

THE DIVISION OF 1884-85.

WHAT CAUSED IT?

BY

C. E. STUART.

NOTICE.

This Paper is not sold.—A copy can be had by sending an addressed postal wrapper to Mrs. MACDONALD, 44 Chapel Street, Aberleen, or to the Author, at Addington House, Addington Road, Reading.

THE DIVISION OF 1884-85.

What Caused It?

THINKING that the time has come to endeavour to make plain to others that which has been plain to myself, viz., what is the root of the present trouble, and what is the real question at issue, I desire to do it, avoiding, as far as possible, all reference to persons, save only as it may be requisite to make the outline of the case clear to the reader. But for that I must recall to mind, and will do it as concisely as possible, the past history of the movement.

For a long time many amongst us have been conscious of a sectarian spirit, early indications of which appeared in the formation of a school characterised by a kind of teaching commonly called *subjective*, and also by the adoption of certain phrases, which became, one might almost say, shibboleths of the party. Now *subjective* teaching, and by that is meant teaching concerning men, or saints, in contrast to *objective* teaching, which treats of God and of the Lord, is very necessary in its place. We cannot do without it. But scriptural subjective teaching will always lead us to the objective. For telling us what we are by nature, and what we are prone to, it will necessarily set before us what we should be; and thus lead on those who partake of the divine nature, to

learn about God, and about His character, and hence what His children should manifest, as well as to learn about the Lord Jesus Christ, and from Him, as the only perfect example set before us, how we should live and witness for God, and for Him in this present scene.

Ephes. iv. 32—v. 2, will illustrate what is meant : “ Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God in Christ hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore imitators of God, as dear children ; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved you, and hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.” Are we told what *we* ought to be ? God and Christ are brought before us, to remind us of that which we should display. Is there room for self-glorification in such teaching ? How could there be, with God and the Lord Jesus Christ kept in view ? Shall the unfolding of divine counsels concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, and which also tell what God has done and will do for us, puff us up as the subjects of such wonderful counsels ? How could that be, were it really remembered, as it ought to be, that our partaking in the fruits of them flows from the sovereign mercy of our God ? When the Apostle was unfolding them, his heart overflowed in praise to God, and in prayer for God’s saints. No encouragement did he give for self-exaltation in any way. Scriptural subjective teaching will never puff up, will never make us self-satisfied, will never encourage that sectarian spirit, inherent really in every one of us, and will never present itself as the highest, or most advanced kind of teaching. On the contrary, it will

continually turn us to that which is objective. Subjective teaching which tends to puff up, is not the true teaching of God's Word. Now, what has been the tendency of that kind of subjective teaching referred to? Let those, who have listened to it, tell.

To fruits of this sectarian spirit let us now turn.

1st. Some began, if language is an index to thoughts, to view themselves, and those who agreed with them, as forming the faithful *remnant* of their day. Such forgot surely that the term *remnant*, applied to Israelites in both Testaments, is never used of Christians in the sacred Word. *A company* of Christians cannot ever be viewed as *the remnant*, as Scripture uses the term. For by that is clearly meant but a part of a whole. No one company of saints in our day, however advanced in Christian attainment, however devoted to God, will include all the persons privileged to share in the blessings peculiar to God's people. They are not the only ones who have been made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; they are not the only persons indwelt by the Spirit of God; they are not the only ones who are members of the Body of Christ. A remnant therefore amongst *true* Christians is an anti-Christian idea. It is wholly opposed to the truth of the one Body, which Body cannot be dismembered. A remnant amongst *professing* Christians, unless it were meant to include *all real* Christians on earth, is a sectarian idea. To imitate the spirit of the godly remnant of Israel in devotedness and faithfulness to God, and in separation from evil, is right. But any approach to saints now viewing themselves as a

remnant, in the midst of other true Christians, is foreign to Scripture teaching.

We do read of those in Thyatira called by the Lord "the rest" (Rev. ii. 24). That comprised all the faithful in that assembly, and thus it distinguished those in the *local* assembly, who were true to Him from those who were not. But, be it remarked, the Lord, it was, who thus designated them, not they themselves. What company of Christians however in any one place, if they really understood what they were saying, would arrogate to themselves the title of "the rest"? And what company of Christians, unless deeply imbued with the spirit of sectarianism, whilst emulating the devotedness of the godly remnant of Israel, would not desire to make it very plain, that no such thought as that of being *the* remnant of their day should receive any countenance from them.?

2nd. High sounding phrases, which cannot stand testing by the Word, became current. The use of the term *heavenly* applied to *truth* and to *people* may be cited as an example. "Heavenly truth" began to be much talked of. Very specious, and very flattering it doubtless was. It is, however, phraseology unknown to the pages of the New Testament. In that volume the Lord Jesus Christ is revealed as *the* truth (John xiv. 6), and the Spirit is also called *the* truth (1 John v. 6). It is obvious, then, that the phrase "heavenly truth," which must necessarily imply the existence of some other truth in contrast with it, is one foreign to God's Word. For if the Lord Jesus Christ is *the* truth, and the Holy Ghost is *the* truth, what truth of God is there which is not heavenly, if men choose to use

such a term? Apply the term "heavenly truth" to all the truth, and the reason for its use vanishes. This is one instance of the baneful effects of phraseology which is not supported by the Scriptures of truth. Men begin to test the teaching from the Word by such phrases, instead of testing the phrase which may be in question by the Word of God. Let us do this latter.

Scripture speaks of *heavenly things* in contrast with *earthly things* (John iii. 12). He who is *the Truth* has made this distinction, and He could tell of both. He had spoken to Nicodemus of the new birth, evidently part of the earthly things; He could also have spoken of heavenly things. Now *heavenly things* presents to us a very different idea to that of *heavenly truth*. All can see a meaning in the former which there is not in the latter; and as the latter phrase was used, it was productive of grave evils, since it led to the depreciating of certain portions of God's Word, which teach us undoubtedly of heavenly things—witness the Epistle to the Hebrews, a large part of which is occupied with the Lord Jesus being in heaven, and the teaching connected with that. Now is it not the case that disparaging remarks were made about that Epistle? But would any true heart, if it stopped to think of it, allow that which ministers Christ, and Christ in heaven, there for us, to be depreciated? Heavenly things there are; and among them that subject peculiar to the Hebrews, viz., the present service of the Lord Jesus Christ as High Priest, must assuredly be classed. What have Christians come to, if such a portion of the sacred Scriptures can be lightly

esteemed, and openly disparaged? The Holy Spirit testifies of Christ. Does He lead God's saints to disparage any part of His own teaching about that Blessed One? Let the Scripture term "heavenly things" be remembered. It will be found a touchstone, an unfailing test, by which to try that high sounding phrase, "heavenly truth."

Then we heard a good deal about being "heavenly men," or "heavenly ones." This last is a phrase Scriptural in itself, but in the way it was used it was quite mis-applied. I cite the only passage in which it occurs—"The first man is of the earth, earthy," *i.e.*, made of dust, "the second Man is from heaven. As the earthy one," *i.e.*, the one made of dust, "such also the earthy ones," *i.e.*, those made of dust; "and as the heavenly One such also the heavenly ones. And as we have borne the image of the earthy one," *i.e.*, the one made of dust, "we shall also bear the image of the heavenly One" (1 Cor. xv. 47-49). The contrast is between *earthy*, a physical condition of the body, and *heavenly*; not, be it remarked, between *earthly* and *heavenly*.

Do we, by this statement, ignore other teaching in God's word, or lower the standard for walk? By no means. We have a heavenly calling (Heb. iii. 1). Our inheritance is in the heavens (1 Pet. i. 4). Our citizenship is in the heavens (Phil. iii. 20). We sit together in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus (Ephes. ii. 6). There is a warfare for us now in the heavenlies (Ephes. vi. 12). We are blessed, too, with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ (Ephes. i. 3.)

All this is true. But when Scripture would

teach us about our walk and daily life, it not only exhorts us, as risen with Christ, to seek the things which are above, where Christ sits at the right hand of God, and to set our mind on things above, not on things on the earth, because we have died, and our life is hid with Christ in God (Coloss. iii. 1-3); but it also tells us to be imitators of God (Ephes. v. 1); to walk as Christ walked (1 John ii. 6); to learn of Him (Matt. xi. 29); to follow His steps (1 Pet. ii. 21); and to let that mind be in us which was also in Christ Jesus (Phil. ii. 5). Now we need an object, a standard, a model. Scripture presents all that to us, as it puts the Lord Jesus Christ before us. He in glory is the object. As He walked in life down here, He is the model. Christ in glory is one thing; Christ as He was in life here is quite another. We need both set before us, and Scripture does that. To forget, or to decry the latter will lead to woeful disaster. The true teaching of the Spirit will never lead us to think lightly of it. But what has been the tendency of the school of doctrine referred to?

Now Scripture never exhorts us to be heavenly men. And calling ourselves heavenly will never make us practically like the Master. It turns the eye from Him to ourselves. It makes self, not God nor Christ, the object before us. It nourishes spiritual pride, and fosters a sectarian spirit. Has not this been the case? Now if it be remembered, as just stated, that the term *heavenly* is only used of us in contrast to *earthly*, the reader will find himself furnished by the sacred writer with the true corrective of the misapplication of this phrase.

As time went on, this sectarian movement developed an *heretical* tendency. A cry was raised about *the testimony*, and about *being in the testimony*. Very ensnaring was this. Of course all were to understand, that those who raised, and those who echoed the cry, were themselves *in* the testimony, to use their own phrase! But what is *the testimony*? Any simple soul would surely suppose that it comprised the full revelation of God's truth for our day—in a word, the Christian faith. The testimony, however, people were now taught, was really but a part of that revelation.* So, in connection with *this teaching*, evangelistic labour was openly decried. Probably those doing that were forgetful of the words of the Apostle Paul, himself a minister of the gospel, as well as of the Church (Col. i. 23-25), addressed to Timothy, in his last inspired communication, of which the Church of God is in possession, "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner; but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the power of God; who hath 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 annulled death, and hath brought life and incorruptibility to light through the gospel: whereunto I am

* I quote, in support of my statement, from *Food for the Flock*, vol. vii., p. 294, "What is the testimony? The testimony, in one sentence, is, that Christ's body is here while He is in heaven: it is fed and nurtured by Himself, in His state and spirit, but His place in heaven is its place also."

appointed a preacher, and an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles" (11 Tim. i. 8-11). No one can read this passage without seeing the close connection there was in the Apostle's mind between the testimony of our Lord and the gospel of God, and no wonder, for the gospel is part of it. Now, evangelistic labour is a special feature of the present dispensation. No one can really maintain the testimony for this day, and depreciate such labour, if rightly conducted (11 Thess. i. 8-10 ; 1 Tim. ii. 6 ; 1 John v. 9-11).

And could we conceive it possible that the Apostle Paul, an evangelist unsurpassed probably in his day (Rom. xv. 18-20), as certainly in ours, when writing in that same epistle to Timothy of Demas, meant his son in the faith to understand that Demas had forsaken him, because he had gone off preaching? Let any one read together the words already quoted from that epistle (11 Tim. i. 8-11), which show in what light Paul viewed the gospel, with those referring to Demas, "Do thy diligence to come shortly unto me: for Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica" (iv. 9, 10), and then ask himself, if the great evangelist meant to convey that Demas had left him to go off preaching! Yet this is the meaning which has been put on *his words*, and has been made public through the press.*

I have spoken of this phase of things as evincing an heretical tendency. For heresy means the making a choice of one's creed. This may be done

* "Demas was not an unconverted man; my impression is that he went off preaching."—*Food for the Flock*, Vol. viii., p. 326.

either by the adoption of error, or by magnifying some one or more truths at the expense of others, and forming a party on such a ground. The heretic is one who chooses for himself. He is not satisfied to take that, or all that which God has revealed. Hence making *the* testimony narrower than the Christian faith, as revealed in the Word, evinces in those who do it a tendency unmistakably heretical, and shows us, when we discern it, what power it is which is really at work. This comes out plainer and plainer. Two examples will suffice.

1st. To admire a beautiful view in nature, or a flower, or to have any in the house, or in the garden, began to be viewed as marking a lack of spirituality. But who made the view? Who made the flower? God, or the devil? Who gave the creature eyes to see them, and capability to admire them? He who has died for us (John i. 3; Heb. i. 2). Now, has He made and put before man, and given him the capability to admire that which is inimical to true spirituality? Of course we may abuse anything in nature. That is admitted. But is it the case, that any innocent pleasure in the works of the Creator, which we see around us, is *necessarily* detrimental to genuine spirituality? Is not this to make God the cause of the creature's lack of spirituality? Now, Scripture has a designation for such teaching, calling it the doctrine of demons (1 Tim. iv. 1), and truly it is well named. It is demoniacal doctrine to make God the author of man's defilement, or of his lack of spirituality. The Apostle has given us illustrations of such doctrines, viz., the "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats,

which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth" (1 Tim. iv. 3). The inculcation, it would seem, of this kind of doctrine, but in a more insidious form, perhaps, is evidently current in our day. Of course anything that God has provided, the creature is in danger, because of the evil within him, of misusing and perverting. Against that each should carefully watch. But the cause of defilement, or of a lack of spirituality, is not to be traced to the works of God, but to that which is within each one of us—sin, the flesh, which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be (Rom. viii. 7). True heavenly-mindedness will never make us refrain from looking upon or admiring the works of creation, though it will make us watchful, lest we should be engrossed by them.

2nd. An advanced school began to be formed as the natural outcome of this subjective teaching, the students in which regarded themselves, it would seem, as a remnant of a remnant. All very flattering to self. And now, as we might expect would be the case where demon power is at work, the excellency of Christ's person began to be depreciated by misinterpretations of typical teaching, the exponents of which one is quite ready to believe were unaware of what it was that they were furthering.* The Holy Ghost exalts the Lord,

* One instance, as being in print, I am free to cite. It appeared in *Food for the Flock*, vol. iii. The writer, stating what he thinks is the typical teaching of barley in contrast to that of wheat, tells us that "wheat in Scripture is looked at as a very precious grain. Barley comes in typically in a lower place (see Isaiah xxviii. 25, margin)" (p. 81). "Hence, it seems to me that barley, in Scripture, has to do with *man* as in responsibility in the old-Adam family, whether converted or not, etc." (p. 82). As to the first of these statements, the marginal reading of

and never leads those subject to His guidance to set forth as scriptural anything, that in the *slightest* degree would derogate from the excellency of that Blessed One. When teaching which touches His person is set forth, and gains currency, it is easy to see what is going on.

From that time the real character of the movement began rapidly to develop itself. Teaching was heard, not confined to one person or place, which, whilst professing to magnify the grace of God to us, ministered in a subtle way to spiritual pride, by exalting the saint to a level, one might say, with the Lord Jesus Christ. Scripture, it will be found, *carefully guards* against this, maintaining not only the spotlessness and excellency of His person, but also His pre-eminence. It provides, too, the true antidote to all that would in any way tarnish or lower the dignity of Christ.

To give one illustration of this. The Lord Jesus Christ, we learn, is in "the heavenlies," so are Christians, as in Him. But Scripture writes of Him as set at God's "own right hand in the heavenlies, *far above* all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come" (Ephes. i. 20-21). Are we *far above* all principality and power? We are *in* Him who is.

Isaiah xxviii. 25, on which it is made to rest, does not, it is now generally admitted, convey the meaning of the prophet. And if we translate with the *Revised Version*, "put in the wheat in rows and the barley in the appointed place," the only proof adduced by the writer for his statement wholly disappears. Nor is this to be wondered at, seeing that the wave sheaf, which undoubtedly typifies the Lord Jesus, and Him *only*, was of *barley*, not of wheat (Ruth i. 22; ii. 23). So the assumed typical teaching, if true, would, unintentionally on the part of the writer, put the Lord in what he calls "the old-Adam family," i.e., under the headship of the first man. *Not Christ Above the People*

But Scripture nowhere, that I am aware of, teaches that we are far above them. And though it speaks of Christians as closely connected with the One who is there, it simply states of such, that God has made them to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus (Ephes. ii. 6). Wonderful favour, truly, this is. But how the truth as to His person is carefully guarded. He is far above all principality, &c. Is it implied that we are *far above all* principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and *every* name that is named, not only in this age, but also in that which is to come? If so, we must be above the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. He, alone, is above *every* name that is named in this, and in the coming age. We cannot be above the Head of all principality and power (Colos. ii. 10), nor on an equality with Him either, as the term Head implies, though we can speak of union with Him as members of His Body. I suspect, a mistaken thought of what it is to be "in Christ," has paved the way for some to be unwittingly ensnared by teaching which really dishonours the Lord. Let Scripture once have its place in the heart, let its statements be weighed, and the tendency of such teaching will be exposed, and those once ensnared by it will escape like birds from the hand of the fowler. And the words of one, now with the Lord, describing the tendency of this school of doctrine, "Christ pales before Christ in us," will be owned as words of soberness and truth.

It has been attempted thus to follow the history of this sectarian movement down to the year 1883 without raising any question as to the responsi-

bility of the leaders of it. God, not man, reads the heart, and He knows the motives of each one. We can judge of actions, and of words. He alone knows the measure of responsibility attaching to each individual. I desire to leave that question, as it should be left, with Him, pointing out merely some rocks and shoals, but not sitting in judgment on the state of soul of any who may have steered in a little boat part of the ship's company right on to them. These remarks apply equally to what follows. And, if obliged, in order to make my meaning plain, to mention any one by name in succeeding pages, I desire it to be *distinctly* understood, that it is with the doctrines of which they have become the exponents that I am concerned, and not with the responsibility of these servants of Christ.

At first, some of the features of this movement above noticed seemed more like the vagaries of individuals which, whilst we refused to adopt them, might be left till their unscripturalness was more generally discerned. But now, looking back on it all, there can be no doubt that there was a system being developed by a power more subtle and more capable than man. To this let me now call attention.

A sectarian spirit, an heretical tendency, with traces of demoniacal doctrine evidenced by the injecting wrong thoughts of God into the mind, and by familiarising souls with statements depreciatory really of the Lord Jesus Christ, these were characteristics of the rise and progress of that movement, which has now developed into an anti-Christian system. I call it an anti-Christian system, because foundation truths of Christianity, one after

another, are distinctly assailed by it. It touches the person of Christ. It undermines Scriptural teaching as to His atoning sacrifice. It would render quite unnecessary a great deal of the Lord's present service on behalf of His people. A very grave indictment is this. I proceed to give proof in support of it, putting the case before the reader in the form in which it presents itself to one's own mind ; that he may judge whether or not there is a pernicious system at work, of the existence of which he may have been quite unconscious. To do this in a connected and orderly way, will necessitate a reference on more than one point to grave teaching, which has been commented upon elsewhere.

1st. The cardinal doctrine of the Trinity has been assailed, and virtually denied, it having been gravely stated that "no one could be in the Father but God Himself."* In support of this astounding statement, of course, no Scripture was adduced. Now, were it true, the Father Himself would not be God. God would be in Him, but He, Himself, would not, in that case, be God. Scripture teaches us of God the Father. This doctrine is that God is *in* the Father. Then His Son, begotten of Him from everlasting, cannot be, what He affirmed that He is, the only begotten Son of *God* (John iii. 18). He, too, then, though the Father's Son, in that case is not *God*. Nor, if this doctrine be true, can the Holy Ghost, who is sent by the Father (John xiv. 26) be *God*. For how could the Father, if He is not Himself God, send the Holy Ghost, whom Scripture affirms is God (Acts v. 3, 4). One

* "The Reading Question," by H. H. McCarthy, p. 13.

who is not Himself God could not, it is evident, send Him who is God. According to this heretical statement, on which I comment, God can be in the Persons of the Trinity, but the different Persons, viz., the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost can none of them be God. The Christian doctrine of three Persons in one God, or the Trinity in unity, is then gone. And God, if in the Father, must be a Being distinct from each and all the Persons of the Trinity, none of whom therefore can be God. I am aware, of course, what H. H. M., the propounder of this dogma, put forth, when attention was called to it. His statement, however, is too plain to be got rid of in the way he attempted to deal with it. The doctrine of the Father being God is one about which there should be no uncertain sound; for if the Divinity of the Father is surrendered, that of the Son, as I have said, must go likewise. It is an attack then on His Person. Thus it is seen, little as its propounder may be aware of it, to be part of a system which must be strenuously resisted.

2nd. But not only is the Lord's divinity assailed. His holy humanity is also more than called in question. It is absolutely denied by that dreadful statement to which attention was directed in *Recent Utterances*, p. 45, viz., that "the carcase" of the sin offering was, "as execrable, burnt without the camp."* What did that carcase typify? It typified, we learn, His body, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost—(Luke i. 35)—it speaks to us of Him who is described by God as holy, harmless, undefiled (Heb. vii. 26); and the carcase itself is called by the Spirit of God most holy (Lev. vi.

* "Voice to the Faithful," vol. xviii., p. 248.

25-30). Now the burning of the carcase outside the camp, as I have pointed out elsewhere,* only took place by God's order *after* the making atonement was completed. All of the sin offering, which was burnt to make atonement, was burnt upon the brazen altar, situated in the Court of the Tabernacle. Outside the camp there was no altar. The portion of it burnt outside the camp was not there offered up in sacrifice.

Now execrable means "deserving to be accursed, very hateful, detestable, abominable." At no time, under no circumstances, could such a term have been applicable to our Lord and Saviour. It deals a deadly blow at the spotlessness of His person. How does Scripture speak?—"He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin" (2 Cor. v. 21). "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," wrote the Apostle Paul (Gal. iii. 13). Between "being made a curse," and "as execrable," *i.e.*, as deserving to be accursed, there is the greatest possible difference. Could one, as deserving to be accursed, be made a curse for others? "Being made a curse" for others, guards the truth as to Him which "execrable" denies. On the cross He was forsaken of God. True indeed! But the statement I comment on speaks of Him *after* atonement was made. "In Him is no sin," says John (1 John iii. 5). Every statement of Scripture about the Lord Jesus gives the flattest contradiction to the doctrine thus enunciated. "No man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed," we read in 1 Cor. xii.

* "Propitiation by Blood," p. 10. London: E. Marlborough & Co., 51 Old Bailey.

3. Could we imagine the sacred writer who penned those words, teaching, or indorsing, that the Lord Jesus Christ was deserving to be accursed, after atonement had been made? This is what the carcase being burnt outside the camp "as execrable" would teach. Could we imagine God giving to Christians, as a *special* privilege, to feed on that sin offering (Heb. xiii. 10, 11) which His Word had typically taught was *detestable*, *abominable*? Clearly such a doctrine is not from above, but is perfectly in keeping with, and is the natural outcome of, that teaching, which by its interpretation of types depreciates (however unintentionally on the part of the several writers) the excellency of our Saviour's person, and thus is part of an anti-Christian system.

The ramifications of this pernicious system by degrees are made manifest, and the fact that it is a *system* is made apparent. For by a system is meant "a whole plan, a scheme consisting of many parts connected in such a manner as to form a chain of mutual dependences." Now this is just what it is. Many a person might make the most egregious blunders. What, however, confronts us, is not the floundering of one person who has got beyond his depth, but a variety of statements uttered by different people, connected together in the same outward fellowship, which, little as the several propounders may be aware of it, tend each and all to subvert the faith once for all (Jude 3) delivered to the saints, by, amongst other evils, undermining the Scriptural doctrine of the atonement.

3rd. For, if *execrable* could at any time have

been rightly applied to the Lord Jesus Christ, He must by consequence have needed a Saviour for Himself, in which case He could not have been on the cross a substitute for others. Hence substitution must be given up, and indeed, if we listen to the utterances of this school, substitution is not required; for another has in print informed us, that “the believer’s trial is, as it were, ‘settled out of court.’” In that case, of course, no judgment has been borne for us. But what says the Word?—“Who *His own self bare* our sins in His own body on the tree” (1 Pet. ii. 24); “*Christ hath once suffered* for sins, the just for the unjust” (1 Pet. iii. 18). Peter thus wrote, and saints have, age after age, believed it on the authority of the Divine Word. Could we imagine John, who witnessed the Lord’s death on the cross, or the others to whom He showed Himself on the day of His resurrection, with the marks of His passion still visible, propagating such a doctrine? No. Apostolic teaching is the reverse of this. Were the Apostles mistaken? They must have been, if there has been, “as it were, a settlement out of court.”

In another way this cardinal doctrine is set aside. “The first man was ended in judgment by the Man of God’s purpose;” so we are told.* What the writer means by the *first* man is made plain by the context of the passage just quoted, and by his reference to 1 Cor. xv. 45. He cannot mean the nature, called in Scripture the “old man.” His words cannot be interpreted of Adam himself. We can only interpret them as applying

* “Voice to the Faithful,” vol. xviii., p. 279.

to the race. Now for any person, or for any race of beings which is ended in judgment, it is clear, on the face of it, there can be no *substitution*. Substitution would preserve those, for whom it was provided, from being *ended* in judgment. Not only, then, is substitution thus set aside, but annihilation of the race is proclaimed, pure and simple. This ending of the first man in judgment, we are to understand, was accomplished by the Man of God's purpose through His death. It is difficult to see where in this scheme any place is left for the judgment of the world, or the judgment of the great white throne. If the race was *ended* in judgment, who is there of the ungodly to be judged? Again we are informed, that the Lord "has borne the judgment of the first man,"* another startling statement equally without foundation. If this were true, the whole race must be saved, or substitution is of no certain avail. In either case that cardinal doctrine is attacked. By the former announcement it is really denied. By the second it is deprived of all its value. I leave the reader to marvel over the confusion there must be in the mind of a writer who could gravely tell his readers, that "the first man was ended in judgment by the Man of God's purpose," and shortly afterwards announce, as the *truth of the Gospel*, that the Lord has "borne the judgment of the first man."

4th. Substitution thus tampered with, *propitiation* is openly surrendered. Two witnesses shall be adduced in support of this—*Mr. B. F. Pinkerton*

* See Mr. Stoney's "Letter to the Brethren in the Lord meeting at Queen's Road, Reading," p. 4.

and *Mr. C. Stanley*. Mr. Pinkerton has declared that "the whole work on which our souls rest with divine certainty was accomplished in this world, not in heaven." By this, as has been pointed out in *Recent Utterances*, pp. 41, 42, propitiation by blood is really denied. Was it a slip on Mr. Pinkerton's part? We learn from his recent pamphlet, *The Atonement, what is it?*, he has not been misrepresented as regards the tenor of his language, nor was he unfairly saddled with something he did not mean. "I believe and affirm," he now writes, "that Christ accomplished the atonement in all its aspects and parts, fully, perfectly, and for ever, when He was in this world suspended on the cross between heaven and earth, rejected of man and forsaken of God" (p. 14). Mark he says, *when He was in this world*. Then He had not died. That this is his doctrine is made unequivocally plain, as he writes (p. 20), "I believe that our adorable Lord and Redeemer committed His spirit into the hands of His Father, after the cup of wrath had been drunk, and the divine majesty had been maintained, yea, and propitiated also; when, as we say, Justice itself was satisfied and said, 'It is enough.'" Mark again the language. His death is stated to have taken place after the Divine Majesty had been propitiated. There is no doubt what this means. It is that propitiation was made before the Lord died. It cannot, then, be propitiation by His blood, as Lev. xvi. teaches in type, and the Epistle to the Hebrews by its references to that chapter confirms.*

* One may well marvel, with the Epistle to the Hebrews before us, at the statements on this subject which have been put forth and upheld.

With that which Mr. Pinkerton teaches, Mr. Stanley is found to be in agreement. In an article in *Things New and Old*, February, 1887, entitled *The New Doctrine—Is it True?* we read (p. 51), “If it be not so, we beg of the author to utterly recall such articles as cannot otherwise be understood than as denying that the complete work of atonement was finished on the cross, in the *body* of Jesus Christ once.” Atonement finished on the cross, *in the body of Jesus Christ once!* What can this mean? One turns to Scripture, but can find nothing like it. Col. i. 22 does not authorise such a statement; Heb. x. 10 does not teach it. A few lines lower down, Mr. Stanley makes plain what he holds. “Does he” (he asks, referring to what I had written) “then teach that propitiation was

It must be plain to every reader of the Epistle that the sacred writer calls attention therein to the ritual of the great day of atonement, and to no part of it more pointedly than to the entrance of the High Priest on that day into the holiest with the blood. It is a very simple question. Of what was that service in the holiest typical? The brazen altar was not in the holy of holies, and the service which took place in the latter was quite distinct from, though closely connected with, that which took place in the court, and at the former. The cross, too, it cannot be pleaded by any stretch of the imagination, was in the heavenly sanctuary. If the special service within the veil was typical of anything, I ask again of what was it typical?

Now it has been said (see *Christian's Friend*, May, 1887) that the teaching of the whole Epistle is entirely opposed to any such thought as propitiation made in the heavenly sanctuary. One has but to read Heb. xiii. 11, 12 to be convinced of the unsoundness of such a theory. “For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered without the gate.” Why this reference to *the blood brought into the sanctuary for sin* (and the words *for sin* are now almost universally held to be genuine), if there was nothing in the atonement made by the Lord to answer to that special service described in Lev. xvi.? A difficulty, too, has been made about the meaning of Heb. ix. 12, “by His own blood entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained (or found) eternal redemption.” It is questioned whether “by His own blood” is to be connected with Christ having come (or appeared) as a “High Priest,” or with the *only* verb in the sentence, “entered.” The context, if taken into account, clears

made on the cross, in the body prepared for Jesus Christ? Or, does he teach it was not made on the cross, but out of the body after death?" "His words" (he adds, writing of me) "are clear and distinct." "His words" (I may now say of Mr. Stanley) "*are clear and distinct.*" But one wonders at any person taught in the Word penning such sentences. Propitiation *made on the cross in the body of Jesus Christ once*, means, we now learn, propitiation made whilst the Lord was still in life! It was made, then, apart from the shedding of His blood. Is that the doctrine of Heb. ix. 22? Mr. Stanley insists on propitiation effected without death having first taken place, a doctrine both unscriptural and impossible, if God's Word is any guide to us in such a matter. And where else, I

this up, I believe. But for this we must go back to vv. 6, 7, which treat first of the *entrance* of the priests into the outer sanctuary, then of the entrance of the High Priest alone into the inner sanctuary. Evidently the point insisted on in v. 7 is the *entrance* of the High Priest into the holy of holies, and what characterised *that*; not a word there of his coming, or appearing as High Priest. If this be borne in mind, the question will be settled. It is the High Priest's *entrance* with blood that the sacred writer is occupied with, and the words referring to Christ in v. 12, "by His own blood," are connected with, and must be construed with, the verb. "By His own blood He entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained (or found) eternal redemption." With this, most of the best modern scholars and expositors, I believe, agree, those of them, at least, who rightly interpret "the tabernacle" (v. 11) as the sanctuary, and among such must be reckoned, it would seem, Mr. J. N. Darby, who has a long note on the meaning of the phrase "by His own blood." See *Collected Writings*, vol. xiii. pp. 193, 194.

I just add that this reference to the day of atonement must have seemed very striking to the saints primarily addressed in the Epistle. For the writer, viewing the Mosaic ritual as still in use, presents the entrance of the priests and that of the High Priest as still taking place, but that of the Lord as what was past, as any good modern translation will shew. The former are said to *enter*, the latter *entered* once for all. Into the earthly sanctuary they were still entering. In the upper room, a company could give thanks because their High Priest *had entered in once for all*. And why not twice? Because He had found by His one entrance eternal redemption.

would ask, can we learn anything about it? One may apply to this teaching Mr. Stanley's own words, "Surely this awful doctrine only needs to be *clearly* understood to be rejected by all;" for, in the language of Mr. Pinkerton, "It is a myth of fancy, or a fiction of the intellect." "It is not a true atonement at all, but a false one, which is thus defined." True indeed. According to these, two witnesses, propitiation by blood never *was* made. It is clear from the Scriptures it never *now* can be made; for "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more" (Rom. vi. 9). Is it not then true to say, such teaching forms part of an anti-Christian system which strikes at the very foundations of the faith? For it is propitiation without the death of the sacrifice, without a sanctuary, and without a High Priest. It is rapidly becoming a very grave question what cardinal truths of Christianity are to be retained, if such teaching is to be accepted.

5th. For not only is truth about the person of Christ, and His atoning sacrifice, attacked, but, in consistency with that, Scriptural teaching, it will be seen, about man, is discarded. Our relations with God can be *re-established*, we are informed, and man's lost condition can be *retrieved* (*Voice to the Faithful*, vol. xviii., pp. 232, 235). If this is true, the ruin of man by the fall must be denied. Then Christ, we are told, "has come to vindicate God in the very order of man in which the first man had failed; not, indeed, to resuscitate and perpetuate that order, but to remove it, by bearing Himself the judgment resting on it, and then rising out of it, to inaugurate an entirely new order—

one that had never existed before" (*Voice to the Faithful*, vol. xviii., p. 270).

What confusion have we here. It was man created in innocence, who failed. Did Christ come in that order? He was not like Adam, merely innocent. He was holy. One perceives here what one has met with elsewhere—all surely part of the same evil system—how the truth of the Lord's conception of the Holy Ghost is ignored (Luke i. 35). Then, did He bear the judgment resting on the order in which the first man had failed? What order was that? Innocence. What judgment was resting on that order? None. If, then, it was the judgment resting upon *that* order which He bore, as another has rightly remarked,* He bore no judgment at all, for none rested on it, or could have rested on it, unless we are to make God, who created Adam in innocence, responsible for man coming under judgment. And from such a conclusion, were this doctrine true, there could, I conceive, be no escape; for God then must have created man in an order on which His judgment would rest. Hence God would be the cause of man coming under judgment. Is this the teaching of God's Word? It seems to bear a very close and suspicious resemblance to that line of error styled by the Holy Ghost "doctrines of demons." Observe, too, how man's responsibility is done away with. Judgment, we are told, rested on an order of man. God says, men are to be judged severally for their works (Rev. xx. 12). The more this system is looked into, the more it will be found to be anti-Christian, and therefore anti-Scriptural in its tenets.

* Review of "Recent Utterances of Mr. Stoney on Christianity and Church Action," by Mr. W. Rickard.

Other statements attacking really the Lord's humanity might be quoted, e.g., "He," the Christ, "brings to an utter end man exhibited by Him, in the most beautiful way, from a Babe to the cross. He gives it up in judgment: 'In that He died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God'" (*Voice to the Faithful*, vol. xvii., p. 276). This, if it means anything, can only mean, 1st, That He brought to an utter end His manhood, hence he is no longer a man. Where is there room for resurrection in this? And 2nd, We are forced to the conclusion, that as He gave it up "in judgment," in corroboration it would seem of which Rom. vi. 10 was quoted, it must have been *sinful*, not *holy* humanity, which the Lord took in incarnation. Now it is quite true that what may be called the life of the flesh, the Lord did give up at the cross, never to resume it. But He tells us, speaking of His life as a man, "I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it again" (John x. 18). That He did take again, so He did not bring to an utter end "man exhibited by Him . . . from a Babe to the cross." Again, "The Son of man 'must be lifted up'; man must go on the one side in Him, that every believer may receive His life—eternal life—on the other side" (p. 275). Reading such statements, one is constantly reminded of the doctrine of annihilation. "Man must go," &c. But I have quoted enough, I trust, to convince any one that there is method in all this—method of which one would fain hope the writer is unaware. Is it not, I ask, a methodical attack, in one way or another, on the person of the Lord Jesus Christ?

6th. It is an anti-Christian system indeed, for it virtually denies the Lord's present service on behalf of His saints, and would land us in the only legitimate, but thoroughly anti-Christian conclusion, that the works of the flesh must be really the fruit of the Spirit, since it is denied by some of its upholders that Christians are fallen creatures. Surely people must have taken leave of their senses when they have arrived at that conclusion. What need, then, can there be for the Lord to wash their feet (John xiii.)? What need can such have of His service as our Advocate on high (1 John ii. 1)? What need, too, for Him to intercede as their High Priest to procure the needful grace, that they should not turn aside from the right path, because of the difficulties and trials of the way (Heb. iv. 16, vii. 25)? Is the Lord mistaken as to our need? Or is the Holy Ghost mistaken about what He does? These are serious questions. Either we need such services of the Lord on our behalf, or we do not. If we are *not* fallen creatures, how can we need them? If we do not need them, why does He who is in glory deign to engage in them? There must be something wrong somewhere.

Then, if it be true that Christians are not fallen creatures, I ask again, why do they sin? Why, too, the need, at times, of any exercise of discipline in the assembly? That Corinthian brother, who certainly was a Christian, acted as if he had been a fallen creature (1 Cor. v. 1). Then sins, for we have sinned since we became Christians, must be, if such teaching is correct, the actings of the new man, which God tells us is after Him

created in righteousness and true holiness (Eph. iv. 24). All this is very strange, and very damaging to something. For one of two things must be true. Either a large part of God's Word, viz., that which treats of the Lord's present service for His saints, must be unnecessary, and the exhortations to Christians (by no means few in number) not to sin must be quite uncalled for; or this system, which I call anti-Christian, is not of God, but has its origin, little as its exponents may think it, elsewhere. One might understand, however wrong it would be, some one asserting that the exhortations above referred to are now out of date. But this system would imply that they were never in season. Now, surely, no plainer proof could a Christian give that he is a fallen creature than to say he is not one (1 John i. 8).

7th. That this system is not derived from the Word of God, but has its origin elsewhere, there cannot surely remain a shadow of a doubt. For in perfect keeping with other parts of it we are told, that the old nature is dead and gone, and that "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." Why, we ask, if such statements are correct, have we injunctions by the Spirit of God to those in Christ not to walk as Gentiles walk? Why the warnings against lying, stealing, and the outflow through the lips of corrupt communications (Ephes. iv. 17-29)? Can we suppose the doctrines animadverted upon are the results of the Holy Spirit's teaching? * Is He

* Then we are gravely told that being *condemned* is the same as being *gone*, or come to an *end*. It is curious how the teaching of this school

not the Spirit of truth? Would He teach Christians that which God's Word denies? If any one on earth justified by Christ has got rid of the old man, he cannot need the practical teaching of Christ's death, given us in Rom. vi. and elsewhere. Such distinctive Christian teaching, if we listen to the upholders of this system, must be all a mistake. But more. This system would deprive saints of the blessed results of being in Christ. It is undeniable that Christ died to sin (Rom. vi. 10). It is undeniable that all those who are in Christ have died to sin (vi. 2), at least if Scripture speaks the truth. It is equally plain that the Apostle Paul, when he wrote to the saints of God in Rome, "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus" (vi. 11), was unacquainted with any saints on earth of whom it was true that their old nature was dead and gone. For how, why have died to that which is dead? Now, if there be any such people on earth as this system contemplates, it is plain such are not, nor can they *ever* be, in Christ, and, by consequence, can never share in the blessings dependant on that condition. For all who are in Christ have died to sin. Senseless, then, as well as untrue, is the doctrine sought to be propagated.

9th. Are we mistaken in calling it an anti-Christian system, and one which must work dire results amongst God's saints? Sooner or later the sense of what sin is will be weakened in the soul, and a proper sense of responsibility for its actions will, in lands its pupils in annihilationism. Crucifixion, we are told, is judicial termination. Well, the Lord was crucified. Was He judicially terminated? They write a deal about *man*, but one misses in all this proper Scriptural teaching about *sins*.

time, reach the vanishing point. Now do not souls get within measurable distance of that when the resurrection of the body is denied (1 Cor. xv. 34)? And denied it is, for a new creation of it is now taught and held. But, if the body is to be raised in glory, the doctrine of its new creation is, and must be, utterly irreconcilable with that of its resurrection. Is that to be new-created which is raised in glory? If the former is true, the latter must be a myth. Now God tells us, and it is well to listen to Him, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen. And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (1 Cor. xv. 13-14). Again, one sees how truth about the Lord is covertly, if not openly attacked, and in such a way as to force any observant mind to the irresistible conclusion that a *system* of false doctrine really confronts us. For, if the figment of a new creation of the body were true, there could be no resurrection of the dead. Consequently, *Christ is not risen*. Can this, then, be of God?

I have endeavoured to show, that truth about the Lord's Person, His sacrifice, His personal service for His people, and His resurrection too, are all really assailed. Now if the true doctrine of the Trinity, of the atonement, of the fall of man, and of the resurrection of the body are all denied by this system, is one not justified in calling it anti-Christian; and is not, I ask, the real cause of the division of 1884-85 made apparent? Who worked to effect this division? Who insisted upon it? Was it not the exponents and zealous upholders of this system? The real conflict,

then, is not about the conduct of saints in Reading, nor that of the writer of this paper; the conflict is as to the maintenance, or surrender of those fundamental truths of Christianity which are necessarily assailed, as it has been endeavoured to point out, in order to propagate this utterly unscriptural system.

I have thus far confined myself to the question of doctrine. But a difficulty may here present itself to some. If the conflict is really about doctrine, why was there ever raised what has been called a moral question? Nothing is easier to understand. Over and over again in the world's history, has the enemy sought to blind men to the real point of attack, by dangling before their eyes a trumped up moral question. We see that in the history of Naboth (1 King xxi.) We see it in the attack on Paul (Acts xxiv.) The Master Himself was not exempt from it (Luke xxiii. 2). Saints have often had to suffer from it. And even in the world, how often has the testimony of a witness been attempted to be invalidated by attacking his character. On that question I do not further enter.* But, in conclusion, let me remind the reader that history, it has been said, repeats itself. This is true; and in the conference held at Albion Hall, London, February, 1885, we have an illustration of it. Let any one turn to *Neander's Church History*, vol. iv. pp. 211-217 (I refer to the edition

* Any one desiring information on it may consult a pamphlet entitled *The Reading Question: a history and review*, by C. B., price 6d., to be had at Aberdeen of Mrs. Macdonald, 44 Chapel Street; at Bristol of E. R. Wills, 36 The Triangle; at Highbridge, Somerset, of W. R. Hadwen; at London of J. W. Carter, Beaufort Villa, Ramsden Road, Balham, S.W.; or at Reading of W. R. Howard, 3 Woodside Terrace.

in Bohn's Standard library), and read the history of a synod convened at Ephesus, A.D. 449, and then compare its history with the account of Albion Hall meeting in February, 1885. The synod of Ephesus was convened to support the Monophysite heresy of Eutyches. That heresy, triumphant at the time, was finally condemned by the fourth General Council, held at Chalcedon, A.D. 451. The Greeks subsequently gave to the Ephesian synod the unenviable title of the ~~synod of robbers~~. ^{it is the synod} And history has never condemned that. By what appellation, in years to come, the Albion Hall conference will be known, must be left to some future historian to determine.

ERRATA.

Page 32, line 10, for *synod of robbers* read *robber synod*.