

**Demonstration of Errors in the New Teaching  
as affording opportunity for presenting the Truth.**

**7. THE FOURFOLD GROUP.**

Two of these, "Reconciliation" and "Eternal life," have already been gone into, the other two, the "Kingdom" and the "Covenant" remain to be noticed.

**The "Kingdom" So-called.**

When showing it to be something different from the "Church," the expression the "Kingdom," has been used in a *general* way of speaking, e.g., as has often been said, "The Church is in Matt. xvi and the Kingdom in chap. xvii (where the future manifested kingdom, of which the Transfiguration is the type, is really meant). In this there is no harm, provided it is remembered that Matthew does not so speak. Besides the "church," there is the "Kingdom of heaven" in Matt. xvi, not the same kingdom at all as in chap. xvii, which is named "The Son of Man coming in *His* Kingdom"—the Son of Man's Kingdom. Hence Scripture, which is far more exact than people give it credit for, teaches *several* kingdoms, not merely *aspects*, but distinct *kingdoms*, though *each* kingdom may have more than one *aspect*, like the various similitudes of the "Kingdom of heaven" in Matt. xiii; different *spheres*, observe, not simply *phases* of *one* sphere. Unless these respective Kingdoms are recognised and apprehended in their distinctive places as God has set them, how can the truth on the subject be known?

**I. The Kingdom of God.**

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot *see* the Kingdom of God" (John iii. 3). "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot *enter* into the Kingdom of God" (ver. 5). New birth is an absolute moral necessity for every fallen man, not in any one time but in every time, and whenever and wherever a man has been born again there has been the Kingdom of God there for that man to be introduced into. Thus God has a Kingdom specifically His, the Kingdom of *God*, and as most accurately defined by our Lord, is that moral and spiritual realm or sphere, which only those born again can see, and into which only those born of water and of the Spirit can enter. It has been, is now, and will be, wherever God has wrought or works effectually by His power in any soul from the fall till the end of the world. Accordingly it was true before Christ came, true when He was here, true now He is glorified, and will be true when He returns. In the sense of this divine, spiritual domain to which we refer, it will be just as true in the Millennium as now, that "Except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God," and that too in the very midst of the *visible* Kingdom of the Son of Man, for there will be those who will yield *outward* obedience, and yet not be born of God. This is the true, moral, undispensational kingdom which must not be confounded with any other. John confines and restricts it to that in which there are none but the Spirit-born, and so does Matthew. But Mark and Luke

use the "Kingdom of God" for three different things: (1), for that in John iii; (2), for what Matthew calls the "Kingdom of heaven;" and (3), for the future manifested Kingdom, which is one or the other is always plain from the *context*, so that there is no need to confuse them. Besides the strictly essential and indispensable *new birth* of John iii, as was to be expected in this Christian day of the Spirit, the Kingdom of God partakes of certain additional features, such as "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," but these do not affect its nature or its dimensions as such. In short, it is the *Christian aspect* of the Kingdom of God.

### 2. The Kingdom of Heaven.

As found in the only Gospel that speaks of it, the Kingdom of heaven is, not heaven, but that something set up on the *earth* after Christ went to *heaven*, and lasting during the time He is absent there, the keys of which were given to Peter, a sphere of profession, all real at first, but afterwards becoming corrupted as Matt. xiii clearly shows. This "Kingdom of heaven" is essentially dispensational. The expression is peculiar to Matthew, which is the dispensational Gospel. Hence there alone have you the Kingdoms distinguished, and not one used for another. When Matthew means the Kingdom of God, he says the Kingdom of God, and when he means the Kingdom of heaven, he says the Kingdom of heaven. "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you" (Matt. vi. 33). Kingdom of *heaven* would not do there at all. But it does in Matt. xviii, and what is said in the beginning of that chapter was literally true of those whom our Lord then addressed, for none but the truly converted got into the Kingdom of heaven when first set up at Pentecost, yet it was as to its very nature and constitution something into which the enemy could, and did, sow tares. But no enemy could sow tares into the Kingdom of God of John iii. It is so constituted that such is impossible. Since the introduction, however, of "tares" and "foolish virgins" into the Kingdom of *heaven*, you could not say of it now what Christ said then. It would not be the truth. There are those *unconverted* in it. How perfect is Scripture?

### 3. The Kingdom of the Son of His (the Father's) Love.

"Giving thanks unto the Father . . . who hath translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love" (Col. i: 12-13). This is special to Paul though John xvii. is its equivalent. It is that blessed region into which we have been brought by the translation of the *Father*, not God, mark. Elijah was translated. Elisha saw him pass away *bodily* from the one sphere to the other. Well this is as real a translation *spiritually* into the Kingdom of the Son of His love, and, as its name indicates, is the realm of those who are loved by the Father as He loves His Son. It is love's own domain, that of the Son of the Father's love, and into that we have been put by the Father as His *sons* along with Him who alone is *the* Son. It is the special reserve of those into whose hearts He hath sent forth the Spirit of *His* Son, so that they cry Abba—Father, not with the spirit of a son, but with the *Spirit* of *His* son, and say, Father, with the same consciousness of the ineffable relationship as the Son Himself. Incomparable privilege surely! He,

the Son, has been set down with His Father *in* His throne, and this "Kingdom of the Son of His love" is peculiar to the time He sits there, and can only be known now. He will not be in His Father's throne by and by, but in His own. The moment He rises up, this particular kingdom will be merged in another, when its place will be taken by, and the sons transferred to,

#### 4. The Kingdom of their Father.

"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear let him hear" (Matt. xiii. 43): This Kingdom is as peculiar to Matthew as the "Kingdom of heaven." It is much larger and wider than the Father's *house* of John xiv, the intimacy and innerness of which exceed all else. The Father's *Kingdom* is to be the heavenly part in that display of glory soon to come, when the wheat, previously gathered into His granary, shall return with Christ, as the "righteous" shining forth like the "sun," that is, a Magdalene and a Saul of Tarsus, seen in the same glory as the Lord, thereby demonstrating visibly to the world how we are loved by the Father even as Christ Himself is loved. It will be too late for the world to *believe*, but they shall *know* when they *see* us, the monuments of His grace and love, revealed along with Him as the companions of His manifested glory. In fact it will be the celestial department of the displayed Kingdom when He will come in His *own* glory and in His *Father's* and of the holy *angels*, that is to say, all heaven is yet to pour honour on the Head that once was crowned with thorns at the Epiphany of His Coming.

#### 5. The Kingdom of the Son of Man.

"The Son of Man shall send his angels, and they shall gather out of His Kingdom all that offend, and them that do iniquity" (Matt. xiii 41). The first thing is the purging out of all scandals. There will be the *immediate* judgment of those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ (2 Thes. i :7-10); the *warrior* judgment of Rev. xix. 11-15, and the *sessional* judgment of Mat. xxv. 31-46, when the "Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory;" the judgment of the great white throne is not till after the Millennium, or thousand years reign. After the habitable world has been judged in righteousness (Acts xvii. 31), by that Man whom He hath ordained, the Son of Man will exercise dominion under the whole heaven, bringing everything into order and blessedness under His supreme authority. It is a joy to know that this sad earth will not be allowed to be a sporting place and play ground of the devil for ever. What was once the scene of the humiliation, shame, and suffering of the Son of Man is yet to be the scene of His glory, honour and joy, and when He reigns we shall reign with Him. This world so long under the ruin and misery resulting from man's sin and Satan's malice, shall enjoy the wondrous fruits of the victory and faithfulness of the Second Man in happiness, peace and blessing which will spread over the whole creation then fully delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

Our God and Father has been pleased in Eph. i. 9-10 to confide to us the bosom secret of "the mystery of His will according to His good pleasure which He hath purposed in Himself" as to what He is

going to do for the glory of His Son, viz., "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times He might gather together in one (head up) all things in Christ both which are in heaven and which are on earth even in Him." This is not the "fulness of the time" (Gal. iv, 4), the incarnation, nor the "times of the Gentiles" (Luke xxi. 24), the period of Gentile ascendancy while Jerusalem is trodden down, nor the "fulness of the Gentiles" (Rom. xi. 25) the complete number of Gentiles brought in while Israel is set aside; but the "dispensation of the fulness of times," that is, God acquaints us of His intention to establish another economy altogether, which is to displace this one, to be characterised by the co-existence of two combined yet distinct states of glory, namely, the "things which are in heaven and the things which are on earth." Not the *earthly* things sublimated into the heavenly; much less the *heavenly* reduced to the level of the earthly; but *both*, in their several domains brought under one Head, Christ. In the *heavenly* circle, the "Kingdom of your Father," there centrally will be Christ and the Church and round them angels, principalities, and powers; while in the *earthly* circle, the "Kingdom of the Son of Man," there will be the favoured nation of Israel and round it all the nations of the earth.

Though both these will cast a mutual brightness and glory on each other, enhancing one another's blessing and joy, each will have a sphere that is proper to itself, and a distinct centre to which all other things become subordinate, Christ being Head *over* all. This is quite distinct from the eternal state, when it will not be a question of heading up and subduing; but Christ delivering up the Kingdom after He *has* subdued all things, that God may be all in all for ever and ever. In the glorious era of the "dispensation of the fulness of times," however, the "Kingdom of the Son of His love" will be replaced by the "Kingdom of the Father," and the present "Kingdom of heaven" by the "Kingdom of the Son of Man," while the "Kingdom of God," the true moral Kingdom, still continues in the manifested Kingdom, new birth being always an absolute necessity for entrance into it. How wondrous the prospect Scripture puts before us! Nor is God's word ever vague or doubtful. All is clear and plain.

Let us now see the New Teaching's version of what it calls the "Kingdom." It is painful to transcribe much of what follows:—

Evidently if you take the light of Scripture, the Kingdom was the great thing looked on to in the ways of God . . . Every prophet looks on to the Kingdom . . . The prophets came in the line of the law but pointing on to the Kingdom.

What have you in view in Matt. xviii. as to the Kingdom? I think the passage is very important because it shows you in the beginning of the chapter the condition of entering the Kingdom, and at the close the great principle of the Kingdom, i.e., grace reigning through righteousness.

What is meant by the Kingdom? There is difficulty in some minds. The Kingdom is that sway of God which has to be established in the soul of every man.

You get the expression of this in Matt. xvii. in the transfiguration. There is a pattern of the Kingdom of the Son of God's love.

When the Lord told His disciples to pray, Thy Kingdom come. Is that the thought? In a sense, yes. (American Notes, pp. 24, 25, 26).

We have looked at the Kingdom too dispensationally.

That is the rock on which many have split.

It is important as to Matt. xviii. to see that the subject of the chapter is not the Church but the Kingdom. You get more about the church in chap. xvi., the

Lord is giving in chap. xviii. the principles and economy of the Kingdom. (p. 33).

Is there a difference between the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of heaven?

One is one aspect of the Kingdom and the other another. The thought of the Kingdom of heaven is analogous to what God did at the beginning; He set a great light in the heavens to rule the day. The Kingdom of God on the other hand is connected with the presence of the Holy Ghost down here (p. 148).

The Kingdom of God was present when Christ was on earth (p. 149).

I think a great point in connection with the Kingdom is to get away from dispensational ideas. We have been greatly hindered by taking things up dispensationally (p. 150).

Is there any difference between the Father's Kingdom and the Kingdom of the Son? They refer to the same point (p. 155).

Observe in these quotations all the five different kingdoms found in Scripture are mentioned, viz., the "Kingdom of God," the "Kingdom of heaven," the "Kingdom of the Son of His love," the "Kingdom of the Father," and the "Kingdom of the Son of Man," but you cannot help noticing how they are mixed up in one indiscriminate mass regardless of their special names, or what they indicate. Now if there are these distinct Kingdoms (as these very citations prove) what is the good of saying the "Kingdom this" and the "Kingdom that," without telling us to *which* of the five you refer? To talk in a vague way of the "Kingdom" as if they all meant the same thing will not do. They differ every one in nature, sphere, and extent, so that there is no excuse for mistaking the one for the other or for mingling them together.

**The Kingdom every prophet looked on to.** We are told "Every prophet looks on to the Kingdom." "The prophets came in the line of the law, but pointing on to the Kingdom." What Kingdom? Which of the five is meant? The Kingdom to which the prophets looked on, and which they have depicted in such glowing strains, is the power and glory Kingdom of the Son of Man, or the thousand years reign of Rev. xx. The *first* Coming of Christ was to *suffer*, the *second* Advent is to *reign*. But that has not come at all yet, nor can, till the appointed time, when "He shall send Jesus Christ who before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began" (Acts iii. 20, 21). Why then seek to apply this to *us* as if we were millennial saints? It is not now at all. The usual answer is, "I refer to the moral thing." But this is not the moral Kingdom. Read the Psalms and Prophets to see. "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts, yea all things shall fall down before Him, all nations shall serve him" (Ps. lxxii. 10, 11). "The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them" (Is. xi. 9). There will be *physical* changes even connected with Christ's very feet standing on the Mount of Olives, which is to "cleave in the midst" (Zech. xiv. 4) when His pierced feet touch it again, not to speak of the changes on the lower creation and on the whole face of nature. To twist all this into what is "moral" is to distort the word of God.

**The Kingdom which is the sway of God.** It was asked "What is meant by the Kingdom? There is difficulty in some minds."

It was replied, "The kingdom is that sway of God which has to be established in the soul of every man." Now what Kingdom is that? Assuredly not the Kingdom "every prophet looked on to. It does come with "observation" and is to be this *earth* regenerated, while the sway of God in a man's soul "cometh not with observation" and is "not of this world." Mark the confusion this leads to. Is it the "Kingdom of heaven?" No. It is never said to be established in the soul, but always something which is entered into as a sphere of profession real or unreal. The Kingdom that is the sway of God is the Kingdom of God, the moral Kingdom. Why not say so? Why confound it with the Kingdom of the prophets?

**The Kingdom of Matt. xviii.** The question is put, "What have you in Matt. xviii. as to the Kingdom?" The reply is, "I think the passage is very important because it shows you in the beginning of the chapter the condition of entering the Kingdom and at the close the great principle of the Kingdom, i.e., grace reigning through righteousness." Here you have the vague expression again the "Kingdom" without specifying which. There is not a word about "sway of God," or "Kingdom of God" in the chapter from beginning to end. It is without exception the "Kingdom of heaven," and it is the "condition" of entering *that* Kingdom, which is given in the early part, for a *real* professor, while it ends with "delivering a *false* professor to the "tormentors," the reverse of "grace," for it is *judgment*, so different from the "Kingdom of God," since that could not happen to any one in whose soul the "sway of God" had been "established." Nothing unreal enters into the Kingdom of God of John iii. Then to import "grace reigning through righteousness" from Rom. v. into Matt. xviii. is to have the teaching of neither. The result of grace reigning through righteousness is *eternal life*, not a Kingdom of any kind (ver. 21). Look it up for yourself.

**The subjects of Matt. xviii.** The point of the chapter is wholly missed. We are told "It is important as to Matt. xviii. to see that the subject of the chapter is not the Church but the Kingdom." We have seen what Kingdom. But are there not more subjects than one, and is the church not expressly mentioned as well as other things? Examine and see how the chapter is divided and of what it treats. (1), There is the Kingdom of *heaven* (vers. 1-9); (2), the salvation of the little ones (10-14); (3), personal trespass (15-16); (4), the church (17-20); (5), personal trespass again (21-22); and (6), the Kingdom of heaven a gain (23-35). Hence what is *not* there is affirmed and what *is* there is denied. It is also said, "You get more about the church in chap. xvi, the Lord is giving in chap. xviii. the principles and economy of the Kingdom." Never trust these random statements. Turn up chap. xvi. and you find what? Just *one* verse about the church, whereas there are *four* verses in chap. xviii, showing the worthlessness of what is so carelessly alleged. There is the usual vagueness, the "Kingdom." It is the "Kingdom of *heaven*," the keys of which were given to Peter in chap. xvi, but he never got the keys of the Kingdom of *God*, nor of the *church*, which has no keys. Nevertheless the Lord gave directions in chap. xviii for the church when it should come into existence, which are as binding for us now as ever

they were, and must not be swamped in the "economy of the Kingdom." It says, "Tell it to the *church*." Why this persistency in trying to ignore and obliterate the Lord's own instructions and distinctions?

**The Kingdom of which the Transfiguration is the pattern.** It is avowed, "In the transfiguration in Matt. xvii. there is a pattern of the Kingdom of the Son of God's love." The only passage where the expression the "Kingdom of the Son of His love" occurs is Col. i. 13, and that distinctly declares it to be something into which the Father "*hath translated*" us *now*. The Transfiguration is a sample of the "Son of Man coming in His Kingdom" (Matt. xvi. 28), which is still *future*. The Apostle Peter leaves no doubt as to this. "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you the *power and coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ but were eye witnesses of His Majesty, for He received from God, the Father, honour and glory, when there came such a voice from the excellent glory, "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased, and this voice which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with Him in the holy mount" (2 Pet. i. 16, 18). In fact the Transfiguration was a pattern of the Kingdom of the *Father*, Moses and Elias type of the raised and changed saints, the *heavenly*, and the Kingdom of the *Son of Man*, Peter, James and John in bodies of flesh and blood type of the millennial saints, the *earthly*, when displayed in two united yet distinct spheres of glory in a coming day. The "Kingdom of the Son of His love" is totally different as we have seen.

**The Kingdom in what is known as the Lord's Prayer.** Someone asked, "When the Lord told His disciples to pray Thy Kingdom come, Is that the thought?" The rejoinder was, "In a sense, yes." This is evidence of the confusion which we deprecate. "Thy Kingdom come" is the "Kingdom of their Father," and is neither the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of heaven, nor the Kingdom of the Son of His love. The prayer begins, "Our Father," and is that Kingdom in which the "righteous" are to "shine forth as the sun" (Matt. xiii. 43). Imagine this being applied to us now!

**The Kingdom "too dispensationally" viewed.** One says, "We have looked at the Kingdom too dispensationally." It is replied, "That is the rock on which many have split." Also, "I think a great point in connection with the Kingdom is to get away from dispensational ideas. We have been greatly hindered by taking things up dispensationally." Once more we are obliged to ask What Kingdom? If the Kingdom of *God*, that *is* moral as we have seen, and could not be understood except by being viewed *morally*. Nor has it anything to do with dispensations. If, on the other hand, the Kingdom of *heaven* is meant, that *is* dispensational, and could not possibly be apprehended as such at all, unless "looked at dispensationally." It is trying to change what is, by its very constitution dispensational, into moral, instead of letting each be itself, which causes so much mystification. This setting aside of the dispensational affords a key to much that would be otherwise inexplicable in the New Teaching; for how can the Scriptures be understood where it is ignored? Those of us, who were brought up in that which made one and the same thing from Adam to

the great white throne, spiritualised everything in the Old Testament, and turned all into moral, know well how the bringing out of the *dispensational* brought order out of chaos: Think of the confusion from which, seeing even the difference between the Jew, the Gentile and the Church of God, delivered us. "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles nor to the Church of God." "Messiah's Kingdom" and the "Church" meant the same thing, a moral and spiritual realm entirely; so that everything was the *church*. Israel, Jacob, Judah, Jerusalem and Zion all meant the Church. It was not until the church was seen to *mean* the church, Israel, Israel, and Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that any true or exact apprehension of God's word was arrived at. Let those who have never known the value of the "dispensational" underrate it in this ungrateful fashion if they will, but they know not what they are losing, and we refuse to be led back into the *darkness* out of which God so graciously brought us under the delusion that it is "fresh light." What is Matt. xiii. but dispensational teaching from the Lord's own lips? It has its place no less than the "moral." Without its recognition God's revealed mind cannot be known.

**The Difference between the Kingdom of "Heaven" and of "God."** This is at least one attempt at differentiation, all else has been jumbling everything together. Even the Kingdom of the Father, and that of the Son, are said to be the same, when *asked* to distinguish them. It is to be regretted, however, that it only issues in perhaps the most astounding statement in the whole book. When asked the difference between the "Kingdom of heaven" and the "Kingdom of God," the reply was, "The thought of the Kingdom of Heaven is analogous to what God did at the beginning, He set a great light in the heavens to rule the day." Is this what Scripture says the Kingdom of heaven is? Surely everyone who has read Matthew's Gospel, where the expression is alone to be found, cannot but know that the Kingdom of heaven is something set up on the *earth* after Christ went to *heaven* into which the enemy has sown "tares," and in which there are "foolish virgins" (see Matt. xiii. and xxv.) that is to say, it is a sphere of profession on *earth*, not a great light in the heavens. Were it "analogous" to the *sun* is the firmament, how could "foolish virgins" get into it? Could "tares" get into anything that was set a "great light in the heavens?" It is pure imagination.

Nor is the definition of the "Kingdom of God" any better, viz., "The Kingdom of God, on the other hand, is connected with the presence of the Holy Ghost down here." This as everyone knows is not the case, and is contradicted on the very next page. "The Kingdom of God was present when Christ was on earth," and therefore could not be dependent on the Spirit's presence down here as erroneously asserted. All this shows how unreliable these offhand, inconsiderate, utterances really are. Never take them for granted. Compare them with God's word. Do not assume they must be right. "Prove all things." "Hold fast" only that which is ascertained to be "good."

January, 1904.

W. S. F.