p. 106). “This is the mystery. It is the same Jesus, Emmanuel, the Son, and yet the Kinsman of the seed of Abraham. And here I would say -- for there is a call for it -- I know we are not to confound the natures in this glorious and blessed One. I fully bow in faith to the truth that the Sanctifier took part of flesh and blood. I avow with my whole soul the true humanity in His person” (p. 109).

And, throughout his *whole* tract, Mr. R. disavows his belief therein: founding his charge of confusion “as between *person and condition*,” upon the fact that we maintain “that the truth of Christ’s Person consists in the union in Him of God and man,” that is, the *union* of the Divine and human *natures* in the *One Person* of Christ. He thus absolutely destroys “the true humanity in His person” -- “*His whole Person*,” and denies that “This is the mystery” of the incarnation.

There is no alternative. If the teaching of the tract be *true*, the doctrines which we have hitherto received are *false*: but if the quotations from those now passed away express the truth, then alas! the doctrine of Mr. R. (whatever hopes we may tremblingly entertain as to himself) is *anti-christian*: it is *apostasy* from the faith.

NOTE. -- References to the Synopsis in brackets are to the pages of the most recent copies, when not otherwise marked; but L. E. marks the larger copies of the Third Edition Revised.

We have used quotations from “Notes and Comments” as, although unrevised, they simply bear out the views of their writer as expressed in his revised works.

N. B. -- The doctrine of Mr. R. concerning the Person of Christ, as developed in the tract we have considered, does not differ *essentially* from that which he taught in 1889 and 1890. It was manifest from the commencement of his propaganda that the effort of the enemy was to divide the PERSON of Christ, and it was evident that Mr. R. did not hold the truth of the indivisibility of that Person, *in its integrity*. The difference is that whilst *now* he *flouts* the truth of the union of manhood with Godhead in Christ, he

*then implied* (in the *most distinct* manner however) that this union, or connection as he then termed it, *could not be*. He *then* insisted (see his letter of Dec. 6th, 1889, together with his paper of July 3rd, 1890) that to keep “the true deity, the eternal Sonship of the Word” clear and distinct from eternal life, was of all importance, because though the latter “was ever an integral part of the Person of the Eternal Son” (whatever that may mean) it was “such as could according to the divine counsels be connected with manhood”; and thus *plainly* he implies that Deity *could not* be thus connected with manhood. Now Mr. R. brands as *error* this doctrine of the union of Godhead and manhood in Christ’s Person, and *boldly* teaches (what so many dear saints would not acknowledge that he taught five years ago) that His manhood is not united with His Godhead in His Person. It is only *human condition*, into which He brought that which was morally of His own Person, so that “Manhood in His case derived its character from what He Himself was.” It is not HIMSELF that we see as the MAN Christ Jesus. The identity of the doctrine which first *implied* and then *asserts* that the union of Godhead and Manhood in Christ is not the truth is thus fairly and unquestionably established. But this awful heresy should have been plain to all in Mr. R.’s teaching concerning the babe in the manger; of whom he said that “He was as a babe the exhibition of infancy in its helplessness, for all else, though there, was for the moment veiled.” Here God *veiled* in flesh is substituted for God *manifest* in the flesh, as the necessary result of a theory which separates His humanity from His Person and replaces this mighty truth by a human condition into which He brings that which can be connected with manhood and is morally *of* Himself, but which is *not* Himself. Because the moral qualities which we are told He brought into manhood were for the moment hidden, in Mr. R.’s eyes, God was not there MANIFESTED in the flesh, but he sees *only* the EXHIBITION of infancy in its helplessness, and ALL else VEILED. Who that owned Christ to be *personally* Man, and whose soul acknowledged “Jesus to be, in the true full sense, ‘God . . . manifest in the flesh’ -- not, as it is commonly slipped out of now also, the manifestation of God in the flesh, but God manifest,” would assert what Mr. R. asserts? NONE. God *manifest* in the flesh speaks to the soul of the Person of the Son incarnate, the Person of Christ, whole and indivisible, and *this* Person Mr. R.’s teaching knows not, and knew not five years ago. He knows and he *knew* a divine Person only, setting forth God morally in human condition, “the manifestation of God in the flesh,” and not God in the Person of the Son taking manhood into union with Himself so as to be God manifest in the flesh in His own Person as Man.



*Note 1:**F. E. R. Heterodox on  
the Person of the Christ*

(By W. Kelly)

. . . Like B. W. N. [Newton] he [F. E. Raven] does not deny the true deity or the perfect humanity of Christ. But the mind of man readily overthrows the truth of His Person otherwise. So Mr. N. did by his teaching that distance in Christ's relation to God was involved in His birth of woman. Still more boldly does F. E. R. assail the common faith of God's elect. This he knows quite well; for he denies that its truth "consists in the union in Him of God and Man." I am content to denounce his own form of denial as a lie against the truth. He has trusted his mind in trying to explain the very point of the Son's inscrutability. The question is not simply of the divine and eternal personality of the Word, but of Him incarnate. The truth no less clearly revealed is that He became flesh, Christ Jesus Man henceforward, as surely as also God from everlasting to everlasting.

It is to the unity of the two natures in His Person that he objects, and in very revolting and contemptuous terms, where reverence and self-distrust were preeminently called for. Yet he knew that he was not only opposing but striving to put shame on the confession of every saint who has written on it, as far as is known through all the church of God, to say nothing of every teacher esteemed among Brethren. Here are his words (7 Dec. 1893): -- "Where the idea of unity of a person is got from I know not. It seems to me perfect nonsense. The idea of person does not bring in the thought of either parts or unity. A person is that person in every variety of relations he may enter. No one would accuse me of dividing the person of the Queen because I said that in her home life she was seen distinct and apart from what she is as Queen. It is two totally distinct ideas coalesced in one person, but which can be separately presented and apprehended."

Now who does not know that a person among men consists of both parts and unity? There are spirit and soul and body; and yet they constitute the person. There may be temporary dissolution of the outer tie by death; there will surely be their unity in one person for eternity. But for the true believer Christ's Person is distinguished from every other by the infinite fact of God and man united thus. These are in Him for ever indissoluble, though no saint

doubts that He is Son of God and Son of man. Whatever His profound emotion in spirit, whatever the conflict when He prayed more earnestly, and His sweat became as great drops of blood, that Man was inseparably God; and as from His conception, so fully in His death and resurrection. Thus had His every word, work, thought, and suffering divine value. It is not the Son alone, but "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and for ever." The man Christ Jesus is not only the one Mediator, but the true God and eternal life; the sent Servant, and the "I AM"; Christ of the fathers as according to flesh, yet He that is over all, God blessed for evermore. Amen.

Deny the unity of His Person, of the Word become flesh; and all the truth of His life and death dissolves. His atoning work is thus utterly subverted; on which depends not only man's salvation, the reconciling of the creature, and the new heavens and earth, but the moral glory of God in view of sin, His counsels of grace as to Christ and the church, and His triumphant rest in men for all eternity. Think of the Queen or any other human being adduced to solve the great mystery of godliness! What have various relations or differing conditions to do with the divine and the human united in one sole Person, the Christ of God, the knot which man's wicked wit and will dare to judge, and essay to untie to his own destruction? Truly "fools rush in where angels fear to tread," and adore. To F. E. R. IT SEEMS PERFECT NONSENSE!

Brethren, have you ever heard of a true Christian who did not thus confess Christ? Here is one called a brother, and claiming to teach, who utters his scornful unbelief of Christ's Person in terms which must have insured his expulsion with horror from all fellowship of saints in former days. Who has a doubt that then it would have raised an impassable barrier? Only of the Lord Jesus could such a unity be predicated, for in Him alone were the two natures for ever united. F. E. R. talks of the Queen! and "two totally different *ideas* coalesced in one person!" Yes, it is not truth, but "ideas" for F. E. R. Is this to "abide in the doctrine of the Christ"?

It is to join Apollinarius of Antioch (the son). He too

made the Logos simply form Christ's Person, as F. E. R. does, and was therefore justly branded as an antichrist; so Nestorius was for dividing the Person, and Eutyches for confusing it: all of them, strict Trinitarians. For if the Logos had not been united to the soul as to spirit and body in the Christ, Christ was not and is not very Man as well as very God. Without that union there must have been two distinct personalities, the divine and the human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth according to scripture. F. E. R. with shameless self-confidence vaunts his idea, which is plain heterodoxy. He does *not* "bring the doctrine" of Christ. The Son did not change His Person, but took up manhood into unity, and this in soul as in body.

In some such way deadly false doctrine befalls such as venture to pry into what is only known to the Father and immeasurably above man's ken. The Apollinarian heterodoxy prevails largely at present; as the error which led to it is a relic of heathen philosophy, accepted by early Fathers such as Clement of Alexandria, and exceedingly common among "thinkers" now as at all times. It pervades Franz Delitzsch's *Psychology* and its English analogue, *The Tripartite Nature of Man*. They (and F. E. R. follows them) make the self-conscious "I" or individuality to reside in man's spirit. But scripture abundantly proves its seat to be in the soul. The spirit is inner capacity *as to* which man is responsible to God; but the soul is that *in* which he is so; and the body is the outer vessel which displays the result, whether by grace for God's will or by self-will in Satan's service.

To the soul belongs the working of the will, and now also since the fall the instinctive knowledge of good and evil; so that one is enticed into fleshly lusts which degrade man, as well as into reasonings of the spirit and every high thing that lifts itself up against the knowledge of God. Hence we read of soul-salvation or "salvation of souls" as in 1 Pet. 1:9. Hence Ezek. 18:4, "Behold, all souls are Mine," and the regular use of "souls" for persons in both O. & N. Testaments. For the self-conscious individual, the responsible person, is in the "I." It is the "I" in self-will without God; the "I" when converted to God, but in bondage of spirit; and the "I" when Christ's deliverance is known in peace and liberty; as for the latter we see in Rom. 7,8. Read also Gal. 2:20.

The error falsifies the truth in human things and yet more in divine. F. E. R. has fallen into Satan's trap in the most solemn of all truths through morbid self-confidence, and the mania of correcting every body by the standard of his fanciful ideas. He has imagined for the Christ a being, Who, if God, is certainly not complete man. For in his theory the soul does not enter Christ's personality which is exclusively the Logos. Thus he bans that unity of the two natures which every saint hitherto confesses to be in

Christ's Person. He was already wrong as to man's person; for like most philosophers he follows the error of the heathen, and ignores the teaching of scripture which points to "the soul" by many plain and irrefragable proofs. But the awful weight of the falsehood lies in his audacious rising up against faith's mystery of Him Who was manifested in flesh (the body prepared for God's Son), not taken up as a mere condition but united with Himself indivisibly to all eternity for God's counsels, work, and ways. If we can rightly say condition, it is that of humanity sustained by Deity in the Person of the Christ.

Beyond doubt the union of God and man in one Person is the wondrous and unfathomable One revealed, not for our comprehension, but for unquestioning faith, love, and honor as we honor the Father. He is thus at once the weary man and the only-begotten Son that *is* (not "was" merely) in the Father's bosom; the Son of man here below that *is* in heaven, and the "I am" on earth threatened by the Jews with stoning because He told them the truth. He must have been the Logos to have been what He was here as man. His soul was united to the Logos: else the Person had been doubled or severed, and He could not be true and complete man. He cried, Let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt. There was His holy will; and it was right to lay it before His Father, but in entire submissiveness to His will and glory; of which none but a divine Person was capable. It was not therefore the Logos superseding the spirit (still less the soul), but perfectly associated with the soul in His one Person. He was true man and true God in the same indivisible Person. In Him dwelt and dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

Yet it is deep pain to feel compelled to speak out plainly, on such a theme not only before others liable to stumble, but in the sense of one's own danger of offending against God's word in defense of what is dearer than life, and far beyond man's thought. Indeed some may be surprised to learn that it was most distasteful to say anything more. A warning I did give in 1890, and a brief leaflet, when the Weston-super-mare Notes disclosed the impious libel against the Lord, that, "Becoming a man, He *becomes* Logos." Many hoped that it might be but a slip; but if so, why was it not confessed in sackcloth and ashes? Understanding that it has been defended since, what must one fear? At any rate when the volume unasked for was sent to me, not a page was read for years. At length having dipped into it, I perceived an astounding progress of unabashed evil. Even then I intended no more than a short paper on "Life Eternal," and another on its denial as a present gift. As one read on, it seemed a duty to expose unsparingly the system of error in general. This may account for a lack of due order through enlarging the original design.

W. Kelly.

## Note 2:

### *Did the Incarnation Dissolve on the Cross?*

If Christ did not have a human soul and spirit, it follows that when He on the cross dismissed His spirit, “**He dismissed Himself**,” i.e., the deity left the body; and that means that the incarnation dissolved. The truth is that He had a human soul and spirit, which remained united to the deity while His body lay in death. Thus there was no dissolution of the incarnation. Along with other blasphemous doctrines, F. E. Raven taught that the deity was the spirit of manhood in the person of Christ. He was followed in this by J. B. Stoney, C. A. Coates and James Taylor, Sr., etc., as we shall see.

W. Kelly rightly said of F. E. Raven:

This man’s mission is not from the Holy Spirit, but from an opposing and evil spirit to seduce unwary souls from the truth they once seemed to enjoy into a whirlpool of confusion and corrupting error.<sup>1</sup>

F. E. R.’s teaching concerning the incarnation, W. Kelly rightly denounced as Apollinarian.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. *F. E. R. Heterodox*, London: T. Weston, 1902, p. 43.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 124. The doctrine may be summarized as follows:

Apollinaris at first asserted that the Logos united with a human body only. Afterwards he modified this, by asserting that He united with a body and an irrational soul . . . Apollinaris, from the account given of him by Gregory of Nyssa (Adv. Apollinarem) seems to have blended and confused the human and divine natures even in the Godhead; for he asserted a human element in the divine essence itself. (W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, vol. 2A, p. 312).

A creed called the Chalcedonian creed was issued in 451 A.D. by the Council of Chalcedon in response to a number of attacks on the Person of Christ. Apart from the use of the phrase “Mother of God” it is sound.

With the followers of Apollinaris, called Apollinarians, in view, this creed stated:

Perfect in Deity and perfect in Humanity, Truly God and truly Man, Of a rational soul and body, Consubstantial with the Father according to His Deity, Consubstantial with us according to his Humanity, Like us in all respects, apart from sin . . .

The expression, “Of a rational soul” (those who consider man to be tripartite, and rightly so, will find the rational faculty in the spirit, 1 Cor. 2:11) was aimed at the Apollinarians. In addition to F. E. R.’s denial that Christ had a human spirit, he also had some such doctrine concerning manhood and deity, for he taught that all that characterizes manhood He brought with Him.

F. E. R.’s Apollinarian doctrine was enunciated in a paper titled, *The Person of the Christ*, printed in June 1889, one year before Bexhill acted in June 1890 to separate from Greenwich, which was sheltering F. E. R. In this paper he said:

The second error maintains that the truth of Christ’s Person consists in the union in Him of God and man . . . The idea of the unity of the Person in the sense asserted is not found. It is a Person in a condition in which He was not previously.

He is here arguing against the orthodox statement that Christ is God and man united in one Person. The “union in Him of God and man” means that man as human body, human soul, and human spirit was united to the deity. This is the truth F. E. R. here denies. His teaching, the “Person in a condition,” means the Deity clothed Itself, as it were, in a human body, so that the Deity was the spirit of the body. That body, this means, had no human spirit. He also said:

[Christ] is not a man in the sense that He is God . . . In Person He is God, in condition He is Man.

Gal. 4:4. The same Person abides, though the condition be changed, in His coming of a woman.

Every Scripture which definitely refers to the incarnation speaks of it as the assumption by Christ of a form or condition.

In the expression, “Father into Thy hands I commend my spirit” I judge that the Lord takes up an expression suited to the position in which He was. But it is the Person who left the condition, which He had assumed, to take it again . . .<sup>3</sup>

Look at the wickedness of the last statement. “The Person who left the condition” means the Lord did not dismiss a human spirit. According to F. E. R., what He dismissed as the spirit of the body was the Deity. Therefore, as his followers expressed it, **He dismissed Himself**.

---

3. *Quemerford Notes*, pp. 145-6. Cited in B. M., *A Brief History of Ravenism*, p. 5.

Query - Why is He not personally Man?

Mr. Raven - He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one. He is the Son, but in the condition of a Man.<sup>4</sup>

J. N. Darby wrote:

I am quite aware of and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one person . . . And this last statement, that Christ had no human personality, no ego, which is really heresy (though God and man were united in one person), and the mere folly of man attempting to fathom the mystery of His person, when He had said, "No man knoweth the Son but the Father" . . .<sup>5</sup>

F. E. R. would not confess the union of God and man in one Person, which all fundamentally sound Christians confess.

I believe the old notion of the union of God and man to be wrong. I do not think it was meant wrongly, but, in the light of what has come out now, it was incorrect.<sup>6</sup>

Consider F. E. R.'s blasphemy concerning the Son's empty- ing Himself (May 2, 1896):

. . . the Son emptied Himself -- in mind took a place lower than that of God in which He could say, "My Father is greater than I" . . .<sup>7</sup>

Since Christ had, according to F. E. R.'s teaching, no human mind (for He had no Human spirit), these words really mean that in the divine mind, which is the Deity, He took a lower place than God. What revolting blasphemies! He continued,

I hardly care for the expression "He took human nature into union with Himself." I do not like the term "union" in this connection. It is hardly the scriptural way of speaking of the incarnation. There it is "become flesh," "took upon him the form of a servant," etc., etc., none of these passages convey the thought of union, but rather identification of a Person with a state or form assumed.<sup>8</sup>

W. Kelly wrote:

Without that union there must have been two distinct personalities, the divine and human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth according to Scripture. F. E. R. with shameless self-confidence vaunts his idea, which is plain heterodoxy. He does *not* "bring the doctrine" of Christ. . . who utters his scornful unbelief of Christ's Person in terms

which must have ensured his expulsion with horror from all fellowship of saints in former days.<sup>9</sup>

The notion that a divine Person was the spirit of the body of our Lord would in effect mean that when He advanced in wisdom (Luke 2:40), the divine Person advanced in wisdom. That is absurd. The notion means, furthermore, that when He delivered up His spirit (John 19:30), "**He dismissed Himself.**" Thus, since in F. E. R.'s scheme the Lord only had a body (no human soul and spirit), when He died, the divine Person was no longer connected with manhood in any way. It follows that in death, on the cross, He was no longer man. The incarnation dissolved. Furthermore, the resurrection then amounted to another incarnation, i.e., He came into "the condition of manhood" once again. These two scriptures alone would be sufficient to show the evil of his views. The truth is that while Christ was dead, the human soul and human spirit remained united to the Deity. However, this would not fit the system, as the following quotation shows:

The doctrinal basis of Mr. R.'s doctrine is that Christ, at incarnation, took the first man's condition of humanity -- but an impersonal one, which was "not commensurate with the spiritual being" (*Some Letters*, pp. 7, 8, 12). Therefore its inadequacy and incompetency to exhibit eternal life, and consequently the necessity that that condition should be laid aside, and moreover, that from that condition of humanity. "Christ was wholly separated by death, in order to be eternal life" -- "a new man" -- and to accomplish reconciliation, it had to be "terminated judicially in the cross, in the Man Christ Jesus" (*The Person*, p. 2). What follows this ending of Christ's incarnate impersonal humanity? Mr. R. teaches that a risen and glorified Christ is as to His humanity a new creation, a new man., which he affirms equally of Christ and of us (*Some Letters*, p. 5; *Eternal Life*, by F. E. R., p. 7). In His incarnate humanity Christ was the "old" in contrast to the "new" which He now is (*Eternal Life*, p. 3; *The Person*, p. 2).<sup>10</sup>

The reader will comprehend these remarks by observing that in the evil system the resurrection of Christ really amounts to another incarnation, as was pointed out above. The fundamental evil opened a totally new sphere of doctrine for the instrument of Satan to mystically apprehend, and propound as new light and advanced truth among those who refused to bow to the Bexhill action of June 1890, separating from F. E. R. and Greenwich, which

4. *Truth for the Time*, Part 7, May, 1895. Cited in N. Noel, *The History of the Brethren*, 2:547.

5. *Collected Writings* 29:322, Morrish ed.

6. *Readings and Addresses in the United States and Canada, October 1902*. Revised by F. E. R., London: Morrish, p. 314.

7. *Letters of F. E. Raven*, Stow Hill; Kingston-on Thames, p. 117, 1963.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

9. *F. E. R. Heterodox*, London: Weston, p. 123, 124, 1902. F. E. R. misrepresented his opposers. He is not to be excused as if this was unintentional. He wrote:

These [the two natures] may be said to be mysteriously blended in one, the unity of the Person, but that is as great an error as if they were spoken of as distinct and apart in Him. (From, *The Person of Christ*.)

Thus he set up a phoney opponent. That is not what his opponents were teaching.

10. *An Answer to . . . What is Ravenism?*, p. 10.

supported him.

In a letter dated July 1, 1895 F. E. R. wrote:

---- accuses me of not holding the real humanity of Christ because I will not accept his idea of a complete man 'spirit, soul and body,' distinct from Deity. He seems to me to have no idea of the Son becoming Man and giving a spirit to manhood, in fact of the incarnation.<sup>11</sup>

C. A. Coates, who imbibed F. E. R.'s system, said:

A divine Person has come into manhood . . . .<sup>12</sup>  
 . . . the Son of God, a divine Person in manhood . . .  
 . . .<sup>13</sup>  
 The Lord's spirit went to paradise the moment He died  
 . . .<sup>14</sup>  
 It shows, too, how entirely He has taken the place of man, because *His spirit was Himself*.<sup>15</sup>

That is a sample of the new form of language -- it clothes the Apollinarian doctrine. "*His spirit was Himself*" means that the "spirit" was the Deity; that He had no human spirit as you and I have.

J. Taylor, Sr. wrote:

Our Lord Jesus, though really man, begotten of the Holy Ghost, born of the divinely-overshadowed vessel, was uncreate, though He entered His own creation, and His holy humanity had no link with that of fallen man. As to *His spirit, it was Himself* -- the Son . . . And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man. The omission of 'in spirit' in [Luke 2] verse 40 is important as confirming that His spirit was Himself personally and could not be spoken of as in our case.<sup>16</sup>

*His spirit was Himself*.<sup>17</sup>

The shifty way in which teachers of evil doctrine often express themselves is illustrated in the following quotation from J. Taylor, Sr.:

Every soul that loves Him and bows to scripture would surely admit that while becoming flesh He changed His estate He could not and did not change in any way His personality, and still more would reject any suggestion

that henceforth there became embodied in Him two personalities. The thought is abhorrent! Nor would any reverent soul assert that He received, as we, a *created* spirit. Yet HE HIMSELF, THE SON, became and abides forever really, actually Man, in all that holy manhood involves. Having become Man, how could His *spirit* be other than human though never ceasing to be divine? for He brought into manhood all that was perfect in manhood according to God. It was surely as was said, *Himself*, for passing into death, in Luke, He commends *His spirit* to His Father. His death was a reality, as His burial attests (p. 279).

At the same time, to speak of Him having a *human spirit* savors of dividing up what scripture does not, and might seem to imply something added to Him (Note to page 279).<sup>18</sup>

C. A. Coates wrote:

As to waxing strong in spirit, you have no doubt noticed that the Editors omit "in spirit," which leaves the expression as to waxing strong a general one, which is quite easy to understand as going along with advancing in stature, and belonging, of course, to the condition into which He had come . . . .<sup>19</sup>

C. A. C made the same point about "in spirit" being omitted as J. Taylor, Sr. did. C. A. C. said, "because His spirit was Himself." J. Taylor, Sr. said, "As to His Spirit, it was Himself."

Regarding the Lord's dismissal of His spirit, F. E. Raven said:

But it is the Person who left the condition.

All three agree; the spirit that left the body was the deity and did not involve a human spirit. All three were Apollinarians.

It seems incredible that a man who believes the spirit of Christ was "the divine Person" could explain Luke 2:46 thus -- Christ's answers:

. . . were not what He knew as God, but what He had learned from God in the place of an instructed One.<sup>20</sup>

Since his view is that the immaterial part of Christ was only the divine Person, this involves a divine Person learning. We might think it is difficult to know whether the stupidity of these notions exceeds the blasphemy or not; but see what heaven does to the mind.

And now we come to J. B. Stoney. His mystical system was at work during the last few years of J. N.

11. *Letters of F. E. Raven*, Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill, p. 107, 1963.

12. *An Outline of Luke's Gospel*, Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill, p. 293.

13. *Ibid.* pp. 283, 286).

14. *Ibid.* p. 291. He means by "spirit" the Deity, as the next quotation shows.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 292.

16. Cited by F. B. Hole in *Modern Mystical Teachings and the Word of God*, p. 38, from *Mutual Comfort*, pp. 172, 199, (1920). Found also in N. Noel, *The History of the Brethren* 2:588. See also p. 599 for another citation.

17. *Letters of James Taylor, Sr.*, Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill, vol. 1., p. 272, 1956.

18. J. Taylor, Sr., *Mutual Comfort*, p. 279 (1920), as quoted by N. Noel, *The History of the Brethren* 2: 599. Italics in the quotation were added by N. Noel.

19. *Letters of C. A. Coates*, Kingston-on-Thames: Stow Hill, p.301, n.d.

20. *Letters of C. A. Coates*, p. 300.

Darby's life. An examination of articles appearing in J. B. Stoney's magazine, *Voice to the Faithful*, vol. 11 (I do not know if J. B. S. authored those criticized by J. N. Darby) is found in *Letters of J. N. Darby* 3:482-491. J. N. D. referred to "a settled system" (p. 488); says, "Your remarks, I think, are constantly fancies" (p. 489); warns, "... Satan found opportunity to mix your own imagination with it, and introduce what tended to sap the reality of truth" (p. 491). A few more remarks are found on pp. 472, 473. Further remarks are found on life and new creation in vol. 3, pp. 14, 15 and concerning related matters on pp. 54-56. An article received by J. N. D. in 1875 (vol. 3, pp. 439-441), found in *Food for the Flock* 2:1, tends in the same line. (That article was not written by J. B. Stoney). J. N. D. rejected the system which many think was "new light."

While J. B. Stoney had many good things to say, he was moving into mysticism that also ensnared F. E. Raven. It is likely that J. B. S. developed F. E. R. who in turn led J. B. S. into supporting and personally holding and propagating fundamentally evil doctrine.

On Dec. 19, 1895 F. E. Raven wrote,

For myself I can say that there is no one on earth whose ministry and self have produced so lasting a moral effect on me as Mr. Stoney.<sup>21</sup>

Let us now examine some things that appeared in Mr. Stoney's magazine. B. W. K. wrote:

Those who say that the Son of God, or the eternal Son, the Christ, and eternal Life are identical or interchangeable terms (and there are such) have evidently lost the all important distinction between the blessed Lord as a divine Person and as Man . . . .<sup>22</sup>

Thus, Mr. Stoney allowed the printing of blasphemy in his magazine. This doctrine means that the Son was not eternal life essentially in His divine, eternal Being.

The *Voice*, 1891, p. 257, says, "Things and people continue in ordinary agreement until a greater light from God is made known, and then a division ensues . . ." This is sanction of F. E. Raven, not ignorance of what he was really saying. I do not know if J. B. S. wrote that article.

While no editor of any magazine would agree to accept responsibility for every expression and notion printed in his magazine, when such vital truth is touched, an editor is responsible.

Query - Why is He not personally Man?

Mr. Raven - He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one. He is the Son, but in the condition of a Man.<sup>23</sup>

Compare that with the following from J. B. Stoney:

The truth is that God was manifest in flesh; the divine Being, a Spirit, took bodily human form . . . The opposers want to have two persons in one, man and God, one time to act as God and at another to act as man. They really do not see the incarnation. They do not see that He who was God became man and hence a man out of heaven. They would have Him to be a man in flesh and blood, and in a way distinct from His being God -- whereas He is God, and He, that same Person, became a man in flesh and blood, but He came from God, He brought everything with Him.<sup>24</sup>

This is the same Apollinarianism as in F. E. Raven; and not only that, but the same doctrine that the second man was ever essentially in the Son, in eternity, is also in this statement. It is an integrated system of fundamental evil.

In 1893 J. B. Stoney said:

The divisions among us all spring from not understanding the mystery, and the nature of Christ; they are intimately connected.<sup>25</sup>

If this statement is true, then J. B. S did not understand the mystery because he, along with F. E. R., was fundamentally unsound on the Person of Christ.

Mr. Stoney, we see, imbibed the main parts of F. E. R.'s evil doctrine. In June 1894, F. E. R. stated in a letter:

I know of no divergence of thought between myself and J. B. S.<sup>26</sup>

W. Kelly wrote:

It is to join Apollinarus of Antioch (the Son). He too made the Logos simply form Christ's Person, as F. E. R. does, and was therefore justly branded an Antichrist . . . F. E. R. with shameless self confidence vaunts his idea, which is plain heterodoxy.<sup>27</sup>

J. N. Darby wrote:

. . . He was a true man, body and soul, and, one may add, spirit. This was called in question by heresy as

23. *Truth for the Time*, part 8, May 1895. Cited in N. Noel, *History ...* 2:547.

24. *Letters from J. B. Stoney*, Kingston-on-Thames: Stow hill, vol. 1, p.127, n.d. The cover on my copy says "New Edition" while inside it says "second series." The Ravenite publisher is Stow Hill. Also cited by the Ravenite, A. J. Gardiner, *The Recovery and Maintenance of the Truth*, p.142.

25. *Ministry of J. B. Stoney* 2:455.

26. *Letters of F. E. Raven*, Stow Hill, 1963, p. 90.

27. *F. E. R. Heterodox*, p. 124.

21. *Letters of F. E. Raven*, Stow Hill, 1963, p. 111; also p. 135.

22. *Voice to the Faithful*, 1891, p. 11 (J. B. Stoney, editor). The division from F. E. R. and those supporting him, came in June 1890.

soon as His deity was.<sup>28</sup>

Persons who hold such doctrines (as F. E. R., J. B. S., C. A. C. & J. T., Sr.), are antichrists and heretics.

R. A. Huebner

---

28. *Collected Writings* 23:478 (Morrish ed.).





*Scripture:  
Its Inspiration  
and authority,*

With Remarks on two Lectures recently delivered in  
the Temperance Hall, Bristol, by the  
Rev. F. M. Wilson, M.A., Head Master of Clifton College,

Entitled:

“Why Men do not Believe the Bible”

by

Alex. Craven Ord

*Prefatory Remarks*

A question of deepest importance to all Christians at the present moment has been raised by statements made recently in Lectures delivered by the Rev. J. M. Wilson. The groundless assumptions contained in these Lectures, and the freehanded and deliberate way, in which the faith of ages which has produced such mighty results in the past history of Christianity and of the world, has been dismissed -- to make way for modern and ill supported ones on the Inspiration of the Scripture -- theories which successively melt away before the inroads of unbelief, has given great pain to many minds. These Lectures appear like dismantling and undermining the fortifications of Christianity, and this by one of its professed friends, in order to conciliate its enemies, who are only too ready to take advantage of such a mistake; whilst weak minds are disturbed, and the wavering induced to conclude, seeing the main prop and stay of Christianity surrendered, that it cannot be maintained in its integrity against all attacks. The warning “*Equo ne credite*,” given to the Trojans when, unconscious of their danger, they introduced into the citadel the Grecian horse filled with armed foes, may well be repeated here. The object of these pages is to show how dangerous in their nature, and how futile and unwarrantable, are these concessions to the infidel, and that Christians may be on their guard against receiving them, as well as that they may understand, how firm is the foundation which the Word of God affords, as the basis of faith.

## *Scripture: Its Inspiration and authority*

Mr Wilson tells us that the Bible contains "The Word of God," but not the "Words of God," that the apostles claimed weight for their writings not because they were inspired, but "on account of their accuracy as eye witnesses." <sup>29</sup>

Is Mr. Wilson correct in this representation of apostolic doctrine on the subject, or has he totally misapprehended the claims of Scripture and the authority of the apostolic and other writings both of the Old and New Testaments? For he also surrenders the account of the "Creation," "the Fall of Man," and the "Deluge," as not necessarily to be believed.

Now if we have not what comes directly and immediately from God, we have no divine warrant for faith, nor (as Mr. Wilson consistently allows to his opponents) is there guilt in the rejection of a divine testimony. Faith is the reception of what God says, because He says it: "He that hath received His testimony, hath set to his seal that *God is true*, for He whom God hath sent *speaketh the words of God*" (John 3:33, 34). "He that is of God heareth *God's words*" (John 8:47). "He that rejecteth Me and heareth not *my words*, hath One that judgeth him, the Word that I have spoken the same shall judge him at the last day" (John 12:48). "God's words" are to have their weight in every soul; if received in faith, they bring salvation and eternal life (John 6:68, 69); if rejected, it is at the peril of the rejector, for how could God speak or address Himself to man, with evidence enough that He has done so, and the treatment of His word be a matter of indifference? If it be a question merely of the apostles' accuracy apart from inspiration, all this would be out of place. The reply would be, there is no certainty that they accurately reported what they heard, so that we should be bound by their statements as the words of God, having the weight which belongs exclusively to Himself when He speaks, whatever may be the instrument He employs.

Perhaps Mr. Wilson may say that he does not deny that our blessed Lord Himself spake the words of God, but the apostles' *report* of His acts and words, is what he refers to, and for which he says, they did not claim inspiration. But even so, we have no *divine certainty* of truth -- no revelation from God, with the absolute certainty belonging to what

comes from Him. The apostles may have had this for themselves, but we are left without it; and all the blessedness involved in the fact that God has come so near to us, and that we have heard His voice, and that voice addressing us in Christianity, in its tenderest and most gracious accents, is lost. Have we then no security that these precious communications have reached us, with all their momentous import for time and eternity: "words of eternal life" (John 6:68) and of which the Savior says, "He that sent Me is true, and I speak to the world those things that I have *heard of Him*" (John 8:26); and again, "All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you" (John 15:15). Hear His own statement as to the special function of the Spirit of Truth, the power of all divine light and knowledge, when sent down from heaven to the apostles. "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My Name, He shall teach you all things and *bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you*" (John 14:26). The distinct object of His mission, was, to bring the very words of Christ to their remembrance, as well as to be an unerring infallible guide into all truth, even such as was not yet made known unto them. His presence and operation were purposely intended, that they might not be left to the uncertainty of the human mind and memory unaided, in that which they had to communicate, for the blessing of the people of God through all this dispensation. Moreover these fresh revelations that he would make, unfolding Truth in its divine range and showing them things to come, He would give as definite communications from the Father and the Son. "Howbeit when He, the

Spirit of Truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth for He shall not speak of Himself; but *whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak*: and He will show you things to come" (John 16:13). Thus He was to give with distinct certainty, the words of God as He received them, and that by revelation to the apostles.

Listen to their own testimony on the same point. Writing to the Corinthians the apostle Paul tells us, that as the things of a man are only known to "the spirit of man which is in him; even so, the things of God knoweth no man; but the Spirit of God." "But God hath revealed them to us (the apostles) by His Spirit"; received expressly that, "we might know the things that are given to us of God." But are they only thus revealed by the Spirit to the apostles, so that in the communication of them to others, they are left to themselves? Far from it. "Which things we speak (adds

---

29. These extracts are taken from the newspaper reports of the lectures, which appeared before their publication by Mr. Wilson. Subsequent quotations are from the latter exclusively.

the apostle) not in *the words* which man's wisdom teacheth; *but which the Holy Ghost teacheth*" (1 Cor. 2:11-13). So that not only the substance, but the form of communication was divine. What can be plainer than "the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth"? I do not say, as has been implied, that He does not use the mind of man in this; but that mind, which it should be remembered, He Himself created, divinely inspired and directed, so as to communicate only and precisely what God intended to be conveyed.

Accordingly the apostles everywhere claim divine authority for what they *write* and *teach*. In this very epistle, writing -- not respecting the highest aspects of revealed truth, but concerning the use of Gifts and Order in the assembly of believers -- the apostle adds: "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are *the commandments of the Lord*" (1 Cor. 14:37). So positive and absolute is the consciousness of this authority, that where the apostle only gives his own judgment, he shows that however valuable this judgment might be, it had quite another character. "But I speak this by permission and not by commandment" (1 Cor. 7:6). This permission, however, lets us know that he was authorized to express his judgment, though it had not the supreme sanction attached to the words of God only. Again, the apostle John says, "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us (the apostles): he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error"<sup>30</sup> (1 John 4:6). The authority with which he wrote was so absolutely of God, that if a man was of God he would bow to it, and prove his relation to God by so doing. These communications, moreover, could be used as an unerring standard and test of truth and error for whatever was presented to those who had them. The apostle Peter also, warning of scoffers who should come in the last days, saying, "Where is the promise of His coming," refers to the prophets of Old Testament Scripture and puts his own epistles and those of the other apostles upon the same footing, as expressing the authoritative communication of the Lord Himself. Writing both epistles, he says, "that ye should remember *the words* that were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Savior through your apostles" (2 Peter 3:1, 2. Rev. ver.).

Everywhere our Lord and His apostles recognize a body of writings which they speak of as "Scripture" or "holy

Scriptures," or "*the oracles of God*" (Rom. 3:2; Acts 7:38) as an infallible standard of appeal which settled every question. "It is written," was enough from the lips of the Lord, on each occasion, to silence Satan, who dared not to dispute with Him the authority of the Word. It is written, man shall not live by bread alone, but by *every word* which proceedeth out of the mouth of God (Matt. 4:4) so that the Lord sets His solemn seal upon the Old Testament Scriptures as giving us the very words which came from "the mouth of God," and as such, the source of life to man. Indeed, in one passage He puts the *written* record of Old Testament Scripture as a recognized authority above the *spoken* Word, even though that Word was His own.<sup>31</sup> "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust: for had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me: but if ye believe not *his writings* how shall ye believe *My words*?" (John 5:45-47). Of such infinite import, as regards the eternal welfare and the standing of the Jews with the Father, are these very writings, of which Mr. Wilson says, "It is plain that any teaching of verbal inspiration or infallibility of the Old Testament is not traceable to the teaching of Christ." Again, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the Lord, in Abraham's reply to the desire of the rich man, that his brethren should not come into the place of torment, shows the fearful consequences of not listening to Moses and the prophets, adding, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead (Luke 16:29-31). In controversy again with the Jews, the Lord citing a passage from the Old Testament to prove His divine title against their questioning, with the words, "The Scripture cannot be broken," silences them, while He specifies the inviolable character of a single statement of the written law of God. To close this testimony of our Lord in the Gospels, we have His own explanation to His disciples after He has risen, recognizing the three divisions of the Old Testament as they stand in the Hebrew Bible, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things *must be fulfilled* which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures" (Luke 24:44, 45). To Him those Scriptures were sacred, as expressing the mind of God; hence the value of the divinely opened understanding to enter into them. So much is this the case, that the special prophetic announcement respecting His treatment by man, in the last moments of His life on earth, is recorded by the apostle John in connection with His intentional fulfillment of Scripture: "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, *that the Scripture might be fulfilled*, saith, 'I thirst.' When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, He

30. This is the very claim that our Lord makes for His own words: "He that is of God heareth God's words: ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God" (John 8:47). What presumption it would be, unless conscious of Divine authority, for any one to make such a demand to be listened to. No one now can assert such a claim, though we have this divine standard by which to judge: "Continue thou," says the apostle to Timothy, "in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of *whom* thou hast learned them." The Old Testament takes the same ground: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20). In the Revelations the apostle John not only assumes the authority of all he writes, but he guards the whole by a warning of fearful consequences to him who should "add to, or mutilate *the words* of the prophecy of this book" (Rev. 22:18, 19).

31. This corresponds with what we find in the Acts, where the Jews at Berea are commended, as more noble than others, for trying even the word of an apostle by the Scriptures, which they knew they had received from God. "They searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so; therefore many of them believed" (Acts 17:11, 12).

said, 'It is finished': and He bowed His head and gave up the Ghost" (John 19:28, 30). The apostle adds, that the conduct of the soldiers in only piercing His side, while they brake the legs of the two malefactors hanging on either side, was a twofold fulfillment of what Scripture had recorded (v. 36, 37) as also was their casting lots for the tunic instead of rending it; "these things therefore the soldiers did" (v. 24). For the Lord himself says; "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, *one jot* or *one tittle* shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. 5:18). With our Lord and His apostles Scripture is infallible -- "must be fulfilled" in its most exact and minutest particulars. It is just this to which Mr. Wilson objects as "literal" and "verbal."

In Rom. 3 the apostle Paul speaks of the advantages the Jews possessed, as the chosen people of God; the chief of which was in having the Scriptures, which he terms "the *Oracles of God*" (cp. Heb. 5:12, 13), committed to them. No language can be more distinctly expressive of what has come from the lips of God, and he adds that their effect cannot be neutralized by the partial unbelief of that word by man, "Yea let *God be true*, and every man a liar, that Thou mightest be justified in *Thy sayings*, and mightest overcome when Thou art judged." For these words of God will be the ground of His judgment hereafter, as our Lord plainly indicates (John 12:48). Stephen, addressing the Jews, speaks of Moses as the Mediator, who received "the *living Oracles*" of God to give unto us (Acts 7:8); and the apostle Peter uses similar language, contrasting the abiding eternal nature of the word of God, with the glory of man, and his fleeting condition. "Being horn again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the *word* of God, which liveth and abideth for ever" (1 Peter 1:23). Incorruptible and eternal, it could be a source of life in the soul, which it stamped with its own abiding character, whilst everything connected with this scene fades away. For this he quotes the striking testimony of the Old Testament prophet Isaiah: "The word of the Lord endureth for ever" (Isa. 5:25).

Let the reader judge for himself, how completely the divine authorship of Scripture becomes apparent, by the character of the expressions made use of, in what has been cited; or in even more formal declarations of utterances by the Holy Ghost, such as: "David himself said *by the Holy Ghost*" (Mark 12:36). "Well *spake the Holy Ghost* by the prophet Isaiah" (Acts 28:29). "The Scripture must needs be fulfilled which *the Holy Ghost spake* concerning Judas" (Acts 1:16). "Which *God hath spoken* by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts 3:21). What comes from the mouth expresses what is in the mind -- hence we have ascribed to Scripture the purpose, intention, or mind of Him who inspired it, whilst the mind of man is also constantly engaged. "Those things which *God before had showed* by the month of all His prophets that Christ should suffer He hath so fulfilled" (Acts 3:18).

The Scripture *foreseeing* that God would justify the heathen through faith" (Gal. 3:8). "The *Holy Ghost this signifying*" by what was specified as to the High Priest (Heb. 9:8). This corresponds with what the apostle Paul states, when warning us as to the last days and their perilous character, he gives as the special safeguard and security for the people of God, in these very times in which we are found, that "All Scripture is 'Theopneustic,' or 'God breathed,'" containing the full declaration of the thoughts of God and His will for man in all times, and under all circumstances; suitable, even for the guidance of a child to salvation through faith in Christ Jesus; or to render the advanced servant of Christ, skilled and equipped for all the work of God. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3:15-17). Again, contemplating departure from the Truth in the Church of God, the same apostle does not lead us to place any reliance upon an apostolic succession, or derivative human authority; but says, "I commend you to God, and to *the word of His grace*" (Acts 20:32). And this being in view of the loss of apostolic care and guidance, renders all the more striking testimony to the importance and sufficiency of Scripture.

It appears then that the Inspiration of Scripture embraces and makes known definitely the highest thoughts and counsels of God, or descends to details such as we find in the directions given respecting the Tabernacle, giving to these last a significance which they could not have had of themselves. But it is the Holy Ghost who indites the whole, so that what is written cannot be limited to the narrow scope of the mind of man. For this reason the apostle Peter says that the prophecy of Scripture is not of any *private* interpretation, i.e. what attaches to the mind or circumstances of the individual through whom it was given, although all this might be included in it: "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (1 Peter 1:21). If it came not by "the will of man" it is because it proceeded from a source above that will, and hence is not to be interpreted except according to the divine spring and mover of the utterances, and not merely by the individual's own (ἰδίος) measure of thought and interest. This accords with another passage of the same apostle when writing of the same Old Testament prophets, he says that it was matter of research, not what they meant in their prophecy, but what "the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify." The Holy Ghost gave therefore the breadth and character of the divine mind to what He inspired. It is on this account that the apostle Paul brings in -- not the prophet Jeremiah from whom he quotes, as a witness to prove the complete forgiveness of sins, founded on the acceptance of the sacrifice of Christ, but says -- "Whereof *the Holy Ghost* also is a witness to us" (Heb. 10:15, 17; 3:7) again to give importance to his exhortation, "Wherefore as *the Holy Ghost* saith, Today if ye will hear His voice, harden not

your hearts.” How otherwise should it be needful that the understanding should be opened by the Lord, that they might understand the Scriptures.” Had it been merely the depth and range of the human mind that were in question, no such divine enlightenment were required, for the perceptions of the human mind are adequate for what is within its compass.

Everywhere in the Old Testament itself, the communications recorded are loudly proclaimed to be directly inspired by God. “Thus saith the Lord.” “The word of the Lord came to Moses,” Isaiah and Jeremiah, “saying.” “God spake unto Moses, saying.” This is repeated in too many passages to be more than alluded to, so that, if further testimony is needful, we have the emphatic declarations of the Old Testament, as well as the universal consent of the New Testament authorities, to substantiate the fact of the fullest divine inspiration throughout.

Against all this weight of evidence, Mr. Wilson can give us positively nothing, except the fact that the apostles describe themselves as eyewitnesses; and the accuracy with which the evangelist Luke, the beloved physician, had carefully traced everything from the first (παρηκολουθηκότι Luke 1:3); but then we have his object in writing stated, that it was in contrast with other writings; that we might have the certainty which belongs, as we have seen, only to these divine records (cp. Prov. 22:19-21, and 30:5, 6). This brings in the question of the human element which has already been briefly alluded to. Do we deny it? By no means. Why cannot human testimony, as to facts and particulars, exist along with divine guidance as to what should be brought forward or insisted on? Mr. Wilson says, “they (the apostles) make no claim to supernatural guidance,” and refers to the statement of the apostle John, that he was an eyewitness, and assures his readers that he spoke the truth, and “he knoweth that he saith true.” But Mr. Wilson should have given the quotation in full; which would show the occasion, as well as the reason of his saying this. The Gnostics, who were a pest of the early Church, as all students of Church History know, held that matter was evil; and denied in consequence that Christ had a veritable human body, as well as the reality of His death. Upon both of these great facts of Christianity, the whole of its doctrines are based -- hence the apostle John, after describing the crucifixion, and what took place at it, adds the particulars concerning His death, which he witnessed and then, that which especially demonstrated the certainty of death -- the piercing of His side by one of the soldiers with the spear (“because they saw He was dead already”) “and forthwith came there out blood and water.” He then gives his special attestation as a personal witness of these facts. “He that saw it bare record, and His record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, *that ye might believe*” (John 19:30-35. Cp. 20:30, 31). Why is this statement, which particularizes in the strongest way the apostle’s personal testimony, inconsistent with the special direction of the Holy Ghost?

We have seen that the Holy Ghost, when He came, was to quicken the memories of the apostles. As eyewitnesses, they were to testify what they had seen: for this, according to our blessed Lord and His apostles, the assistance and guidance of the Holy spirit were indispensable. “Ye are witnesses of these things; and behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high” (Luke 24:48, 49). It should be remembered, that they were to bear witness in the face of an unbelieving generation, and before the world at large. What avail would it have been to testify to such, that the Holy Ghost had told them the facts concerning Christ? It was all important that they should be able to speak as eyewitnesses. Both our Lord and His apostles alike, allude to this; not as if *their* testimony rendered that of the Spirit needless, but as combined witness: “*He* (the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth), shall testify of Me, and ye shall *also* bear witness because ye have been with Me from the beginning” (John 15:26, 27). “And we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him” (Acts 5:32; 1:8).

It is, however, by no means true, that the evangelists write exclusively as eyewitnesses. They each give us their narrative, according to the purpose of the Spirit of God, in exhibiting the varied phases of the character of Christ. The apostle John, who is occupied with the Glory of the Person of the Son of God, relates, how -- His adversaries “went backward and fell to the ground” in Gethsemane, as well as how He sets His seal to His own work upon the Cross. Nevertheless, though personally present throughout, he omits the agony in the garden -- the supernatural darkness which overhung the earth, and the cry of the Lord when forsaken, on account of our sins. The evangelist Luke, who views Christ as the gracious, suffering, Son of man -- though not an eyewitness -- details the conflict of the Savior in Gethsemane more fully than any of the other evangelists. For the same reason he tells us all that relates to the birth of Christ and traces His genealogy up to Adam. Mark takes up what suits the mission and path of Christ as the divine Servant on earth, commencing only with what introduces His service. Matthew shows the fulfillment of Scripture and of the promises in Him, who was the Messiah, the Seed of Abraham, and Son of David. Similarly, the apostle Paul, (1 Cor. 11:23-25), when insisting on the character of the Lord’s supper -- he narrates the circumstances of its first institution -- says: “I received (not of the apostles present but) from (ἀπὸ) the Lord that which also I delivered unto you.”

The Scriptures contain, without doubt, the words of evil men, of Satan, and even the defective sayings and doings of the people of God. But those who recorded them, did so by the will of God, in order to give us a divine picture of man and of God’s ways with man, for our instruction, edification and warning, surrounded, as we are, by similar dangers and

difficulties. "These things happened unto them for ensamples (types), and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come" (1 Cor. 10:11). All that the Christian values in the Old Testament -- written to communicate, though but partially, the knowledge of God -- His patience, longsuffering, tenderness, combined with righteous and holy ways in His character as a moral Governor -- would be lost, had men, however pious, been left to give us merely their own ideas and views, concerning these things. Nor could the human mind uninspired, have been competent, to trace the unfolding of God's gracious dealings with man, and still less the revelation of His ultimate purposes in connection with, or in consequence of, those dealings, contained in the Old Testament Scriptures. The employment of the human heart and mind by the Spirit of God, when under the influence of feelings produced by spiritual life in the soul, have the deepest interest for the saints of God, at all times. The pleadings of Moses for the people of God, using the Glory of His own name; the promises He had made to the Fathers, and His own unchangeable nature; or the forgiveness which He had revealed as a part of His name, (Ex. 32:11-13; 34:6-9), all have this character. The righteous indignation of Jeremiah, at the insensibility of God's chosen people to the faithfulness of Jehovah towards them, on the one hand -- and his tears over them -- and breaking out of earnest pleadings for them, so long as that was possible, on the other, convey the deepest instruction for all times and seem to remind us of One, whose love has no equal in earth or heaven; and whose tears, intercessions, and still more -- His life given as a ransom -- when Himself the object of unmitigated human enmity, have shown us where alone these moral beauties could be seen in their perfection, rising above the sin which He shed His blood to cancel.

True, the inspiration of the writers of the New Testament exhibits the full knowledge of the mind of God, as well as an intimacy with the purposes of God in the future -- unknown to the Old Testament. The apostle Peter tells us, that when the prophets enquired as to the meaning of their prophecies, *touching things to come*, they were informed, that these revelations were not intended for themselves; but for "us" who have fuller light through the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, as an abiding Comforter in the Church (1 Peter 1:10-12. Cp. Dan. 12:4, 8, 9). The Lord seems to allude to this character of inspiration, when He foretells, that when the Holy Ghost shall have come, as the result of His being glorified as the Son of man at the hand of God; "He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, *out of his belly* shall flow rivers of living water" (John 7:38). This expression indicates, that the Holy Ghost, when sent from Christ in heaven as the Head of His Body the Church, would be a living spring in His communications, acting through the deepest affections, sympathies and interests, of which the human heart is capable. "This spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not

yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7:39). The apostle Paul, speaking on this very point, says: "Who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct Him? But *we* have the mind of Christ." And that "the Spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2:11-16). The very things that were hidden before, in order that they might be revealed now. This accords with the way in which the Spirit of God now acts in all believers; helping their infirmities, sharing their sorrows (Rom. 8:18, 26, 27), bearing witness with their spirit -- a means of intelligence and communion to the Christian, as well as enabling him to enjoy the glory to come, of which His presence is the earnest.

In all this we can trace the perfect harmony between the divine and the human element,<sup>32</sup> which writers of this kind constantly put in contrast, as if they were mutually exclusive of each other; and then having defined inspiration to be that which no one believes,<sup>33</sup> they throw contempt upon it as "mechanical," "dynamic," &c. We know indeed that at times the Holy Ghost did, both in Old and New Testament times, act on men exceptionally to show His power where the mind was not engaged, though the heart might be. But this the apostle puts in a lower place than where the intelligence was in exercise, and forbids its employment in the Christian Assembly: clearly it was not so in his own case, or that of the other apostles, for he says, "In the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue" (1 Cor. 14:15, 18, 19).

That our Lord came to inaugurate by His death and resurrection and the descent of the Holy Ghost another dispensation, established upon other principles than those contained in the law, -- whilst verifying and giving it its full place of authority, by dying under its curse for us, -- is everywhere evident in the New Testament. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," accords with the principles of exact justice, for under the law, God was maintaining His rights as Lord of all the earth (Joshua 3:11). Israel as a nation was the center of this government, until, set aside for

---

32. Had the beauty of the human element in Christianity been understood, we should have been spared the ignorant cavil of scepticism, directed against the allusion to the apostles' "cloke" in 2 Tim. Is it unworthy of Him who became a Man for our sakes, and showed His tenderness towards all the necessities and sufferings of the human frame -- that His apostle, under inspiration, should show consideration for the infirmities of Timothy, the health of the "beloved Gaius," or the apostle's own need in His service, against the winter? These things if observed would have guarded men, from the "neglect of the body" and the asceticism, so characteristic of the religion of the middle ages.

33. Dr. Westcott's statement on this subject, the only one, excepting that of an American infidel, quoted by Mr. Wilson, to show what are the views he opposes, is simply a caricature. Calvin himself, the special object of these animadversions, while strongly insisting on the action of the Spirit of God in inspiring all Scripture, especially points out the distinctions of style, flowing from the personal differences of the position and character of the prophets, and shows how the same contrasts are to be seen in the evangelists. (See *Institutes*, ch. 8, sec. 2 & 11.)

their disobedience and idolatry, the scepter passed into the hands of the Gentiles. He even made use of the sword of Joshua, to cut off those nations, whose iniquity rose to such a height, that His patience could no longer hold back the execution of the righteous sentence passed upon them (Gen. 15:16). Now through the death of His Son, which has vindicated His righteousness in another way, He is acting in love to His enemies; whilst the rights of Christ, and His claim as sovereign Lord of the earth, are held in abeyance. "Sit thou on My right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Psa. 110:1). These rights remain to be made good in power, when Christ comes, and "all things are put under His feet" (Heb. 2:8). The establishment of the Kingdom of Christ, so often foretold in the Scripture, can only be -- by the putting down of all opposition, and the destruction of enemies, who have refused all the offers of love in the gospel, and the restoration of God's ancient people, with whom God's government, and the earthly kingdom of the Messiah, stand in connection. Hence it is that we have in the Psalms, the call for the execution of God's righteousness in judgment upon enemies, and the vindication of His holy character against evil; this government is seen again in the book of Revelation, consequent upon the Lamb taking the Book and opening the Seals, when we are again on Old Testament ground; "lightnings and thunderings and voices," proceeding out of the throne of God, and cries for judgment again ascending, as in the Psalms, for without this judgment, the Kingdom of Christ could not have its place (Rev. 4-19).

God does not surrender His right to put down evil in the earth, because He is now acting upon the principles of grace. But the infidel abuses the long-suffering love of God, and the light in which this love is exercised, to challenge God's righteous actings in the Old Testament, which He will resume, and from which His earthly people have their character and position. "Judgment shall return to righteousness and all the upright in heart shall follow it" (Psa. 94:15). For the principles, feelings and conduct of the people of God, are regulated by the divine procedure, according to the dispensation in which their lot may be cast. "When Thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness" (Isa. 26:9). At the same time, every Christian admits, that when God was hidden behind the vail, knowledge was partial and imperfect. Many things, in consequence, were tolerated or passed over, which the clearer light -- now that He has rent the vail and been fully displayed in the manifestation of Christ -- condemns, for "the darkness is past or 'passing away,' (παράγεται) and the true light now shineth" (1 John 2:8. Cp. Matt. 19:4-8). Though the Lord shows in Matt. 5 and elsewhere, the entire change in the nature of the divine action; yet the whole fabric of New Testament doctrine is interwoven with Old Testament Scripture, which -- whilst exhibiting contrasts in many points, -- it fulfils in a way which evinces the same divine mind in the whole. The death of Christ, and His rejection by the Jewish nation

-- accomplishing as it did the almost innumerable passages of the prophets, and putting its seal upon the authority of the law -- opened according to the Hebrews, heavenly things; the vail being rent, so that the Jewish system, of which the vail was the central expression, passed away to disclose a heavenly order and place of worship, a heavenly priesthood and heavenly worshipers. All this is anticipated in the figures of the law, "which serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things; as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle, for see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount" (Heb. 8:5).

We have, in the special dispensational dealings of God, the great principles of promise, law and prophecy, brought out in His ways with man; but this does not correspond with Mr. Wilson's theory of education, growth and progress of the human mind, developed in his second Lecture. Each revelation is perfect, *for the object for which it was intended*; but promise, though antecedent in time, is in its nature higher than law as a principle of divine action towards sinful men, because resting on the faithfulness of God alone, as the apostle teaches in Gal. 3:17-20. The law was needed to test man on the ground of righteousness, and to show that he was incapable of meeting the divine claims contained in it, in order to bring him to a sense of his guilt and ruin, before revealing the perfect grace of God in the Gospel -- meeting that need through the death of the Son of God. That death, at the same time, confirmed all the promises of blessing through the promised seed of the woman, and laid the basis for the fulfillment of the prophecies of the future glory of Christ, by which God sustained the faith of His elect, when it became evident that the recall to the obedience of the law by the prophets (a second purpose of prophecy) was likely to be ineffectual as regards the nation at large; the authority of the law being vindicated in the Son of God being born under it as man, and bearing the consequences of its breach for those who believed. Thus, promise, law, and prophecy all have their terminating radii and center in the death of Christ, who thereby introduces the true ground on which alone we can stand in the presence of God, justified by His grace, through faith in the blessed work accomplished on Calvary.

If the intervention of law, between promise and prophecy is inconsistent with the idea of progress, in the sense which has been attached to it, the introduction of Christianity is entirely irreconcilable with it; for Christianity addresses man, not as he was under the law in a state of probation, but as a lost sinner. "The Son of Man is come to save that which is lost." In addition to this, man is proved to be in a condition of enmity against God, by the total rejection of His Son when sent into this world in love, though that love has made use of this act of deepest rebellion, to display in the cross how it can rise above sin and efface it; the Spirit of God by this means giving to the soul, a just estimate both of sin and of divine goodness.

Advance indeed there is compared with former dispensations, in the manifestation of God in love, and not only advance, but perfection, which excludes the idea of further development hinted at by Mr. Wilson; for the only begotten Son in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him. He alone could do this, and, in absolute perfection, and say: "I have glorified Thee on the earth." What could surpass the glory of the Father displayed on earth by His Son?

But why has this glory -- though "full of grace and truth," exactly suited to man in his present condition -- not been perceived and owned by the world? (John 1:14, 17, 18). "For in Him was life and the life was the light of men." Let the same Scripture tell. "And the light shineth in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not." For this is the natural state of man -- alienation from God -- darkness that does not comprehend the light, though it has shone with all its brightness in this world. This is why men "do not believe the Bible." "For the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2:14). It is not by surrendering the lofty claim of divine truth, and what distinguishes it; nor by lowering it down to what may suit or flatter the pride of man's intellect, that he will be induced to accept Christianity. Each must find out for himself, that God will only teach those who are willing to listen to Him, and give Him His place as God. "He gives not account of any of His matters." And those who presume, with the partial and imperfect perceptions of the human mind, to arraign God at their bar, and to sit in judgment upon Him and His word and ways -- who is their Creator and Judge -- must take the consequences, and find out in the end that He in His inscrutable wisdom, hides things from the wise and prudent, and, reveals them unto babes. The soul of man needs grace and the Spirit of God, so freely given, to apprehend divine truth (John 4:10).

No one questions that there are difficulties in Scripture, and mysteries also. We are surrounded by them in the world in which we live, and they are impenetrable to the mind of man in his present state of existence. "In vain," says Professor Baden Powell, "they seek to get rid of mysteries, the being of a GOD is the greatest of mysteries." The connection of the soul with the body -- the nature of plant life, and why it should assimilate from surrounding elements that which it requires -- the crystallization in beautiful forms of certain organic and inorganic substances -- are all unfathomable to our minds. Is it then strange that in the revelation of what is *Divine*, we should find mysteries? There especially we ought to bow, and own the incompetency of the human intellect, to measure what is infinite and incomprehensible. Difficulties in Scripture do indeed exercise the faith of the individual believer, and whether he has the reverence for God, which makes him attribute what he cannot understand, to his own partially enlightened mind; he is but a child and knows only in part,

and the consciousness of this serves to keep him humble, and dependent on God for further illumination. "Now we know in part, and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. "When I was a child I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I am known" (1 Cor. 13:9-12). He who in the consciousness of this imperfect knowledge, waits on God for light, finds how many points of Scripture, inexplicable at first sight, are afterwards resolved, or serve to bring out some further unfoldings of divine truth, which he otherwise had not perceived.

In conclusion, we have seen that the statements of our Lord and His apostles are everywhere at variance with those of Mr. Wilson: they universally claim the inspiration which he repudiates for them, and for which repudiation, we have not a syllable of real evidence from Scripture advanced. To reduce, therefore, the question to its simple and proper issue, we have only to ask, who are to be accepted or listened to, by Christians in general, touching the nature and authority of the Christian Records -- our Lord and His Apostles, or writers of this school? Certainly it is not presumption, in the feeblest and most simple minded Christian, to prefer to trust, on such a vital question, to the Lord Himself and the great founders of Christianity sent by Him, rather than to recent speculators in divine truth, many of whom on the Continent and even of late in England, have piloted themselves and their too credulous followers, either into avowed infidelity or into the mysterious and dark whirlpool of pantheism.

What Mr. Wilson says of the Fathers, the Reformation and the Church of England, has as little foundation as when he speaks of the New Testament writers. Mr. Greaves has shown, in his quotations <sup>34</sup> from Bishop Ellicott, how unequivocal are the views of the early writers of the Christian era on the subject of the inspiration of Scripture.

The Reformers placed the authority of Scripture upon the very highest pinnacle, in opposition to the attempt of the Church of Rome to put human tradition and the Apocrypha upon the same level with Scripture; but unfaithful as she proved to be in this, the Church of Rome did not venture to deny the plenary inspiration of canonical Scripture. From the very commencement of the promulgation of Christianity its acceptance has been general, in a way that can be affirmed of no other Christian doctrine; so that the

---

34. *The Bible: Its Historical Inspiration*, by the Rev. Talbot Greaves, J. Fawn and son, Bristol. Anyone who wishes to see, the remarkable confirmation, which recent discoveries give, to the historic accuracy of Old Testament Scripture, on which Mr. Greaves' excellent sermons chiefly dwell is recommended to read a pamphlet entitled *Ancient Monuments and Holy Writ*, by Dr. Pakenham Walsh, George Herbert, Grafton Street, Dublin.



statement of Mr. Wilson, “still no theory of inspiration” is entirely misleading. It may be quite true that the Church of England has never formulated any doctrine upon this subject. Why? The fact is, the articles and standards of that Church were written to guard against well known and prevalent errors;<sup>35</sup> but what every one believes, it is not necessary to affirm formally. The high authority of Scripture is, however, assumed in the articles and formularies in a way it could not be if the framers of these standards had not the fullest belief in its complete inspiration. Read the two first homilies, which express the authorized teaching of the Church of England, and still more what is written in the homily entitled, “An Information for them which take offence at certain places of the Holy Scripture,” from which the ensuing extracts are taken.

For the whole Scripture, saith St. Paul, is given by the inspiration of God. (2 Tim. 3:16). And shall we Christian men think to learn the knowledge of God and of ourselves in any earthly man’s work or writing sooner or better than in the Holy Scriptures, written by *the inspiration of the Holy Ghost*? “The Scriptures were not brought unto us by the will of man; but holy men of God,” as witnesseth St. Peter, “spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit of God” (2 Peter 1:21). [With reference to difficult passages in the Old Testament]: It is a shame that Christian men should be so light headed to toy as ruffians do with such manner of speeches, uttered in good grave signification by *the Holy Ghost*. Consider that the Scripture, in *what strange form soever* it be pronounced, is the *Word of the living God*. Let that always come to your remembrance which is so oft repeated of the prophet Esais: The mouth of the Lord, saith he, has spoken it. It cannot therefore be but truth which proceedeth from the God of all truth: it cannot be but wisely and prudently commanded, what Almighty God hath devised, how vainly soever, through want of grace, we miserable wretches do imagine and judge of His most holy word. Christ Jesus, the Prophets, the Apostles, and all the true Ministers of His word, yea *every jot and tittle in the Holy Scripture*, have been, is, and shall be for evermore, the savor of life unto eternal life, unto all those whose hearts God hath purified through true faith. The more obscure and dark the sayings be to our understanding, the further let us think ourselves to be from God, and His Holy Spirit, *who was the Author of them*.

With such extracts before us, what are we to say to such a statement as: “We attribute to the Bible qualities which are claimed for it neither by the book itself, nor by the formal declarations of Christian churches, nor by *their most representative writers*.” Alas that one in the specially responsible position held by Mr. Wilson, and put forward by others, as the champion of Christianity in the serious combat with infidelity, should take such ground, and allow the only weapon which the enemy cannot stand against, “the Sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God,” to fall

from his grasp. It is a blade of high temper and keen edge, “quick and powerful and sharper than any two edged sword,” yet one which the unlettered Christian can use with irresistible effect, if guided by the Spirit of God.

How many now wandering in the dreary wilderness of unbelief, who would at one time have shrunk back with horror, if asked to relinquish Christianity, have had their faith first undermined by the insinuation of these, doubts concerning Scripture, used by the enemy of souls, as the narrow end of the wedge, to loosen its foundation; for where the authority of Scripture is once shaken, all that is supernatural speedily crumbles; and miracles, atonement and resurrection, all indeed that distinguishes Christianity, as a revelation of God and from God, is surrendered by degrees, till at last there is not a plank left to float the soul over the dark ocean of eternity.

We must not be surprised if, in the closing days of the dispensation, God allows the heart of the Christian, and his adherence to the Word of God, to be tested; and whether he will hold fast that sacred deposit, which has been entrusted to him, notwithstanding the weakness and defection of friends, and the opposition of enemies. It is no doubt more difficult and requires more faith, to maintain the truth in days of declension and unbelief, and when human opinion is being constantly put on the same level with, or substituted for divine truth. But faith thus tried will have its sure reward.

In our Lord’s address to His Father in John 17, after saying: “I have given them (His disciples) Thy Word,” we have His gracious testimony: “They have kept *Thy Word*.” Think what it will be, to be owned by Christ Himself before His Father, in this blessed way, in a day yet to come. We have, moreover, in

His address to the Church at Philadelphia, His own encouraging commendation, to those who are faithful in holding fast His word. “Thou hast kept *My Word* and not denied *My Name*”; and again, “Because thou hast kept *the Word of my patience*, I also will keep thee,” closing with the reward which He will bestow, as the blessed and public result of that fidelity, approved before all: “Behold, I come quickly; hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown,” (Rev. 3:8, 10, 11).

35. Human standards must always be of this character, for they can only deal with errors known at the time, and cannot, as the Word of God does, provide for all times and all possible erroneous phases of the human mind.

{*This article has been added for the second edition.*}

## *Practical Separation and Testimony*

*Hebrews xi. 13-16; Mark xiii. 31-34; Ephesians 1.19-23*

There is one point in Heb 11 in connection *with* what we have had before us, which is, that that which throws us out of this scene as to our hopes, expectations and joys, is the truth that God Himself is a stranger in His own world. God is not at home here, because His Son has been rejected; and the effect of this is, that we who are united to Christ are thrown out of it too; but into His blessed company. It is this which has separating power with the saints.

We are so apt to look upon ourselves as losers because of this. It tests the heart continually while down here, thus proving whether we are content to let all go for Him. We gain everything.

To Abram God appeared as "the God of glory." God takes His start there with him, and from thence unfolds to him His purposes and counsels in Christ. God gives rest to the heart here by choosing us to share in His rest there; and He calls us out from this scene, separates us from what is in it, that we may be able even now to take part in that rest.

Look at the Lord in Mark 3. They said, "He is beside himself." They could not understand His blessed path of self-renunciation, self-forget-ting toil in their midst. Neither can a worldly Christian understand it. And to the extent to which the saints follow in His steps will the world be unable to understand them. It is "As long as thou doest well to *thyself* men will speak well of thee."

But what are these to the Lord who take His path with Him? He looks round with delight and satisfaction upon them, and says: "Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and my sister, and mother." Priceless is that will to Him. All such as do it most near; all re-lationships dear and tender concentrated in one. This is the result of faithfulness to God in days of evil. Christ loves our company; He delights to have us with Him. If the church has left its first love, has Christ ever left His? He loves to have us in association with Himself, linked with Himself; and how can that be? Only in the path in which God's will is everything; His disciples had left all to follow Him.

But then comes the question, are we content to take the lot of pilgrims? These of whom we read in Hebrews that they declared plainly that they sought a country, "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the

earth." And what was the consequence? What did God do for them? When we link ourselves with God's interests, He can link Himself to ours. It is then He is "not ashamed to be called our God." It is wondrous that God should call Himself the God of men on earth.

It is seldom God takes up people in this way; it is only with the patriarchs and David. He links Himself to the interest of those who identify themselves with Him upon earth; to those who have no home, no country, no city here, and who are content to find themselves in company with Christ in His path of separation and rejection in this scene through which He passed. If through grace I can take this place, He says of me "My brother, and my sister, and mother."

But what does it involve? Self-surrender; there must be the giving up of self. The more self-surrendered we are here, the more we are able to enter into and learn the path of that blessed One on earth, the more we are able to walk with Him in it. How did He come into this world? The manger and the cradle tell. He says of Himself, "I am meek and lowly in heart." He came as the dependent One, the obedient One. God never had but one obedient Man upon earth; never but One who always did His will, who could say: "I do always those things that please him." All else were disobedient; men were in open defiance of God; and there is not a single one of us, though saved by His grace, that does not carry the principle, the root of this in his heart. So that though we know what this path of obedience is, yet how often we get out of it. There never was any trod the earth like Him. The meekest, the lowliest man ever seen here was the Son of God.

It was just this point that our brother touched upon which I wished to take up a little. *Rest* we must not seek here; our rest is to come, when all will be according to God's own heart.

As regards the testimony of God, there are only two places where the apostle says he is "not ashamed." He is "not ashamed of the testimony of the Lord" in Timothy; and he is "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ" in Romans. We get these two great subjects: the testimony of the Lord, and the righteousness of God, in these two epistles. How wonderful! A display of righteousness for man, and that God's own. Sin righteously met for the

believer, by God taking all that His Son has done and using it to justify sinners!

Well may the Lord present Himself to Nicodemus as the only One who could tell of heavenly things, because He “came down from heaven.” Thus, divine love is heavenly. (See John 3:12, 13, and 16.) Conversion is connected with this earth; but heaven itself came down to die for me, to sacrifice itself for me. Who can tell the wonders of this love! The divine wonders and depths that we shall enjoy, as we were hearing, in eternity, all flowing to us from that blessed One to whom “all power is given.”

I once saw on a tombstone a little verse which struck me,

“Millions of years my wondering soul  
Shall o’er my Savior’s beauties rove.”

It was not about the sinner, or even about the salvation, it was the beauties of Christ Himself. It spoke wonderfully and beautifully of the occupation of the soul through all eternity; and that is the essence of Christianity. The more I see men giving up Christianity and slighting it, the more its beauties come out; and the more the blessed Person of Christ is despised, the more His beauty comes out too.

Then there is the other side to this path of separation on earth. We look up into heaven, and what do we see there? The glorified Man; the One who fills heaven with His glory. What do we find is the great subject there in the book of Revelation? It is the Lamb in the midst of the throne; the Lamb who was slain; it is the worthiness of the Lamb and the efficacy of His blood. And how is He spoken of? When John sees Him he says: “His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow” {Rev. 1}. Just as the evangelist says of the transfiguration, His raiment was “white as snow.” And Daniel gives us “the Ancient of days,” whose garment was “white as snow.” The very selfsame words are applied to the sinner washed in that precious blood: he is made “white as snow, as white as wool” (Isa. 1). Such is the place, the portion, that He has won for me, and I glory in the means that has done it.

But this is not all; there is more than salvation. God has His eternal counsels in Christ. What is the will of God? Is it to

gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him {Eph. 1:10};

from the highest archangel down to a blade of grass? This is God’s counsel as to Him who came down from heaven and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross, that He might give us a place on His throne, a place in His glory. Thus is God working everything after the counsel of His own will. Thus He has

saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by

the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel {2 Tim. 1:9}.

He has gained too the victory over death and the grave, and has gone up there to sit at the right hand of God. Man looks at death as the *end* of everything, his own complete overthrow, where-as the very first thought as to the testimony is that of death abolished, by Christ having taken His place in it. We are connected with Christ as the fruit of His death, and every after-step is connected with death, He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all heavens.

“God hath not given us the spirit of fear.” The apostle did not give way under the consciousness of the difficulties that pressed upon him. He knows that he has the spirit of “power, and of love, and of a sound mind.” Therefore he says, “Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner.” He had not a fear, however things might be failing outwardly. He was not going to give up; he would maintain it in every iota, and be himself in practical consistency with it, as our brother has been pressing.

I am sure we all feel the need of more earnestness on this point; I do. The apostle, as Moses, counted the *reproach* of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. Is there a despising of this world in its objects, in its principles, in its progress? Do we not too often take up a *little* of it? And remember, the more we meet of its reproach, the better for us; it is really a thing to be loved, to be valued, if it is the reproach of *Christ*.

If we are not on the ground that Moses was, counting it greater riches than all here, we shall surely be formed by the world around us. I am persuaded of this, and the more so as I look back and think of early days amongst us, when some can remember that the reproach of Christ was a thing gloried in; and now, when I look around, I see the great assimilation to the world that is coming in. What a contrast!

Surely it is for us to be refusing citizenship in this world; refusing a country, a home here. It is then God can say: I am not ashamed to be linked with those people; not ashamed to be called their God. And in the day that is coming we shall share in His throne as His companions, His bride, partakers of His glory for ever.

*Food for the Flock* 8:330-337 (1882).



