
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>







4139.aaa.51.

REMARKS

ON A TRACT, ENTITLED

"The Intercession of Christ,"

AND ON THE SECOND PART OF A PAPER
ENTITLED

"The Three Appearings,"

IN

"THINGS NEW AND OLD,"

FOR NOVEMBER, 1868.

London :
HOULSTON & WRIGHT,
65 PATERNOSTER ROW.
1869.

REMARKS

ON A TRACT, ENTITLED

“The Intercession of Christ,”

AND ON THE SECOND PART OF A PAPER
ENTITLED

“The Three Appearings,”

IN

“THINGS NEW AND OLD,”

FOR NOVEMBER, 1868.

S. S. S.

R.

London:
HOULSTON & WRIGHT,
65 PATERNOSTER ROW.
1869.

ck

**BURG AND DANIEL,
BRITANNIA STEAM PRINTING WORKS,
ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA.**



INTRODUCTION.

IN Oct. '67, I received the tract on Intercession, which I had not seen before, with the following note:—

“You probably know the enclosed tract. It is to our minds very difficult to understand ; still we would not willingly reject any truth contained in it. The Greek word *entūnkano* means, Mr. D. says, “*active intervention, or intercession.*” In the dictionary it is “*talking with, or getting to the spirits of another.*” Many are being exercised on this subject. May the Lord the Spirit put *all our thoughts* aside, and just make His truth, *whatever it is*, manifest to the saints—we indeed want childlike simple hearts.”

After Reading the tract, I wrote the Remarks, (not till Feb. '68,) which I now publish with a few notes appended.

In Feb. '69, another copy of the tract was sent me

by one who charged me with erroneous doctrine on the subject, "to mark such passages.....as I could not subscribe to." As man's exposition was thus sought to be used as a test of my orthodoxy, instead of God's Word, I returned it *unmarked*.

"Things New and Old" for Nov. '68, was sent for remark, as the Tract had been, and as the subject is the same, it seemed well to put them together.

REMARKS, &c.

Feb. 10th, 1868.

* * * * *

.....I have been unable hitherto to fulfil my promise respecting the tract on "Intercession."

For myself I would say I neither deny nor set aside Christ's intercession, but I do not accept J. N. D's explanation of it: neither is "*a cold and heartless security*" the result of my rejection of his explanation. If we "know Christ as our perfect righteousness," it is by the teaching of the Holy Ghost the *quickener*, and who not only gives life, but, by the presentation of Christ to our hearts, excites and draws forth living, holy affections: "a deep and softening sense of His constant love to us, and our dependence on the daily exercise of that love."

The work of the Holy Ghost, in the saint down here, is unnoticed in the tract, as in all who take this line

A*

of thought, as far as I have seen. The only allusion to it is page 6, speaking of *His* intercession. And here I would ask, are the "groanings which cannot be uttered," "*active intercession or intervention,*" in the sense in which the writer seeks to put them? They are evidences of *life*, and so are "*active,*" but is there motion, or speech, or "*active intervention*"—in the ordinary sense of the words? What then becomes of his pressing the meaning of "*entũnkano.*" Christ is indeed at the right hand of God—He is there by right and title—but He is there *also* "for us:" and so He is there presenting Himself as the head and representative of the redeemed: it is His presence intercedes or avails for us: He is there on our behalf, we are there in Him, and thus may be said to receive in Him, from the fountain head, every needed supply: and because He is there, and we are here, the Holy Ghost has been sent down here, to make good in us, to work in us, all that should result from His love—revealing it to us, in our hearts, and conforming us to His image.

J. N. D. said some years ago, in my hearing, that the word translated "advocate," as well as "comforter," would be more correctly represented by the English word "guardian." What then becomes of the stress laid upon the use of the word "advocate," limiting the thought to pleading as he does?

"Priesthood with God, and advocacy with the

Father," may have some show of truth, though I do not see the benefit of the distinction; but priest for infirmities, and advocate for sins, though sought to be built on this, is quite set aside by Heb. v. 1, 2, where we find both sins and infirmities distinctly connected with priesthood; so that the tract makes a distinction contrary to the Word; and I believe there is evil in this too.

In answer to the question "to whom was it (the epistle to the Hebrews) then and there addressed—I mean when it was written?" I will quote from the same writer, so that however contradictory, he shall answer for himself. "The epistle to the Hebrews is a treatise elaborately composed as a last warning to the Jews, whose polity was just going to be put an end to, and urging them to have done with it, as ready to vanish away, and to go without the camp. The contrary had been borne with hitherto. Now this was urgent." "It is in its contents and reasonings suited to Jews, because addressed to them." "The epistle being addressed, as it evidently is, to Jews connected with Jerusalem and Palestine."—*Irrationalism of Infidelity*, p. 223, 224. "These instructions, naturally, are given in an epistle addressed to the Jews, because their religious relationships had been earthly, and at the same time appointed by God Himself." "God Himself who had instituted the ordinances of the law, now established other bonds, different indeed

in character, but it was the same God." "This fact gives occasion for His relationship with Israel to be resumed by Him hereafter, when the nation shall be re-established, and in the enjoyment of the promises; not that this epistle views them as actually on that ground, but it lays down principles which can apply to that position."* "Still the people were, I say again, a people in relationship with God. Many of them might refuse the new method of blessing and grace, and would consequently be lost;† but

* If "it lays down principles which can apply to that position" those principles cannot apply to "the Church," which is in a different position altogether. The object of the epistle is to bring them to the acknowledgment of those "other bonds," in order that "His relationship with Israel may "be resumed," and "the nation.....re-established."

† This very principle shows that Christians, as known and acknowledged in the present day, cannot be here contemplated. The link between Israel and God subsisted on the ground of their obedience; *the disobedient* "would consequently be lost;" and yet "the link between the people and God subsist" as long as His grace saw fit to continue it. The gentiles—the world—were "without God," The testimony of His grace to the world, full and free as it is, does not of itself bring them nigh—nor does the profession of Christianity by the world. "Faith in Christ" alone brings into communion with God. There is now no other link, and this can never fail or be broken. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me," and his own word is "they shall never perish neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." I repeat, Israel, and Israel only ever had any link with God upon the ground of profession without the reality of internal life. Believing and life are associated by Jesus Himself, and unbelief and wrath. What link then can there be between nominal Christianity and God! It is a mistake to endeavour to force principles which belong to Israel in their position upon the company which God is now separating to Himself from the world. It is not now Jew, or Gentile—but Christ's, or the world's.

the link between the people and God is accounted to subsist." "It is very important for the understanding of this epistle, to apprehend this point, namely, that it is addressed to *Hebrews* on the ground of a relationship that still existed, although it only retained its force in so far as they acknowledged the Messiah who was its corner stone."* "The epistle then does not desire to establish again the true, but elementary, doctrines which belong to the times when *Christ was not revealed*; but TO GO FORWARD to the *full revelation of His glory and position* according to the counsels of God revealed in His word." *Pres. Test.* Vol. xi. p. 346, 347.

These quotations seem to me to show that the writer has, in this tract, made, what he charges others with, "a blunder." He admits the epistle does not take "Church ground" "not the church, as such" but says that there was no Jewish remnant there, save Christians, to address it to."† Was there not at that time a

* This is the very thing I contend for; viz.: that they did not acknowledge Messiah, and therefore, the relationship was on the point of severance; the time to which Jesus referred, Matt. xxi. 43, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you," see also Isa. lxxv. 12, 15 and to the end.

† "The epistle when read in Greek contains, within itself, ample evidence of its having been written during the period previous to the destruction of the Temple, and while the solemnities of the Levitical ritual continued to be celebrated. In every single instance, in which reference is made to the legal ordinances, the present tense of the verb is employed. Thus ix. 6, 7, read in the original, represents the ordinances

“Jewish remnant” some of whom might listen to these last words of exhortation, own Jesus and be

referred to, as being observed during the period at which the apostle wrote,” as follows—“Now these things, being thus prepared, into the first tabernacle the priests *enter* continually, accomplishing the acts of worship. But into the second *entereth* the high Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he *offereth* for himself and for the errors of the people: the Holy Ghost this *signifying* that the way into the Holiest was not yet made manifest, as long as the first tabernacle kept its standing. Which hath been a figure unto the present time in which *are offered* both gifts and sacrifices which *cannot* perfect the worshipper, as pertaining to the conscience; things imposed (together with meats and drinks, and divers washings—carnal ordinances,) only until the time of reformation.” *Amended translation of Hebrews*, H. Craik.

I quote also J. N. D’s translation of the same passage—with his note on one part of it.

“Now these things being thus ordered, into the first tabernacle the priests *enter* at all times, accomplishing the service; but into the second, the high priest only once a year, not without blood, which he *offers* for himself, and the errors of the people. The Holy Spirit *showing this*; the way into the (holy of) holies, *has not yet been* made manifest, while as yet the first tabernacle *subsists*; the which is an image *for the present time*, according to which, *i.e.*, ‘which time,’ both gifts and sacrifices, unable to perfect to conscience him that worshipped, are offered (consisting) only of meats and drinks and divers washings, ordinances of flesh, imposed until the times of setting things to rights.” “The commentators seem to me to have laboured in vain, from not perceiving that the present time here, is the time of the tabernacle subsisting. It is all present...And so the Apostle views it, and calls them to come out of it. *Slasin exein* must not be taken as speaking of standing legally, by divine authority; it means subsisting *de facto*. Of course as to signs it did, it was not yet set aside actually.”

I should like to know what that was which was “subsisting *de facto*,” “not by divine authority” “not yet actually set aside,” which the “christians” referred to in the tract on Intercession, whose “conciences were purged,” and who “were then drawing nigh to God,” &c., were called by the Apostle to come out of.

brought into Church position. And may not this same testimony be used for the remnant of the nation in the last day, to bring forth a remnant from among them which God will own and bless? See the use of this word remnant, both for the remains of the nation in judgment and the remnant that God will bring through the judgments into permanent blessing. Isa. xxxvii. 4, 31, 32. xlvi, with x. 20, 21. Jer. vi. 9, with xxiii. 3. Ezek. xl. 13, with xiv. 22.

“This blunder has arisen from the epistle’s not taking *church ground*, that is, the union of the saint with Christ.” But THAT IS THE GROUND *on which every believer in the present period stands*, and, whether he apprehends it or not, God deals with him as on this ground, and this only. As soon as [saints forget this and look at themselves “as on earth, and Christ as in heaven, for them, *apart from them*, in God’s presence,” they are off the ground on which God has put them, they are off the ground of faith, and no wonder the enemy has the advantage. Ephesians gives the true, and real, and constant ground of the saint now as quickened, raised and seated with Christ in the heavenly places : and exhorts him in every relationship and position down here, *upon that ground*, to “walk worthy of the vocation;” it never takes lower ground, nor can there be any circumstance which is not included and provided for in this epistle, *on that ground*—with the saints—the world—the relationships of life—conflict with the enemy.

“Was the writer not a christian?” Doubtless he was, and more than a christian. That is, a christian is not necessarily a member of the body; (there will be christians in the Millennium,) and Paul was that, although it does not appear in the epistle itself; He in grace makes himself one with them, “as a Jew,” to bring them into their own proper place according to the counsels of God. In writing to them thus, he does not relinquish his own peculiar place.

Note, p. 10. True, “the epistle” indeed does not “go back to Judaism,” how could it? but this does not make it inapplicable to the remnant, nor fix it to the present period.* Israel will be in the land in unbelief, keeping the commandments of Moses—this epistle takes them up on that ground, and tells them Christ is the end of the law, which never perfected anything; while He has perfected for ever all that receive Him; therefore they are exhorted to draw nigh through Him.

I deny what is stated in p. 7, that the ninth of Heb. supposes that the consciences of those addressed were purged. I should say directly the contrary. They

* The writer admits (p. 9) that “a link between God and the people is allowed to subsist,” a relationship that still existed; “although it only retained its force in so far as they acknowledged the Messiah who was its corner stone.” And thus the Apostle exhorts them to “go on to perfection.” Heb. vi. 1. How could it then be supposed to “go back to Judaism?”

are told of what the blood of Christ had done in contrast with that of calves and goats; and exhorted, in virtue of the boldness which faith in that gives, to draw near as in ch. x. 19, by which I judge they were not drawing near, or why should they be exhorted to do it? Christ was in heaven and the eternal inheritance is presented most certainly—the way into the holiest was open truly—but they did not avail themselves of it, for he says, “*let us draw near.*”

What is the meaning of a “Jewish Christian?” God’s Word recognizes no such thought. Paul says “we who *were Jews*” have renounced that position that we may have Christ and His benefits—not Christianity,*—and in Galatians he would have no vestige of Judaism—not even the separation at meals; the least portion of Judaism “perverted” “the truth of the gospel.” A Jewish Christian, I should say, was neither Jew nor Christian. I can understand what a converted Jew is—one converted *from Moses to Christ*. To quote again from this same writer, “In a word he addresses himself perfectly to *Jews as such*, yet to bring them out of their Judaism.” *Irr. Inf.* p. 227. “Thus making it God’s direct testimony to them, *i.e.*, *the Jews*, with whom he joins himself, as a Jew, in a

*“Christianity, as it is called, for it is not a Scriptural term, though Christian is, involves really no union with Christ at all; but is merely a form, which the world has taken up, at Satan’s suggestion, to mock God and deceive souls.”

most beautiful and gracious way, as he said ‘*the fathers*’ not your fathers.” *Irr. Inf.* p. 227. “The neglect of his counsel produced the bastard Christianity, if Christianity it can be called, of the Nazarenes.”—*Irr. Inf.* p. 224.

Here is I believe the spring of that which is known as Christianity in the world; it has Christ’s precious name, but any doctrine connected with His blessed person and work which it may weave into its web, is only to pervert and nullify the truth, and thereby deceive and beguile the unwary.

If it be “not the church as such” that is contemplated, how can it be used for the church except as taking the doctrines and modifying the application of them according to the dispensational characteristics which so especially mark it off from every other period. Indeed he says elsewhere “the blessed apostle is specially occupied with the counsels of God, and the divine plan of dispensations,” &c., and—“with this dispensational character of Paul’s writing, the epistle to the Hebrews clearly classes itself, and has a more finished style as being an essay.”—*Irr. Inf.* p. 224. And certainly if we take the testimony of the book itself, it is clear that it is “the world (or habitable earth) to come, whereof we speak,” and that is assuredly connected with Israel, not the Church now being gathered. Again, we have especially the first or old covenant contrasted with the second or new; and

these are also by the testimony of the epistle itself connected with "the house of Israel and the house of Judah," not the Church. Again Melchisedec's priesthood is prominently presented, and, from Psalm cx., we know that to be coincident with the rod of strength out of Zion; and this same writer again says that Melchisedec Priesthood is "*Kingly rule, and the subjugation of enemies; and the possession of heaven and earth in fact, as well as title, by the Most High God, and consequently universal blessing. Most definitely.....it is blessing and refreshment after and consequent upon the destruction of all enemies.*" "It is not that which Christ the Lord now exercises,"—Mel. Priest. Now neither of these matters directly pertain to the Church as such, but they may, and do, instruct it in the mind and purpose of God. At the same time they do immediately concern Israel; and the way in which (as he admits) they are here treated in connection with the "development of the counsels of God, in the full revelation of Christ's glory and position, according to those counsels," shews that it is not the Church as being gathered that is contemplated, but that which follows after the Church is caught up to meet the Lord in the air.

He sees that the epistle leaves the question of the union of the Church with Christ in heaven outside altogether; but *this is the fundamental and ruling question with the Church.* To say that the epistle "teaches what

Christ is for us in heaven while we are walking in conflict on earth," and to leave out this main point of relationship, the union of the members of the body with the head, is surely to separate what God has joined together, and must be injurious in its effects. Israel not being in this position but as a "nation," "family," "brethren;" these relationships, though involving a certain kind of union, are *not unity*, which the Church's *is*. I can own the *principles* and use them as God may give wisdom for help to a saint down here, to a certain extent; but I believe if I would help him after a godly sort, I should ordinarily use Ephesians rather than Hebrews, or at any rate Ephesians after Hebrews, because there I do find the saint considered and counselled as down here in the body, in the world, and exposed to Satan's shafts; but how, and from what source is help provided there? the very source and ground that is purposely and necessarily untouched in the Hebrews—the unity of the saint with Him who is quickened, raised up, and seated in the heavenly places. As I said before, if it be the saint's conduct in the Church, the world, the relationships of life which God owns, or conflict with wicked spirits,—all exhortation and instruction is based upon the purpose and work of God in Christ, *as the head of the body which is His fulness*. Wondrous word, blessed truth, may God give us grace to hold it fast, and use it as he would have us.

What "is *our* heavenly calling" if it be not "our being there in union with Christ?" Is not this "union with Christ" the very essence of "our heavenly calling?" Can we consistently separate them? If we relinquish for a moment that which is the origin of the Church's existence, we get upon another ground. "Dead in sins.....QUICKENED TOGETHER WITH CHRIST," is the Church's birth, so to speak, and our perfection in Him, and the consequent present indwelling of the Holy Ghost, is that which "leads to the knowledge of the love, tenderness, sympathy, faithfulness, interest in all our state and circumstances," and not "the heavenly grace," as it is put in the tract, in a sort of abstract, indefinite way. For what is heavenly grace? how can I know it? how is it manifested? Is it not by the Holy Ghost? and what does He tell the saint of? Is it not Christ and His fulness? "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."*

*"Dependence.....is not drawn out by being perfect and always infallibly so," (p. 5) "our perfection in him does not," (p. 8) "our being in Him in heaven does not." (p. 9.) "It is our heavenly calling, not our being there in union with Christ." (p. 8.) I do not desire to reason on the best mode of drawing out our dependence on Christ—reason is not faith. But as I heartily believe in the perfection of God's Word, I desire to take it as He has given it to me; and submitting myself to it, I am sure I shall learn more or less of the wisdom and goodness of God, in it, as fitted and adapted to the circumstances in which I find myself. Ephesians tells out the purpose of God concerning those He is now gathering, and shews the true character of *our heavenly calling* not merely to heaven, but to union with Christ in heaven

Where in Scripture do we read "Christ intercedes for us, and the soul is restored." It may be J. N. D.'s ex-

or rather IN HIM, as "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." The Heavenly calling in Hebrews does not reach up to this, whatever may be included in it, (and I would not limit it, except as the Word does,) it is quite plain that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were partakers of that heavenly calling.—Heb. xi. 9-16. The *position* of those addressed in Ephesians and Hebrews is different. J. N. D. himself says, "Abraham had righteousness by faith, and we too—all true; that he is the heir of the world—beyond doubt; but how these shew that he was a member of the body of Christ, no one can tell. Abraham had a heavenly hope; but why does this say that he is of the body, the church? The law brought a curse, and faith a blessing, as the case of Abraham proved, and that hence we, having faith, got blessing with Abraham; but that the blessing involved *identity of position*, there is not a trace of." Is the Comforter come.—p. 22-23.

The highest character of blessing is brought out in Eph. "The hope of His calling," &c., and the calling is to affect the walk—the calling is presented as the motive to consistency, &c., nor is anything else put before the saint, to draw out his dependence; surely it will soon be found out that the saint has no resources in himself. The present need of the saint is fully considered and provided for, but in God's way—not turning the thoughts away from the position, to one at a distance, separated from him (though it be a fact) nor to "heavenly grace" to meet his need, nor to intercession to help and restore from failure—but thus—"Ye were darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light, proving what is acceptable unto the Lord, and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them," (Eph. v. 8, 10, 11.) Again, "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace to the hearers, and grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed to the day of redemption."—Eph. iv. 29, 30. Surely these portions will be conclusive with simple minds that the *position* of saints in Hebrews is not the same as that of saints in Ephesians, and therefore priestly intercession as sought to be pressed, is not the only way of restoring the soul, nor is it the true way for the saint in the present period.

position, but *it is not Scripture*. He presses the *English meaning of the word Advocate*, and thus restricts the real Scripture thought. The intercession or advocacy needful and consequent upon failure in the walk, as it is put in the tract, must be to propitiate God, because Christ is up there and we down here. If imputation of sin is impossible, (which is true, for Christ is there for us as having put away our sin), it is something in the heart of the saint that is needed; and one down here to do that needed thing; now that is just the place and work of the Holy Ghost, and nowhere do we read that *it* is the work of Christ for us in heaven. The Holy Ghost tells us—witnesseth within us—of the permanent, perfected work of Him who is our “Guardian” in heaven, and so maintains us there before God in all the virtue of His own person and work, notwithstanding our failure down here; and the practical result of this—the Spirit’s witness to this—is to lead the soul not only away from the failure, but back to communion with God.

Again, I ask in what way can Christ’s intercession or advocacy restore the soul, as the tract says, unless the Holy Ghost work in the soul, giving it an apprehension of what has been *done afresh before God* for its failure. I say “*afresh*” because it says “there can be no thought of imputation” of sin which is put away for ever, and therefore it must be some fresh thing done (even if connected with atonement), something

with respect to the special act of failure, and done after its commission.*

It is well to bear in mind what is truly stated (bottom of page 9), that atonement was made by the High Priest in Israel, "*not in the exercise of his priesthood, properly speaking, which was in the sanctuary, but which laid the foundation for it, in which he was the substitute and representative of the people, the foundation of his priestly service proper during the year.*" But the repeated sacrifices of this priestly service told that real atonement had not been made, sin was not put away; and whatever the scapegoat might and did typify, they had not access to God; they had still to wait for the true propitiation, ere they could look for the full enjoyment of blessing by Messiah—Melchisedec.

When the one offering was made, Israel rejected it, and the Holy Ghost's testimony to it also; therefore they were set aside, and "the full revelation of His glory and position in connection with the full development of the counsels of God" deferred for a season. Now, what we know is, and it is the Holy Ghost's

* I apprehend the intercession of Christ before God for us is continued and uninterrupted; and in virtue of this, the Holy Ghost continues His work in the world, and in the saint; however the world may reject, and the flesh in the saint may lust against Him and His work. The repeated intercession of Christ, on each and every occasion of failure, involves the remembrance of sin before God, and so touches the perfection of His work which has put away sin, as well as overlooks also the present work of the Holy Ghost in the saint. Three points of solemn moment.

special, present testimony, that "He hath put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself," and therefore there is no more offering for sin as there was in Israel. They never had access, they needed still a priest to go to God for them—"we have access by *one spirit* unto the Father" and therefore need no priest. True, and blessedly so, it is "THROUGH HIM" we have it, but not as a priest. He made atonement for us as our *substitute and representative*—not our priest—even as with Israel; but, unlike them, we get the blessing at once—they wait for it. The only priesthood of Christ is Melchisedec, and that is for blessing, not intercession. The intercession, as I have before said, is His maintaining us before God in all the virtue of His own person and work. Thus the position of Israel and the church are in contrast—they were never perfected*—the church is—they had a priest witnessing to distance from God, because sin was *not* put away—we have the Holy Ghost witnessing to our being brought nigh, and

*As a nation this was true, whatever blessing individuals may have got. But now of them even as a *nation* it may be said "by one offering he hath perfected for ever" even "them." They are perfected in Him, "He died for that nation;" even as the Church is accepted in Him; but as a nation they are not yet sanctified or separated, because they have not received "the truth" believing on the Son of God. If *individuals* from among the Jews become sanctified by the truth now, they are like those from among the Gentiles, "baptized by one Spirit into one body" and so "perfected for ever," not as the nation nor as of the nation, but as members of Christ's body, "the Church."

having access at all times, because sin *is* put away. The point of resemblance is, they were liable to fall, and we are liable to fall—they, from their position, because *their standing* was on the ground of their obedience or otherwise—we, are liable to failure in *our walk*, because our body is not yet redeemed, but *our standing* is perfect and abiding in Christ; so that this even is contrast rather than resemblance—their hope is, a Royal Priest, Melchisedec, to bless them in the earth, when they shall own His sacrifice—ours, to be caught up to be with Him as His bride, when God pleases, because we are already one with Him. The Hebrews presents Christ as having made atonement, and therefore constituted Melchisedec with power to give the blessing of the new covenant promised to Israel as soon as they own Him.

Peter's case is not to the point. I do not think it 'anticipative of His priesthood.' It was "by Christ's own grace and action," when actually in His presence, *before he had made atonement* that "Peter's heart was touched" but "the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified," it was a special case. So Christ prays in John xvii. It was while He was "in the world." Again (John xiii.) Jesus does not "take His place on high."* He knew

* Christ had indeed by a *few* been "already owned Son of God, Son of David, Son of Man," but not by the nation, "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" whom as "Son of

that "He came from God, and went to God," and because of this, His action with the disciples; it was not priestly at all—we may wash one another's feet—He bids us—but not because either He or we are priests. "I, your *Lord and Master*, have washed your feet" are His own words.

"Christ is priest for those in relationship with God." True, most true. But who are they, and what is their relationship? Is it all that are in any relationship, or is it certain persons? We see according to this writer (*Pres. Test.* vol. 11), that Israel had of old a relationship with God, a relationship which still existed, the force and value of which depended on their owning Jesus as Messiah; and consequent on their reception or rejection of Him; on the one hand there was full blessing—on the other "vengeance," "recompense." "The Lord *shall judge His people*." This does not at all correspond with the relationship of those who are known as His people now. We may

Man" He came to seek and save. All through His course He had to say in spirit, as at the end He did in words, "I have laboured in vain, and spent my strength for naught and in vain."—Isa. xlix. 4. His people were not willing, "Israel would none of me." All that the Father in sovereign grace gave Him, came to Him, and He did not cast them out, but they were only a very small remnant. Besides, He presents Himself as "LORD AND MASTER," yet taking the servant's place. It cannot be then truly said, He "now takes His place on high." He was their Lord and Master, even when he appeared in fashion as a man; not more so, though, in another condition, and with another title to it, when "God made this same Jesus...both Lord and Christ."

be chastened, but it is, however severe,—that we may *not be judged* with the world. They will be judged and only a remnant saved. Whatever resemblance there may be between *the nation of Israel* and an *individual now*, it is manifest there must be a vast disparity between a *saint among them* and a *saint now*. The failure to mark this difference brings in much confusion and contradiction.

The moral tone of the last few pages no one can find fault with; but the basis is wrong. It is not in virtue of His priesthood we are helped. In virtue of His atonement, the Holy Ghost is given to tell us of what He has done, and where He is for us; and that His being there answers to God for us as interceding (*intercession does not necessarily demand a priest*) for us on God's behalf as well as our own. An intercessor is—a “mediator, an agent between two parties to procure reconciliation;” surely He has done this for us. Mediation and priesthood are two things. A mediator is by no means necessarily a priest; and a priest, if and as a mediator, is such in connection with the circumstances of his priesthood, as with Israel's priests. I do not see what advocacy those need, whose “walk *is* in the light, as God is in the light.”—p. 14. If it *is* in the light, it is perfect, because, “if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.”—1 John i. 7. Now,

here if there come in, in any way, the thought of sin in connection with walking in the light, it is "*the blood*" NOT "*the intercession*" that the Holy Ghost puts as cleansing. There is a difference between our standing, and our walk; our *standing* is in the light; our walk should be, but is not always;—in that case, the Holy Ghost we see uses the blood to cleanse.

I might notice other thoughts, but I conclude with repeating, that I do not deny the intercession of Christ—Scripture tells me He intercedes for me, and I thankfully receive the truth. I do reject the interpretation of Scripture which makes Christ an interceding priest, and so virtually connects Him with Aaronic priesthood—and makes Him a priest for the Church, putting them in Israel's position of distance, instead of their own place of nearness and constant access. I do also repudiate the ignoring of the work of the Holy Ghost, which is evidently and necessarily connected with this interpretation. Jesus Himself said, the Holy Ghost should guide the saints "*into all truth;*" whereas in this system, His name is scarce mentioned, and His operation entirely unnoticed, and yet the question is one of "restoring the soul," and guiding the walk. I am sure it is not of God. If there be "*a cold and heartless certainty of being safe,*" it is the result of Antinomian doctrine, such as is condemned in Rom. vi. And if there be "dependence, confidence, and affection, united to security in Him who is the object

of them, till we come where it is no more needed;" I am sure it is the result of the Holy Ghost's taking of the things which are Christ's, and shewing them unto us.

I remain, &c.,

M. J. S.

February, 1869.

* * * * *

“Things New and Old” for Nov. came safe to hand. The paper on Advocacy, which you had marked, differs in a slight degree from others on that subject, in that it does notice the work of the Holy Ghost in the soul of the saint. At the same time, it is very contradictory and unsatisfactory.

In the first place, he says, “It is impossible that any question as to sin or guilt can ever arise;” *i.e.*, before God. If so,—and it is most true,—what need can there be of a “priest” to *intercede with God*? Why should he say “*Jesus GOES to the Father for us.*” He says also “*He prays for us*, and it is through the efficacy of His priestly intercession, that we are convicted, and brought to self-judgment, confession and restoration.” Thus there is evidently the bringing of sin to remembrance, and that before God; Where the word, and the writer elsewhere, says it cannot come. Again, he makes the *priest* intercede with the *Father*, while elsewhere he

says, “*priesthood* is spoken of in reference to *God*, *Advocacy* in reference to the *Father*.” How inconsistent ! Then as above “*Jesus goes to the FATHER*”—an extraordinary expression—“and His *priestly* intercession,” this is before the Father (to be consistent he ought to have said God) “brings conviction, self-judgment, &c.” This is in the heart of the saint. In another place he says, “this he does by producing in our hearts, by His Spirit who dwells in us,—that other advocate, the sense of failure,” &c. There is great confusion here. “*He* does—by *His Spirit*.” The work of Jesus, if anywhere, is in heaven ; and the work of the Holy Ghost is in the soul of the saint, down here. Now it is not consistent to say, “He does it by His Spirit;” it is either He, or the Spirit ; for the work is not one, but two, whatever connection there may be between them. This I say is not true, nor consistent. It is mingling the work of Christ, and the work of the Holy Ghost, to say the least. Again, Scripture does not speak of “that other Advocate;” it does of that “other Comforter.” I should not mention this, but the *English meaning* of the word advocate is unduly and unscripturally used, to press and justify this peculiar line of thought. In another place he speaks of “one divine Person” *managing* for us here, and another divine Person *managing* for us in heaven. Now this thought is more scriptural, because the word *managing* does not define or limit to any peculiar action, as the

word *advocate* does, in this paper, and others of a like character; and moreover, it is nearer in signification to the original word, which might be translated "*guardian*;" whose services for the object of his charge would be such as the circumstances of that object called for, however varied they might be.

But to return, while the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and His consequent operation in the saint, is most blessedly the result of the finished work of Christ on the cross, and His being at the right hand of God in heaven,—still, one is a finished work, abiding before God, in all its precious perfectness;—the other is that which is carried on from age to age in the world; and from day to day in the heart of the believer; and the two works, for they are *two*, are effected by different persons, and differ greatly in character. One is completed—the other not. And it is *because* the one is completed, and not to be added to, and is ever in its completeness before God;—that the other is being carried on by that other Person, and will continue, till the purpose for which He has come down here shall be completed; and every member of the body gathered and brought home.

Again, Advocacy and Priesthood are not the same; however this writer may seek to mingle them at one time, and separate them at another. A priest may advocate the cause of the sinner or needy, but he will do it according to his position and office, *i.e.*, by sacri-

fice, &c.; but he has many other things to do. An Advocate is not by any necessity a Priest. An Advocate, taking the simple meaning of the word, whoever or whatever he may be, is merely one who pleads the cause of another. Now I do affirm it to be contrary to Scripture, to say, that in this sense, Jesus is the advocate of believers; and it is in this sense the writer presses it. He has emphatically sat down, as having nothing more to do. "All things that the Father hath are mine," therefore He can have nought to ask for; this must be, or He has not finished His work.

I readily admit "that when a true-hearted child of God is betrayed into sin, the Holy Ghost will produce in him such a sense of it.....in the presence of God, that he cannot lightly go and commit the sin again," but this is the work of the Holy Ghost; and it is for this He is here. He "worketh in us to will and to do, of His good pleasure."

I do not deny in a certain sense, what the writer calls "a double advocacy," but not as he puts it. "If any man sin, the blessed Paraclete on high intercedes with the Father—*pleads the full merits of His atoning work—prays for the erring one, on the ground of His having borne the judgment of that very sin.* Then the other Paraclete acts in the conscience, produces repentance, and confession, and brings the soul back into the light, in the sweet sense that the sin is forgiven,

the unrighteousness cleansed, and the communion perfectly restored." This is a very human, business-like procedure—very like a court of justice—but the misfortune is that it *is* human—not divine. However one might in thought connect such a procedure with the settling the question of sin once for all, the idea of the repetition for every sin is monstrous. Scripture everywhere presents Christ's work as finished, as to the putting away of sin from before God ;—here it is all paraded—forgiveness asked—pleaded for on the ground of the atonement made, (as though God had not given His expressed intimation of that, and needed to be reminded that that particular sin was included in the sin which God's Lamb bore away on the cross,) and then, in due course, the result follows below, only he has forgotten to put in the link of communication between the heavenly and earthly actings ; which according to his elaborate plan should certainly have been inserted ; the judgment or forgiveness should have been pronounced and the message sent down.

The Scripture doctrine is, that Jesus " has put away sin, by the sacrifice of Himself ;" and that because of this, God has exalted Him, and seated Him at His own right hand on high ; and being *thus* there, the Holy Ghost has been sent down, to make known what has been done in heaven, and give efficacy to this testimony ; applying it to the heart of the sinner, that he may believe the grace, and turn to God ; and to the heart

of the saint, that he may walk in the light of that love, as a pilgrim down here ; and, if he turn aside, to revive in his soul the sense of that love ; and thus draw him back to the path of holiness, and to wait for God's Son from heaven, even Jesus, who delivered him from the wrath to come.

The root and basis of all this confusion and contradiction, is, the determination to maintain, as some have said, " that Christ has a double priesthood"—Aaronic and Melchisedec. This is not mere surmise and conclusion on my part, however surprising such a statement may seem, and however contrary to Scripture, I have heard it more than once, and seen it in writing, and contended against it. Some who would not say quite so much, yet say, that though Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec only, yet He exercises *it*, at present after the character of Aaron : thus completely confounding, by mingling two distinct orders of priesthood, and falsifying God's Word, which says, that " the priesthood being changed," the law (of its services) must be also. Thus " they make the Word of God of none effect by their tradition " " which they have received to hold."

Aaronic priesthood, and all the Levitical services, were given to people who were under a broken law ; and were suited for them in that position ; not for a people in happy communion with God ; and thus are unsuited to the saint in his present position of

“accepted in the beloved.” They were given in mercy to them, to maintain them in a certain relationship with God, till He came who should make atonement for their sin, and bring them into liberty with God. They were “shut up” by and under the law and its ordinances, till the time of the reformation. When that time came—when He, the object of faith, said to them “the time is fulfilled,” they preferred Barrabas. Yet God accepted His atonement on their behalf, and sent down the Holy Ghost, “when the day of Pentecost was fully come,” in fulfilment of the promise given to them, in that feast of Jehovah; so that “all the house of Israel might know assuredly,” that in spite of their rejection of their Messiah, God had, even *after* their rejection by crucifixion, made the same Jesus, Lord and Messiah; and that now, on their accepting this testimony by owning Him thus, He was ready to come and take His own place as Messiah with them,—the Royal Priest,—Melchisedec; and bring them into the enjoyment of all the privileges connected with that position, “the restitution of all things.”

“But Israel would none of Me;” and thus the time of restitution is postponed, and the King-Priest sits at the right hand of God, *till* He shall set His enemies as a footstool for His feet. Meanwhile, the Holy Ghost turns away from Jerusalem, and at Antioch, outside of Judea, Judaism, and the Jews as a people, takes the place of rule and authority; and gives com

mands to those who were ministering to the Lord, to go forth to the work to which *He* had called them.— Acts xiii. Now in all the epistles which the “chosen vessel” of the Lord wrote to the Gentiles, to whom he was specially sent, *by Him*, (having been *taught by Him*, too, from heaven; even once catching him up there to let him see and hear what was going on there though he was unable to tell it out;) I say, in none of these epistles is there any attempt to take up the principles of Judaism, the forms or ceremonies of the law, or anything connected with that system, as a pattern for the present time. On the contrary, in Galatians, he uses the strongest language, to condemn the least approximation in any way to it, and even the chiefest Apostle of the circumcision, is “withstood to the face, because he was to be blamed,” for tampering with the question; and that, too, after God had shewed him the distinction between Jew and Gentile was set aside.

Now I say, that the very thought, more especially the attempt, to revive priesthood in any way, is a return in measure to the old thing; “the weak and beggarly elements;” and so brings into bondage; putting some one, or something, between the soul and God. Jesus Himself says, “I say *not* that I will pray the Father for you;” and, that in prospect of his departure, and absence from them; when He should, by His atoning death, have opened the way, and removed

every hindrance, and they should themselves have access to God, as their Father. But now, in spite of this, people will have it that "Jesus goes to the Father, —prays for us—intercedes with the Father—pleads the full merits of His atoning work—prays for the erring one on the ground of His having borne the judgment of that very sin." Alas! Alas! Has God forgotten that He needs to be reminded?

Is this the intercession which Rom. viii. 34, speaks of? Nay! What does it say? "Who is he that condemneth? Christ that died? yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us?" I read these, as some suggest, as a series of interrogations, leaving out the italicised words "*it is.*" Certainly this is the force of the passage. Who shall bring a charge against *God's* elect? Shall God, who justifies them? who else can? who shall condemn? (God will judge by Jesus Christ) Christ that died for them? yea, rather His life more than His death, precious as that was, is the object or ground of confidence; as in Rom. v. 9, 10, 17; if death brought such blessing, "*much more*" life. So here. He is risen—He is even at the right hand of God—and there on our behalf. The whole question of sin is settled, we are "made the righteousness of God in Him." His being there, in this way, under these circumstances,—intercedes with God on our behalf; Scripture says so; I do not want to alter one

word, but I will not accept man's lowering of the aspect in which the only hope of the sinner, and joy of the saint, is presented in God's Word. He is there, and also maketh intercession for us. I ask again, looking at this blessed Scripture, how can it be said "Jesus goes to the Father, prays for us," &c. How mean and low! Jesus does say "I will pray the Father and He will give you another Comforter," Guardian, even as Jesus had been their Guardian; comforting when needing, but teaching and other things as well. Faithful to His promise He did ask or pray; and the Father did send another Guardian in His place. Jesus, the risen man, at God's right hand is the plea; and the Holy Ghost, in the world and in the believer, is the answer to that plea. In this sense the plea continues, the intercession goes on, and the Holy Ghost remains to carry on His work, but this intercession is different from what this writer and some others speak of.

I hope these few thoughts may be helpful to you. The question of priesthood is an important one; and the common thought is too much in accordance with the Jewish principle, and, more than many may be aware of, with the Romish. May the Lord the Spirit open our eyes to see more of the truth as it is in Him who is *The Truth*; that we may walk in it, in the liberty wherewith we have been made free in Him.

15 JA 70 I remain, &c.,

M. J. S.

Also by the same:

FOUR LETTERS ON PRIESTHOOD, and QUESTIONS on the same subject.

Also, Shortly to be Published, (D.V.)

THE GREAT MYSTERY—THE CHURCH WHICH IS HIS BODY.

