



TWO LETTERS

BY

C. E. STUART.

TWO LETTERS TO MR. B. GLADWELL

BY

C. E. STUART.

Several having asked to see the following, it is now printed, together with a second letter, a few verbal corrections having been made, it being found very inconvenient to multiply copies in MS.

ADDINGTON HOUSE,

ADDINGTON ROAD,

READING, *31st July, 1885.*

DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST,—

I now take up my pen to reply to your long letter, dated June of this year. You write, you say, as an “unlearned and ignorant man,” but evidently with no thought that you may be mistaken in what you advance, only having little or no hope that you will succeed in convincing me of my errors, which, in your eyes, seem very serious. Clearly, you think me incorrigible, whilst though “ignorant and unlearned” yourself, you believe your statements and positions are right, and those of your correspondent wrong.

Now it is plain you and I have learned different things from the same Scriptures.

First, you have learnt, you tell me, from Rom. iii. 19 that the texts I quote from the Psalms as to the ungodly, &c., speak of Israel—those that were under the law. I learn, and Rom. iii. 9-19 is my authority, that whilst in the Psalms addressing Israel, God was shewing that morally they were no better than Gentiles, and therefore He speaks in language that was meant to include them both. “What then,” writes the Apostle, “are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all

under sin, as it is written, ‘There is none righteous, no, not one, &c.’” Again, “What things soever, the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that *every* mouth may be stopped and *all the world* may become guilty before God.” Clearly the Apostle applies those Scriptures to shew, not that Israel *only* were under sin, but that the language of God spoke of men morally, and therefore included the Gentiles with the people of Israel in its sweeping conclusion.

This is confirmed both by the language of Ps. xiv.—“The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of *men* (not the children of Israel only) to see if there were *any* that did understand, &c.”; and by the change of language made by the Apostle in quoting Ps. x. 7, substituting the plural pronoun for the singular, which the Hebrew, and all ancient versions, I believe, agree in exhibiting. Hence, those Scriptures give God’s statements about the ungodly, whether Jews or Gentiles; and, found in the revelation given to Israel, they establish, beyond a doubt, the sinfulness of the whole race, and therefore of Jews in common with Gentiles. So when I read, the sinner “shall not stand in the judgment,” I understand that none who are viewed as in that moral class, whatever their national description may be, shall stand in the judgment, and I venture to think that most “unlearned and ignorant” people will agree with me in this. And, whatever may have been the special privileges bestowed on Israel, we must not bring them in here to neutralize the statements of God about all men, who, in themselves, are sinners.

Secondly, you learn from Exodus xii. that redemption by blood was theirs. I have learnt that redemption by blood is *not* taught us in that chapter, though shelter by blood from divine judgment is; and that, while redemption by power was effected for the nation in bringing them through the Red Sea, no longer to be under the power of Egypt, redemption by blood is a blessing they have never yet enjoyed, though they will in the future. Redemption is not treated of in Exod. xii. First mentioned for Israel in Exod. vi. 6—“I will redeem you

with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments," we read of its accomplishment in xv. 13—"Thou, in Thy mercy, hast led forth the people which Thou hast redeemed." Redemption by blood on the part of God for any of Adam's race is a New Testament truth, though, of course, Israel's future blessedness predicted in the Old Testament, has to do with it, and depends on it.

Then as to standing before the throne of God. You object in general to the Scriptures to which I turned to elucidate something of God's thoughts and teaching about it. But I do not find that you give me in exchange Scriptures that do treat of it. You admit, p. 4, that Gentiles had no standing, and that Israel by nature had none. You admit that heavenly saints have a standing in God's presence, and state that Israel, who had some kind of standing, will have "a better one founded on a better redemption and atoning work than they had." But, instead of proceeding to establish your statements by the Word, you immediately pass on to say—"I get their present place (*i.e.*, of heavenly saints) in Heb. x., Rom. v. 2, 1 Pet. v. 12, Gal. v. 1, and other Scriptures. Their future place I see in Rev. iv., v., and elsewhere." Well, one might have thought that you here used *place* for *standing*. But that illusion you effectually dispel by proceeding to contrast "sitting" in Rev. iv., v. with "standing," as you ask, "Is the sitting on thrones around no higher position than standing before God's throne?" To turn then for a moment to the passages referred to. You object to the use made of Rom. v. 2, and tell me on p. 6 that it is "a statement of fact, not title." But the fact there involves the question of title, and is, indeed, indissolubly bound up with it. Your use of Gal. v. 1 is surely wrong. It is an exhortation to saints to stand fast, and not again to be entangled in a yoke of bondage. Your reference to 1 Pet. v. 12 will afford you no solid ground to rest on in the present question. Many, on very good authority, take it as an exhortation. There remains then only Heb. x., to which you refer, and that, by your own way of dealing with Rev. iv., v., is

taken from under *your* feet. For, as neither the terms “standing” nor “place” are used therein of believers at all, though “to enter into” is, *you* will not, I presume, be so inconsistent as to ask me, in the face of your objections to Rev. iv., v., to accept Heb. x. as teaching on such a subject. Hence, it appears to me, that you leave us destitute of Scripture, which, without controversy, treats of so important a subject as our standing before God. You speak of other Scriptures, but where and what are they?

Now, as to your remarks. You write, “Had” Israel “no standing? In Exod. xix. 4 I read—‘I have brought you to myself’; in Deut. xxix. 10—‘Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God’; and in Eph. ii. 17 I learn that the Jew was ‘nigh.’” It is, of course, of all importance to understand what it is that we are writing about. You object to my statement of “title and ability for a fallen, and once guilty creature to be before the throne of God without judgment overtaking him.” It is surely plain enough in what connection I was writing of a person’s standing. I might fairly ask, what has Exod. xix. 4 to do with the subject? And, in accordance with your treatment of Rev. iv., v., since the term “standing” does not occur there, I may well ask how could *you* turn to it? God brought the people to Himself, as they sang in Exod. xv. 13—“Thou hast guided them in Thy strength unto Thy holy habitation.”

But bringing Israel to Himself is not the same as His giving a person who deserves everlasting punishment a standing to be in His holy presence. Then we have only to read Deut. xxix. 10-15 to see how inapplicable it is to the question at issue—“Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water. That thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into His oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day: that He may establish thee to-

day for a people unto Himself, and that He may be unto thee a God, as He hath said unto thee, and as He hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath: but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day." Standing before God to enter into covenant with Him, by the keeping of which they would continue in their land, is very different from standing before God's throne on the ground of an accomplished sacrifice, giving an unchallengeable title to be there, as I should think many an "ignorant and unlearned man" will readily perceive.

Eph. ii. 17 tells us of the dispensational privilege of the Jew in contrast to the Gentile. Of this the Syrophenician woman was conscious, as well as the Roman centurion (Luke vii. 2-10). But that dispensational nearness has nothing to do with the truth about which I was writing, as the Lord has taught us, who, addressing those dispensationally nigh, declared, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke xiii. 3. See also Matt. iii. 7-12). Dispensational nearness and standing before God on the ground of sacrifice are widely different. So the passages you quote in proof that Israel had a standing are anything but german to the subject: they are wide of the mark.

You write—"Now on p. 6. you say on the strength of your "proof texts, 'The sinner, apart from redemption and atonement, has no standing before God's throne.' I learn from "the Scriptures I have given that Israel had both redemption "and atonement. Had they then no standing?" On this I would remark—*First*, that you here claim for Israel that they had a standing in God's presence; but on p. 6 of your letter you quote my words from p. 16 of "*Is it the Truth of the Gospel?*" which said they had one nationally, only to challenge them as having no foundation from the Word of God to rest upon. You state on p. 2 you learn that atonement was made for Israel nationally each year. You dispute on p. 6 of your

letter my statement about it, that what was true of them *nationally* is true of saints now *individually*. And you deny that Lev. xvi. gives us their real standing? You ask—"How could it be their real standing?" I had written, and you quote my words, "typically set forth." Do you deny that? If you do not, I do not understand your question, with my words under your eye. You add—"Lev. xvi. was the provision God instituted to enable Him as a holy God to remain amongst an unclean people." Where you learn that you have not told me. I read Lev. xvi. 30—"On that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." I see not in Lev. xvi., xxiii. 26-32, or in Num. xxix. 7-9 that which supports your statement. Lev. xvi. 16 is no authority for it. But I understand you to deny Lev. xvi. teaches us of Israel's real standing, for "they had," you state, "a standing before Lev. xvi. was instituted at all;" but you give me no proof of what you assert. Now, I think you will find yourself in this at variance with the teaching of Heb. ix., and will land yourself in the conclusion, that those who have sinned against God can have a standing in His holy presence apart from atonement by blood, typically then set forth, now really and fully accomplished, and on the ground of which we enter the holiest (Heb. x. 18), and apart too from the service in the sanctuary of the High Priest of God's appointment. If that is your doctrine, it certainly is not mine. To your question—"How could the blood of bulls and goats secure that?" I need give no answer. One might marvel that *you* should ask it.

Second, you mix up things that differ. I had written, "the sinner apart from redemption and atonement has no standing before God's throne;" you immediately, on quoting my words, speak of Israel. I wrote of the *individual*. You reply by speaking of the *nation*, and affirm that they had both redemption and atonement, but forget, as I have already pointed out, that they enjoyed redemption by power and not redemption by blood. Now this is an important difference, because

redemption by blood involves forgiveness of sins (Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14). This, true of the earthly people by and by (Jer. xxxi. 34), when each and all of them will be righteous, and be saved, was not true of them in the past, else they must all have been saved. When redemption by blood is enjoyed, all who share in it are forgiven. Had that been the case in the past, Judas Iscariot, Ahab, and others must be in heaven; for they all belonged to Israel, and had part in privileges involved in the redemption effected at the Red Sea, otherwise redemption by blood does not ensure to the subjects of it abiding blessing. But this last is not the subject of divine teaching, till every individual who has part in it enjoys everlasting life. It was redemption by power that Israel enjoyed, so the nation as a whole could never perish, for redemption puts those who share in it on ground which never alters. By that Israel became God's people; but, though the nation could never perish, individuals once numbered amongst them, we know well, are lost. When the earthly people shall enjoy the blessings of redemption by blood, all Israel shall be saved.

Third, you dissociate things that are indissolubly connected, as standing before God's throne and the title to stand there. You say—"It is one thing to be able to *stand* in the judgment, quite another to have *title* to be in God's presence." Israel "had a standing," but "no title in the immediate presence of God." Now, title to be in God's presence and the standing before His throne, both rest on the blood of the sacrifice.

The standing cannot be possessed by any of Adam's race without the title also, typically set forth in Lev. xvi., now really effected for us by virtue of the sacrifice of Christ. But you say—"Israel had no title in the immediate presence of God." To that I must demur. Israelites could not enter the holiest, but Israel as such had their standing there, entitled to it by virtue of the blood on the mercy-seat, and before it. Atonement made every year proclaimed by what it would be really effected, viz., by blood. Made once in the year, its effect remained valid throughout it. The people had a stand-

ing in God's presence, though individually they never entered the holiest. Else why the blood sprinkled seven times before the mercy-seat? Of what did that speak, but of the ground on which the nation stood in the divine presence?

Then you draw a distinction between power to stand and title to stand, a distinction in this case without a difference. The title is the power, and that is the blood. And you ask if Ps. i. does not speak of having no *power* to stand in the judgment, and Ps. v. of standing in God's sight after the judgment is executed? I answer no; Ps. i. does not speak of power. It simply states that the wicked shall not stand in the judgment; and Ps. v. clearly does not raise the question of standing *after* the judgment is executed; for it says—"The foolish shall not stand in Thy sight: Thou hatest all workers of iniquity. Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the Lord will abhor the bloody and deceitful man." Why, I ask, raise a question of standing before God after the subjects of that question are destroyed? What sense could there be in that. The words are simple enough—"The foolish shall not stand in Thy sight," and why? He will destroy them, *i.e.*, judgment, of which there is no reversal, will overtake them. And as to your enquiry about Ps. i.—"Could the question of title apply here? Unquestionably it is implied, but, of course, every passage of Scripture does not openly express all the teaching of the inspired volume to which it relates. It is true we read in the Psalms of earthly judgment, *i.e.*, of judgment to be executed on earth, because it is the earthly people that are brought before us, and God will judge them on the earth. That is the judgment of the quick as distinct from that of the dead, and that judgment, we learn, will be final in its character. As the Lord then passes judgment on those with whom He deals on earth at the day of His appearing, so will the abiding portion of each and all of them be.

The righteous in that day, whether of Israel (Ps. i.) or of the Gentiles (Matt. xxv., Rev. vii. 9-19), whom He accepts will live, and that for ever, never again to pass through the

ordeal of divine judgment. All those then brought before Him for judgment called the goats will be cut off, it appears, to enter on their final doom, I suppose, at the setting up of the great white throne. For the judgment of the sheep and goats in Matt. xxv. is certainly definite and final, never to be reversed (vv. 34, 41, 46). "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment." The millennial judgment of the quick will determine their final condition, though the eternal state of the righteous on earth, and I conclude, too, of the wicked who will at the Lord's appearing be cut off (that of the beast and the false prophet excepted), will not be entered upon till the Lord has sat on the great white throne. Certainly the beast and false prophet at His coming receive their final doom (Rev. xix. 20). Of the sheep and of the goats, as I have said, the final condition of each is pronounced (Matt. xxv. 34, 41, 46), the special millennial blessing of the former being detailed in Rev. vii. 15-17, in marked contrast in one feature to the blessings of those on earth in the eternal state. God will tabernacle *over* them in the millennium. He will tabernacle *with* them, dwelling in their midst, in the eternal state (Rev. xxi. 3). The fact is clear, and we must admit it, that the thought of standing before God in these and kindred passages has to do with the throne. God's word is too plain to resist it; and your attempts to challenge it, to me only confirm it. You refer for instances of the use of standing to Josh. i. 5, 2 Kings x. 4, Isa. l. 8. But what have these, let me ask, to do with the subject in hand? No man standing before Joshua; no one standing before Jehu, still less the words of the Lord in Isa. l. 8—"let us stand together: who is mine adversary?" are statements clearly beside the mark, nor will Deut. xxix. 10 avail you, as I have already pointed out.

But you write—"The Israelites then had title to stand before God, and three times a-year every male must present himself before God, however wicked he might be; but he could not stand when it was a question of God's governmental judgment. This, then, seems to me to be what the scriptures

quoted from the Psalms, Nahum, and Malachi, speak of." Let me remind you in reply, that what you call God's governmental judgment in those Scriptures is really the announcement of final judgment. Of course, in one sense, every act of God on His throne is an act of His government. But, when one speaks of God's governmental dealings, we mean temporal as distinct from final dealings with the responsible creature. In such dealings, the godly may be, have been, and will in the future be involved, but not in God's final dealings in punishment with His creatures. Now what these Psalms refer to is that which will be finally true of the impenitent. Saints, in all ages, share in governmental dealings (see for Christians 1 Cor. xi. 30, 32, James v. 15, 1 John v. 16), and the remnant of the Jews will keenly feel it, as they share in the sufferings consequent on their forefathers' sin in crucifying the Lord. But those Psalms quoted speak of the ungodly as distinct from the righteous. No saint is viewed as involved in those statements. We must keep these things distinct. The phrase you use with reference to these Scriptures, "*God's governmental judgment,*" is really then, permit me to say it, incorrect and misleading too. With us, governmental dealing stops at death, or the rapture. With the earthly saints, it will stop at the moment of the Lord's intervention on their behalf. Governmental judgment does not pursue the subject of it in the other world. The Scriptures to which you apply this term, speak of what is final and eternal for those referred to. "Who executes this judgment?" you ask, and answer "It is Christ who executes it." Well, it is He, the Son of Man and the Son of God, who judges, and that when He sits on the throne of His glory (Matt. xxv. 31, John v. 27), angels being the instruments used in the execution of it (Matt. xiii. 42, 50). But let me again state, there may be an interval between the condemnation of the wicked quick and the execution of the sentence. With the ungodly dead, the latter follows directly on the former.

As far, then, as I have followed you in your letter, these things are clear. The language of Psalms i. and v. is not to be

limited, as Rom. iii. teaches, to Israel merely. They speak of a moral class, whatever may be the national distinction of the individuals who compose it; and they do not treat of God's governmental judgment, but of the final condition of those referred to, determined for them when they are summoned before the Son of Man sitting on the throne of His glory, who is coming with all the heavenly saints and angels to judge both the quick, and subsequently the dead. Now, if you cannot make good your assertions on this point, I think you will find it difficult to turn away the edge of these Scriptures, and to upset what I have advanced in connection with them.

You ask, "How then can these scriptures teach us anything as to the standing of believers in the present dispensation, seeing that the standing of these saints will not be in the immediate presence of God at all," &c.

To which I reply, they teach us what we want to know, viz., the connection in which the truth of the standing of God's people is found in the Word. You say, too, "Another thing occurs to my mind, which is: If such a scripture as 'Psalm i. 5 treats of that question, and states that the ungodly shall not stand, then does not the opposite of this give the standing, viz., 'the godly shall stand in the judgment.' This, though true of the Jew, will not do for us, as you well know; for the Lord says, and you have referred to it 'somewhere I think, 'He that believeth shall not come into judgment.'" In reply to this, I do not know what you think I do, for my Bible tells me we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God (Rom. xiv.), when the saints will receive their reward for all that will meet with the approval of the Lord Jesus Christ. The same will be true, though at a different moment, of the earthly saints. So it is true we shall stand in the judgment, in the fullest and happiest sense, though we shall not come into judgment to be tried for our life. The wicked dead raised up for judgment will be condemned, and be cast away for ever from God's presence into the lake of fire. We, through grace, shall be for ever in His

holy presence. Now, when you say "Does not the opposite of this give the standing?" you confound, methinks, the ground of standing before the throne, that is the blood of Christ, with the moral class, which will, or will not, stand in the judgment. The Psalm tells us of the moral class which will not stand, but does not set forth the real ground on which any can stand. Your words, "give the standing," assume what is not stated in the passage. And did you not forget, when making your remarks about the men of Bethshemesh (1 Sam. vi.), that their city was one of those assigned to the priests (Josh. xxi. 16)? Kirjath-jearim, on the other hand, where the Ark abode, was not one of the cities of the priests.

To turn to the vexed question, as it seems (though to me it is incomprehensible that, with the Word before them, any one should question it), that no higher position can a saint have than a standing before God's throne. You cannot, you say, understand it, and think Rev. iv. gives a higher position. Here we must differ. I cannot understand that it does. It is not with me a question of posture in the presence of God. I presume, from what you say, it must be that with you. I do not comprehend how the thought of standing in the divine presence is limited to a question of posture when there. Nor, I apprehend, when Scripture treats of the saints' standing, does it necessarily define his posture before God. But when it says "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment," it does, it appears to me, unquestionably affirm the lack of title to such an one to stand in the presence of a holy and righteous God. "Shall not stand" is, it is true, a question of fact, but a fact which could have no existence apart from the question of title; and all your remarks as to the dispensational difference between Israel and Christians have nothing to do with the question before us, unless you can shew that Israel as such (not each individual of the people) had no standing before the mercy-seat by virtue of the sprinkled blood. You ask—"did the Israelite ever know his sins put away, &c." You cannot have perceived that I wrote of the Israelites ("Christian Standing,"

p. 7) of the people as a whole, not of each individual of the nation.

Now, I ask, on whose behalf was the blood sprinkled on the mercy-seat, and before it? Lev. xvi. 17, 33, 34, answer for the Children of Israel, and Heb. ii. 17, whilst primarily written of Christians, uses language which can include the earthly people—"To make propitiation for the sins of the people." And, I ask again, why was the blood sprinkled that day seven times before the mercy-seat? What was the meaning of that act? Why first sprinkled once *on* the mercy-seat, and then seven times *before* it? Was it only to typify blessings into which Christians were to come, but never the nation in whose midst that rite was to be repeated, according to God's intention more than 1500 times ere the true sacrifice was offered up? Heb. ix., x. forbid that supposition, and the goat for Israel (Lev. xvi. 15) refutes it. Israel nationally were viewed as standing before the mercy-seat, though actually the individuals among them, the high priest in the past and the priests in the future excepted, never did, and never will get there at all; just as Christians now have boldness to enter the holiest to worship in the heavenly sanctuary, though in person we are not, nor have ever been there. "Has not God," you ask, liberty now to assign me any place He pleases?" Unquestionably, but place and standing before God's throne are not necessarily synonymous. He will give me a place in His house (John xiv.) He will give me a place on the throne with the Lord. He might, with perfect justice, have assigned me a place in Gehenna.

But none of these are what one can call a standing in the presence of God. The truth of God, the teaching of the Word, is what is wanted. Positive teaching from God's revelation is what feeds souls. "The details," you say, "no doubt typically set forth the way in which sins are atoned for." Well, whose sins were typically set forth as atoned for? Ours only, or Israel's also? "We are purged (are no longer what Israel always was—unclean), and have boldness to enter into the holiest."

But, if the details typically set forth the way sins are atoned for, I fail, I must confess, to see any real force in this remark. You state, "Israel always was unclean." Here again you mix up the question of individuals among them with that of the nation. If atonement was made for the holy place because of the uncleannesses of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins,—were not their uncleannesses typically set forth as met by the blood?

Again you ask—"What does *access* speak of? Is it into "*righteousness* or *justification*? If so, grace and righteousness "are one and the same thing. But to me it is plain that the "access follows the being justified. It is the present favour "of God resting on those who are His. Does He so regard "those who are not justified? Could you speak of access "through faith into the grace that justifies? In ch. iii. 24, it is "grace active towards me who am not standing in His grace, "in v. 2, it is grace I *stand* in. Did Israel ever stand in "grace, or was not their standing in *law*? Were they ever "justified even? *Also* seems to me plainly to add something "to what we already have through Him. *This* grace is "answered by 'wherein we stand,' as I might say, 'This "letter which I have now written.'" A crop of questions, I may well say. "What does access speak of?" I thought access spoke of approach or introduction into something; but I trust, I am willing to learn. "Is it into righteousness or justification; if so, grace and righteousness are one and the same thing." I must admit my dulness if it be so; but I do not understand what access into righteousness means. I could understand access into a condition of justification, as one formerly unrighteous, now justified, or reckoned righteous, because I am unrighteous in myself. Then you must bear with me in thinking grace and righteousness to be very different things. But I could understand God acting in grace toward me, and that in righteousness, because perfectly glorified by the death of His Son. I could understand a certain display of grace being in accord with perfect righteousness. In

the abstract, however, grace and righteousness, I should have thought, were widely different. Then to you it is plain that access follows the being justified. To me, it is plain the *term* access follows the being justified in the Apostle's writing, but follows it in no other way. If you mean the access of v. 2 is doctrinally subsequent to being justified of v. 1, I must beg leave to disagree with you. You say—"It is the present favour of God resting on those who are His." My Bible tells me the Apostle wrote "access into this grace," not *the* grace, or grace. I presume he had some definite reason for his use of the demonstrative pronoun "*this*"; and that little word carries me back to Rom. iii. 24, where I read—"being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "This grace," then, I understand to be the grace or favour shewn in justifying me, and the reason of its introduction in ver. 2 of chap. v., and its connection with the previous verse by the conjunction "also," I have thought, was simply this. In ver. 1 we read of peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, peace being a consequence of justification by faith. Having stated that we had peace through our Lord Jesus Christ, the Apostle reminds us that not only what is a consequence of justification is ours through the Lord, but the grace of being justified comes also to us through Him. Hence, I see the use and force of the conjunction "also," and I understand that the access in ver. 2 is not an adding "something to what we already have through Him." So, to be correct, if speaking of this passage, we may say, It is in this grace we stand, not as you put it, "It is grace I stand in." True, of course, that is, but it is not the truth of that passage.

Your remark on Rev. vi. 17 surprises me. "Corrected by you," you write, it "links the Lamb with the wrath." Certainly the Authorised Version links the wrath with Him, and Him only, in that passage. Is this a new thought to you? Read the previous verse. The corrected reading I gave connects the wrath with both Him that sits on the throne, and with the Lamb. Not less am I surprised by the way you quote my

words from p. 8 of "*Christian Standing*," and tell me it is serious doctrine. If you meant by "serious," important, weighty doctrine, I should agree with you. It is most important doctrine. But, since you mean something very different, let me point out that you omit from the quotation, and pass over in your remarks, the rest of my sentence, which, in fairness, you should have quoted, viz.—"beyond simply receiving the testimony of God about it." These few words really meet your objections to my statement, so there I leave them. A second time I am obliged to point out what I must call your unfair way of quoting me. You write, "On p. 10 (I see you here quote from the first edition of my pamphlet) you say relationship speaks of nearness, but Eph. ii. says the Jews were 'nigh'; were they in relationship?" Can *you* acquit yourself of unfairness here? Were you not aware I wrote—"Relationship *by birth* speaks of nearness?" Had you quoted me correctly, what possible ground could there have been for any reference to Eph. ii. 13? Need I marvel that you do not understand me? But, when you write, you are at a loss to know how any one is to understand me, I can leave that to be explained by those who have understood what I attempted to set forth.

To turn now to your second head—my "teaching that a person partakes of Christ's condition, as dead to sin, &c, by being in Him by the Spirit," and you quote sentences about it from my pamphlet, pp. 12, 13, 26 (now, I observe, from the *second* edition), very sound in doctrine I should have thought. You object to the statement that "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. Rom. i.-v. 11 treats of the former; Eph. ii. 1-7 of the latter." Evidently in your eyes this is defective, leaving out "the view in which he is seen in Rom. vi., vii., a living helpless slave to sin, and under law, powerless for good." We have learned very differently from the Word. I have learned that Rom. vi. and vii. both treat of *saints*, not of *sinners*, the former

of one indwelt by the Spirit; the latter (vv. 7-24) of one born of God, but not indwelt by the Spirit. If your doctrine is correct, that chap. vi. treats of a sinner, a helpless slave to sin, and not of a saint, then a sinner apart from the new birth, and the indwelling of the Spirit can reckon himself dead to sin, and alive unto God, and can obey from the heart that form of doctrine delivered to him, ver. 17. Now, if your doctrine is correct, the sinner is not a creature ruined by the fall, with a nature that is only evil, and which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. He can, by his own efforts, live as a Christian should live. For surely you will admit, God, in that portion of His Word, does not exhort a responsible creature to do what he lacks power to accomplish. But your doctrine is wholly inconsistent with the teaching of that passage. You say the person there is a helpless slave to sin, powerless for good. But, says Paul, "ye have obeyed from the heart, &c." To follow you, I must deny that man is a fallen creature, and must flatly contradict God's Word. I must decline such a lead, and prefer keeping to Apostolic teaching. Now clearly, God there addresses those whom He has empowered, and because He has empowered them to act as He directs. Does He so empower unconverted people? And, let me ask, are we in Christ in one sense by the indwelling of the Spirit, and in Christ too in another sense in another way? for you write—"In one sense, at least, we are in Christ by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost." Are there two ways of being in Christ?

Then you tell me the doctrine of Scripture "seems plain," a man is a bond-slave to sin, "until freed by death, of which baptism is the figure. He dies with Christ, in figure, by baptism." You will excuse me, but I was not aware that any one dies with Christ, in figure, by baptism. Baptism is not, that I am aware of, a figure of death, but of burial, a different matter. Burial with Christ is that of which it is a figure, and burial unto death (vi. 4), a plain proof it is not in itself a figure

of death. That, you will find, is the doctrine of Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12 agrees with it.

Then you ask—"Is the unbaptized person regarded as freed from sin, or as a slave to it?" Now I have no wish to enter on a disquisition about baptism. I may, however, say, I was not aware that a person as baptised ceases thereby to be a slave to sin; and I would ask you, were Cornelius and those with him, in Acts x., who had received the Holy Ghost, in Christ? and had they died with Christ to sin before being baptized, or not? The answer is simple. They were in Christ, and they had died to sin; for, receiving the Holy Ghost before baptism, they shared in all that Peter and those with him had, though, as Christ died before their conversion, they needed what Peter did not—to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, in order to take their places before God and man as disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now you tell me the result of what I have taught is, that "the Holy Ghost takes a man as he is in Adam, as he is in the flesh, as he is under the dominion of sin, and puts him in Christ." I presume you mean all this to describe an unconverted man, and I can understand your confusion, because you view, what is not the case, the one in Rom. vi. as still a sinner, *i.e.*, unconverted. As to the Holy Ghost putting a person into Christ, I do not think, if we are subject to the teaching of the Word, we should speak in that way. God gives the Holy Ghost is what Scripture says; let us keep to it. But, clearly, if that same Word is to guide me, a man is in Adam and in the flesh till he is in the Spirit, and so in Christ. There is no middle state, as you seem to suppose. It is either the one or the other, and the change is effected by the indwelling of the Spirit. If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not Christ's. It is as being in Christ that we have died to sin; for we have died with Him, and so are to reckon ourselves in that case dead unto it, and alive unto God in Christ Jesus our Lord. But the Spirit comes and dwells only in one who is already a saint, though, till He dwells in him, he is not in

Christ. Being in the flesh is not a condition confined to the unconverted. Every one born of God is in that condition till indwelt by the Spirit. God, by the indwelling of the Spirit, brings the believer out from being in the flesh to being in the Spirit. Till then, he is not in Christ. Can you disprove this? Tell me how we have died with Christ to sin, except by being in Him who has died to it? You say he *dies* with Christ in figure by baptism. Scripture says we *have died* with Christ, and does not say it was in figure by baptism. It was not. Were that the case, what would you say of Peter, James, and John, and the 120 who never were baptised, that I know of, with Christian baptism at all? The teaching of baptism is brought in, not to show that we die with Christ in figure by that rite, but as an additional reason not to continue in sin. "Shall we continue in sin?" asks the Apostle. "No," is the answer, "How shall we, who have died to sin, live any longer therein." "Or," he adds, "know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto Christ Jesus were baptized unto His death, therefore we are buried with Him by baptism unto death" (not died with Him). Hence our proper Christian *condition* as having died to sin forbids continuance in it. Our Christian *profession*, that we have been buried with Christ unto death, alike forbids it. This is why and how baptism is here introduced. Died with Christ, because in Him, must be true of every real Christian. Buried with Christ by baptism, would only be true of those who had been baptized in His name. Hence, writes Paul, "So many of *us* as have been baptized, &c." It is true, it would be in vain to seek practical deliverance from the power of sin, if we had not died to it first. But, as in Christ, we have died with Christ to sin.

Your reference to the leper, "was the oil put on him, apart from washing?" seems to me unhappy. For he washed himself. It was not like the priests at their consecration. They were washed all over by another. The leper was not. Compare Lev. xiv. 8, 9, with viii. 6. Do we receive the Holy Ghost as a consequence of any change we make in our ways? Is it

not conferred on us when we believe the gospel of our salvation? And, if I turn to the ordinance for the cleansing of the leper, I find the oil was put on him after the blood had been put on him, and just where the blood had been put. So your remark on that score would not be in place. And when I tell you that I do not believe the cleansing of the leper is typical of a sinner's conversion, but of a person's restoration to his place in the assembly, I think you will see the hopelessness of convincing me by that of what you think is serious error.

Then as to Rom. vii. The first husband dies before the woman can be married again. But in Christianity, of course, it is the converse—we have died, not the law. We have died to it, by the body of Christ, who has actually died, to be married to another, even to Christ risen. Your objection, I think, you will find untenable. You say my “doctrine ignores the need of “being identified with the death of Christ, in order to freedom “from the power of sin and the law.” If you read “*Christian Standing and Condition*,” pp. 13, 26, and “*Is it the Truth of the Gospel*,” pp. 42, 43, you will see how far you have misconceived what I really hold, and should teach, and what I have there stated. We get freedom from the power of sin and the law, not by baptism, but through being in Christ, who has actually died to both. We have thereby died to both. Your objection to what is stated on p. 24 of “*Christian Standing*,” based on Eph. ii. 13, is to me, allow me to say it, inconceivable. Does it ignore the pulling down the middle wall of partition? I should have thought it affirmed it. The Jew was dispensationally nigh (Acts ii. 39), the Gentile dispensationally far off. Now the converted from each are one new man in Christ. By and by, the national difference will be again acknowledged, as Deut. xxxii. 43, &c., shews. But Rom. xi. is a different line of teaching to that of Eph. ii. 13, if you refer to the olive tree.

As you object to my use of Rom. viii. 9 to shew how we come to be in Christ, and yet you own we are, in one sense, in Christ by the indwelling of the Spirit, should you not have

stated on what part of Scripture you rest for the doctrine which you admit in one sense is true? I presume it is on the authority of the Word that your admission is based. Now, I believe the more that verse is pondered over, the more its bearing will come out—"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is not Christ's." Some, I see, admit it is by the Spirit we come to be in Christ, but refuse the statement that it is by His indwelling. Such overlook the force of the verb—"If any man *have* not the Spirit of Christ," &c. Apart from having the Spirit, and the context shows that it is His indwelling that is referred to, a man is not "of Christ." A man may have life, being born of God, and hence be in relationship with God, being His child (though not consciously so, of course), and yet not be Christ's. Now what is wanted for this last? The Word answers, the indwelling of the Spirit. Is it going beyond the Word then to say that it is by the indwelling of the Spirit we come to be in Christ? Apart from that, we are not Christ's; with it, we are. Can you adduce any teaching of the Divine Word which shews that by something else we come to be in Christ?

You admit that, if we have not the Spirit of Christ, we are not yet recognised as being of His company, though you add "Gal. iv. 6 plainly shows that we are sons first by faith in Christ, and receive the Spirit because this is so; but I can quite understand that in Rom. viii. we are not recognised as "of Christ's company, until we have received the Spirit." Now why write Christ's *company*, and not frankly state we are not of Christ till we have received the Spirit? Why, too, write of being, or not being recognised? Who is to recognise us as of Christ? Man, merely? No, it is God. Why say *recognise*? Why not plainly admit the bearing and force of Rom. viii. 9—"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is not of Him?" *Not recognised* you say! The passage says nothing about recognition. Non-recognition implies the existence of that which Rom. viii. 9 distinctly denies. Gal. iv. 6, as you remark, plainly shows that we are sons by faith in Christ before we

receive the Spirit. That is perfectly true ; but I fail to apprehend any difficulty in that, nor do I see how Gal. iii. 26 and iv. 6 shew you that justification and the reception of the Spirit are not concurrent.

You ask, "does Scripture anywhere teach that God gives the Holy Ghost to a man as yet not justified?" Do you mean to one not justified by blood, or what? Your question here would need to be more precise, I trust you will allow me to say. To your question let me reply by another. Where is the truth of justification by faith raised, when the gift of the Holy Ghost is either promised or given? It is promised and given in connection with forgiveness of sins (Acts ii. 38, x. 43, Eph. i. 13), and not in connection with justification by faith. But, if a man is justified by faith, he has clearly, as the Word implies, believed the gospel of his salvation, on the belief of which he receives the Holy Ghost. So, addressing the Galatians, the Apostle reminds those who were turning to the law to be justified that they had received the Holy Ghost. That settled the question raised in Galatians. They possessed full Christian blessing.

To come to your third point—the teaching of Eph. i. 6. It is a question first of all of the reading, and no one that I know of, whose judgment you would be likely to rest on, now maintains the other reading. Certainly J. N. D., as you will see in his note, admits it is the best attested reading. If the best attested reading is accepted, the translation is plain enough. J. N. D. admits what it must then be, with which the Revised Version and others agree. What we have to do, I take it, is to accept it. If you object to it, your quarrel, I believe, is with God, not with me. So far as to the reading. But are we accepted before God by being in Christ? I know of no sacrificial teaching of the Old Testament which could favour such an idea. Was the offerer in the burnt-offering or the sin-offering? the former was offered for his acceptance. He was accepted according to all its value, but was he in it? Certainly not. If he had been in it he must have borne the judgment,

for the sacrifice did, being consumed on his behalf on the altar. What confusion we should get into, if things are not kept distinct in our thoughts. But you turn to Lev. xxiii. 10-14, and would press the words "accepted for you." Well, for whom? For Israel. But Israel were not the crop in the field. To use the passage as your argument requires, you must teach that the crop was accepted in the wave sheaf. But the Word says nothing about accepting the crop. For *you*, not for *its* acceptance is the statement in the passage. The people could not enjoy the crop till the wave sheaf had been offered. To that, I suppose, the words you quote refer (see v. 14). If you would press the passage into your service, since it clearly speaks of Israel in the past, you must teach, to be consistent, that Israel in the past were accepted because in Christ. But you cannot mean that. Then, viewing the wave sheaf in its typical light, you will find the assumed parallel does not exist. You say—"presented in the first fruit sheaf to God, and accepted in Him." But the wave loaves were not accepted *in* the wave sheaf. A marked difference is made; leaven was in them, and a sin-offering was offered up with them. There was none with the wave sheaf which typified Christ, Himself, and alone. "Presented in the first-fruit sheaf to God." Where is that taught? Col. i. 22 treats of us in the future, and that in relation to our persons, in our bodies when changed, *i.e.*, the whole person. And, let me ask you, where are we said to be risen even now *in* Christ? We are risen *with* Him, not *in* Him. In no way then can Lev. xxiii. help your argument, or establish your position. With the failure of the parallel, all that you found on it drops. So I pass on.

Your fourth objection is, that "I deny the application 'of new creation' to the person of the saint, and to the material heavens and earth." On this I can be brief. You admit that the identity of the person is not touched by new creation, and yet you assert that the body will be created anew. I may seem a dull scholar; but I cannot understand how a person's identity will be preserved, and yet his body be created anew. Now, the only

instance that we have on record, that can help us as to the preservation of a person's identity when raised, is certainly a witness against your doctrine. I allude to the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. The body in which He died was undeniably the body in which He appeared when risen. It could not be otherwise. "They were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: handle Me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have." (Luke xxiv. 37-39.) It was to His body that He turned their attention in proof of His identity—His body with the marks of His passion. Again, a week after, when the Lord addressed Thomas, was it not in language which assured him of His identity, proofs of which he would gather, if he touched Him? "Reach hither thy finger and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side: and be not faithless, but believing." (John xx. 27.) You will probably admit, that the body in which the Lord died is the body in which He rose. That settles then the question about the bodies of the saints, if resurrection for them is not a myth. For, if there be no resurrection of the dead, Christ is not risen. God raised Him not up, if the dead rise not. "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." (1 Cor. xv.) It would be a terrible doctrine to deny His resurrection. But you cannot hold that truth, and deny the resurrection of the dead.

Now, creating anew of the body after death of which you speak, would distinctly deny its resurrection. It is raised in glory. Could you predicate of that which is raised in glory, the need of being created anew? It is raised. What is raised? The body which was sown in corruption. Scripture teaches dogmatically on this subject; for it is a fundamental truth of the gospel—"It is sown," "It is raised." "Who shall change (or transform) the body of our humiliation to be fashioned like to His body of glory?" (Phil. iii. 21). God "shall quicken your mortal bodies because of His Spirit which dwelleth in you."

(Rom. viii. 11). *Resurrection* of the body is a Scripture truth. The body being created anew is quite an unscriptural thought. Further, let me remind you, that *created anew* is not a Scriptural phrase, and is liable to mislead those who use it. We are created in Christ Jesus unto good works. For, "if any man be in Christ, he is new creation." Does God re-create what He once created? I do not remember any such statement, nor is there one line in the Word which teaches that our spirit and soul, two parts of every man, will be created anew, any more than the body. 1 Thess. v. 23 is decisive against it.

But you would press 2 Cor. v.—"The house not made with hands." But that is the body in its resurrection state as raised in glory. Then "not of this creation" (Heb. ix. 11) does not refer to our bodies at all. It is speaking of a contrast between the heavenly sanctuary and the earthly tabernacle, the latter of which was the *antitype* (v. 24), so that you cannot even predicate an existence to the latter before the former. It is really the reverse. Hence created anew would be out of place in that connection, as certainly it is when our bodies are treated of. But if I am wrong, point out, if you can, where the body, the soul, and the spirit of the saint are said to be created anew. I believe you cannot do this. To affirm such a doctrine is a mistake. To insist on it is to deny resurrection of the body, and to rob us of all Christian hope.

I am quite aware of the difficulty of surrendering all at once thoughts we may have long cherished. But Scripture is plain, when taken simply. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," or, there is new creation. But created anew opens the door to the thought of re-creation, which is what many, if I understand them, really, though unintentionally, hold.

Here I close. I quite remember meeting you at Newcastle, and conversing with you about the hymn book.

Believe me,

Yours faithfully in Christ,

C. E. STUART.

I am sorry my reply has been so long delayed.

N.B.—The numbers of the pages in ordinary type refer, unless otherwise stated, to the printed copy of MR. GLADWELL'S first letter; those in italics to his second letter.

ADDINGTON HOUSE,

ADDINGTON ROAD,

READING, *15th Dec., 1885.*

DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST,—

Your long letter, which reached me on Nov. 16th, was the first intimation I have received from you of the safe arrival at Gateshead of my letter of July 31st. You tell me at the close of it (*p. 34*) that the tone of my letter of July was that of contempt. It was quite unintentional on my part, let me assure you; and I am relieved to find that you furnish me with no proof of the accusation, saving that I called you a leader, which you never thought of being. Now had I done such a thing, I do not think any one could, on that score, accuse me of being guilty of contempt. But it is a misapprehension on your part. My words were (*p. 17* above)—“To follow you, I must deny that man is a fallen creature, and must flatly contradict God's Word. I must decline such a lead, and prefer keeping to Apostolic teaching.” In this I see nothing wrong.

Then you write of misconception on my part of what you have written. I am unaware of it, and should regret it if it was the case. Let us look at the instances you adduce to prove it. On *p. 10* of your second letter you give an example, as you think, of it. I had stated that you claimed for Israel that they had a standing in God's presence. You were attempting, you will remember, to controvert my words—“The sinner, apart from redemption and atonement, has no standing before God's throne.” Your comment was—“I learn from the Scriptures I have given that Israel had both redemption and atonement. Had they then no standing?” Now, why write

thus, if you did not mean to affirm that they had a standing in God's presence? Standing before God's throne is surely standing in God's presence. Your remark which I quoted was out of place, if it did not mean that. And further on you wrote (p. 3 of your printed letter)—“The Israelites then had title to stand before God.” I am unable then to see the justness of your words—“Had you attended to what I said, with “a tithe of the care you exact from others, you would easily “have seen that I did not admit ‘standing’ to be the same “thing as ‘being in the presence of God.’” Title to stand before God *I* understand to be very like having a standing before God's throne, or in His presence; and standing before God's throne, you must remember, was the truth you had to meet.

On that same page of your reply you tell me I have given your statement wrongly, when writing that you said—“Israel, “who had some kind of standing, will have a better one, “founded on a better redemption and atoning work than they had” (see p. 3 above). You had only said, you now write, that “they needed a better one.” Pardon me if I demur to any misrepresentation here of what you wrote. You stated (p. 4)—“The Gentiles had no standing, I know, that Israel “had, I believe, though they needed a better one founded on a “better redemption and atoning work than they had . . . “That the heavenly saints have a standing in God's presence, “and a better one than Israel had or ever *will have*, I learn “too from scripture,” &c. You will see I have not misrepresented you, when your words I have put in italics are taken into account. You wrote of the need in one sentence, and of their having the need supplied in the next.

You express surprise at the remark that it seems a question of posture with you, when you call attention in Rev. iv. to the saints *sitting* in contrast to *standing*. But was there not ground for that, seeing you wrote (p. 5)—“Is there no contrast here “between *around* and *before*, and also between *throned* and “*standing*?” unconscious, I presume, that I had written “No

“higher position can a saint have than *a* standing before that “throne.” You do make it a question of *posture* when you ask—“Is the sitting on thrones around, no higher position than “standing before God’s throne?” Now, one might have a standing before God, and show it, and enjoy it, by sitting in His presence. The two things are quite compatible, and are not in that sense any contrast. Having a standing is perfectly compatible with being seated, or enthroned in God’s presence.

Then on *p. 21* you ask—“Can *you* acquit yourself of *wilful* “unfairness here? Where did I say that Rom. vi. treats of a sinner?” On *p. 9* of your printed letter is the answer, where you write—“Further down on the same page the ‘two lights’ “in which the sinner is viewed, leaves out the view in which “he is seen in Rom. vi. and vii., a living, helpless slave to sin, and “under law, powerless for good.” Whatever you may have meant, you wrote “he (*i.e.*, the sinner) is seen,” &c. Now, if you say you did not mean that, why, it may be asked, when commenting on my words, which pointed out the two lights in which the sinner is viewed in the New Testament, the one set forth in Rom. i.-v. 11, and the other in Eph. ii. 1-7, did you write this “leaves out the view in which he (*i.e.*, the sinner) is “seen in Rom. vi., vii.?” Your doctrine would suppose that Rom. vi., vii. treat of man as a sinner.

On *p. 22* you call attention to my words—“I was not aware “that a person as baptised ceases thereby to be a slave to sin.” “Another instance,” you exclaim, “of gross unfairness on the “part of one, who insists on scrupulous exactness from his “opponents. Who had said anything of the kind?” You are aware, of course, I did not say you had. But having written—“Is the unbaptised person regarded as freed from sin, “or as a slave to it? Is he regarded as alive under its bondage, “or as dead to it?” great stress evidently was laid by you on the person being unbaptised. My remark, therefore, I venture to think, was not only not an unfair one, but really a very natural one. And when you wrote to me—“The doctrine “seems plain. He is a bond-slave to it until freed by death, of

“ which baptism is the figure. He dies with Christ in figure by “ baptism,” &c. ; since it is by Christ’s death we get free from the power of sin, I trust you will not be angry with me, if I refuse to plead guilty to the charge of making “ a baseless insinuation ” (*p. 24*). Saints get freedom from the power of sin and from the law, not by baptism, but through being in Christ, who has actually died to both. For baptism, I repeat, is not a figure of dying, nor of having died, but of burial unto death.

Having sought thus to remove any impression of unfair dealing on my part, let us now turn to a more important subject, viz., the doctrine you have propounded, and maintain. You tell me in your second letter (*p. 2*), that your purpose was “ to prove, that the scriptures, in the Psalms, did speak of Israel “ (I believe Israel only, you couple the Gentile with them), “ and that the thought of having a standing, is not, and cannot “ be raised there, seeing, that so far as Israel was concerned, “ they had one already ; since they had both redemption and “ atonement.” At the outset let me remind you that I wrote of a standing *before God’s throne*. It is this you have to combat, if you would upset my ground. Then, to establish your thesis, you asserted that the Psalms which I quoted, referred to Israel only. In reply, I turned you to Rom. iii. 9-19 in refutation of such a thought, for the language of the Apostle leaves no room for doubt on this point, as we read “ For we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin : as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one,” &c. Now, how have you met this? Have you, can you controvert it? You have not met it. “ I suppose,” or “ so far as I see,” are not Scriptural proofs of the incorrectness of what had been advanced.

Next you asserted Israel enjoyed redemption by blood. In my reply it was pointed out that redemption by blood was not a doctrine taught them. It is a New Testament truth, and involves, for those who share in it, forgiveness of sins and justification (Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Rom. iii. 24). All who share in that are saved. Hence, if your doctrine is true, the

whole nation of Israel after the flesh are saved, and Ahab, Judas Iscariot, and others, will be in heaven. How have you met this? You cannot give Scripture to upset it. You *suppose*, and you *believe*, are all that you can say. But mere supposition and belief, unless founded truly on the written Word, are of no value as arguments by which to prove that your opponent's doctrine is "destructive of Christianity" (p. 10).

Now let me give you Scripture, which must outweigh any amount of supposition or groundless belief on your part or on mine. In Ex. vi. 6 God first speaks of redeeming Israel, saying, "I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm, and with great judgments." In Deut. He declares that they were redeemed from the house of bondage (vii. 8, xiii. 5, xv. 15, xxiv. 18); and Moses reminds them that it was effected by God's greatness (ix. 26). To this redemption David and others looked back, and spoke of to God (2 Sam. vii. 23, 1 Chron. xvii. 21, Neh. i. 10, Ps. lxxvii. 15, lxxviii. 42, 43, Micah vi. 4). Of redemption by blood they do not speak, only of redemption by power. Exod. xii. does not speak of redemption by blood, nor treat of it either. It is surely wiser for us to see how God speaks on the subject in Exod. vi., and to learn. Some years ago I learnt that I had been wrong on this subject, by seeing how God's Word spoke of it. Redemption by blood, I make bold to say, Israel in the past did not enjoy. Shelter by blood from God's judgment Exodus xii. sets forth, as I have before pointed out to you. But though redemption by power was that which they knew, and not redemption by blood, there are principles common to both. Hence it is that redemption, as set forth in the history of Israel, can instruct us. For those redeemed by God become His people, and He their God, and that stands good for ever. In Israel's case the redemption by power was national. With us redemption by blood is individual.

Further, you told me that they had a standing (pp. 1, 2), had a title to stand before God (p. 3) and had a standing before

Levit. xvi. was instituted at all (p. 7). Then they could have a title to stand before God apart from atonement by blood, for that was not typically shadowed forth till one and a half years after their departure from Egypt, viz., on the 10th day of the 7th month in the second year. Rather queer doctrine it seems to me. But when I asked you for Scripture, remarking that in your efforts to prove me wrong, you left us destitute of any Scripture, which, without controversy, treats of so important a subject as our standing before the throne of God, what do I get in reply? I quote your words—"As to giving you scriptures that do treat of it, the only ones I know of, which "speak of it *as a position to be occupied in blessing by any "saints whatever*, are Rev. vii. and xv., and the saints there "seen are certainly not Christians, nor do I believe they are "Millennial saints," &c. (*pp. 3, 4*). After this I need say nothing.

Your contention about Rom. iii. and the Psalms you cannot maintain. Your assertion as to redemption by blood having been enjoyed by Israel, has nothing but supposition and groundless belief to rest upon. And now, in the place of giving Scripture to prove the truth of the Christian's standing before the throne of God, you adduce Rev. vii., xv. as the only proofs of it as a position to be occupied in blessing by any saints whatever. These passages, you correctly state, do not refer to Christians at all. So you cannot give me a single Scripture in response to my appeal. Your foundation on which you sought to build, to demonstrate that my teaching was "destructive of Christianity," crumbles, then, to dust. Now, till you can make good your foundation, and furnish me from the Word with that which I asked, a most reasonable request, I need not go through your letter to reply to your remarks *seriatim*.

Just one observation, and I will close. It arises from *p. 32* of your letter. "But take," you write, "the chrysalis, after it "has been crushed to dust, if God brought forth the butterfly "from the dust, would that not be creation?" I feel sure you are quite unaware on what line of rails you are here travelling.

Were the chrysalis crushed to dust, the creature within would cease to exist. Death, on the other hand, is not the termination of man's existence. For your argument to be valid, you must either affirm the immortality of the moth's existence, independent of the preservation of the chrysalis, or deny that to be true of man. There is no escaping from this, that affirming the re-creation of the body, is denying, most completely, its resurrection.

Here I conclude, subscribing myself

Faithfully yours in Christ,

C. E. STUART.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

"CHRISTIAN STANDING AND CONDITION,"

4th edition, price 4d.

"IS IT THE TRUTH OF THE GOSPEL?"

2nd edition, price 3d.

"RECENT UTTERANCES,"

Price 3d.

· E. MARLBOROUGH & CO.,

51 OLD BAILEY,

LONDON, E.C.