

THE OCCASIONAL MAGAZINE

SO CALLED, AS COUNTING UPON GOD TO GIVE,
FROM TIME TO TIME, IN HIS GRACE, HELP FROM SCRIPTURE
AGAINST CORRUPTIONS OF THE TRUTH;
SO THAT THE WORD OF OUR GOD MAY BE EXALTED
ABOVE THE THEORIES AND DEDUCTIONS OF MAN'S INTELLE

FOR

“ALL THE FLOCK.”—(ACTS xx., 28).

“THY WORD IS VERY PURE.”—PS. CXIX. 140.

“THE LORD KNOWETH THE THOUGHTS OF MAN THAT THEY
ARE VANITY.”—PS. XCIV. II.

“God will make the Quarrel of Scripture His own Quarrel.”

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.

PRICE SINGLE COPY, ONE PENNY. POSTAGE HALF-PENNY EXTRA.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO BE ADDRESSED—

Editor of "OCCASIONAL MAGAZINE,"

Rose Cottage, Blackmoor.

WELLINGTON, SOMERSET.

(Of whom Copies may be had.)

Also of the following :—

Mr. JNO. WILLIAMS,

28, Queen's Buildings,

Montague Street,

BOROUGH.

Mr. C. HILL,

28, High Street, Clapham,

LONDON, S.W.

Mr. JNO. DOYLE,

15, Lawn Terrace,

BLACKHEATH, KENT.

Mr. WM. DARLING,

Pharmaceutical Chemist,

126, Oxford Street,

MANCHESTER.

Miss A. F. SHEARER,

Stationer,

3, Quarry Street, Hamilton,

SCOTLAND.

The Occasional Magazine.

THE BODY OF CHRIST, AND THE HOUSE OR DWELLING-PLACE OF GOD.

TRUTH is older than error, and the Holy Ghost, the unction we have received from the Holy One, would ever lead us to the purest, fullest, sweetest revelation of the truth, that truth which we "have heard from the *beginning*" (1 John ii.) So Paul commends us "to God and the word of His grace" (Acts xx.); and Jude exhorts us to "contend earnestly for the faith which was *once* delivered unto the saints."

For more than 300 years the Bible has been given to us again, after ages of darkness. Unspeakable mercy! Yet what is the return? The Lord had to say of Israel "I have written to Ephraim the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange thing" (Hos. viii. 12.)

How true of men now. All the great Protestant sects appeal, not to Scripture, but to what is of themselves.

To the Church of England, the Liturgy and the articles, are the last appeal. To Presbyterians, their Standards and acts of General assembly are decisive. To other bodies, other authorities are made supreme, all idolize something of their own, and "Brethren," or a considerable number of them, attempt to bind the conscience by an "assembly judgment" *apart from God's Word*. As the sects around have their constitution, confessing they have not scripture for everything, so those who left them because "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," have themselves become a melancholy spectacle of the common tendencies of men to exalt themselves and their authority above the supremacy of Scripture.

But God, in mercy, has ever watched over and guarded the truth. The story of His care for His testimonies, and of the feeble instruments He has raised up in their defence is the most thrilling in history. Witness the conflict for the truth as to the Trinity in the first centuries, in the Greek and Asiatic Churches. Later on in the Western Churches, the fall of man, the freedom of the will, Divine decrees and human agency were the subjects of earnest controversy. Still later, God's plan of salvation roused vehement discussion, and, for a time, entailed fearful sufferings on those who contended for the truth. During *this* century leading minds are opposing the truth of the inspiration of Scripture, its interpretation and application.

Thus, many questions are now engaging the thoughts of men, but perhaps none so widely and so deeply as *the Church*. For fifty years a deep "Catholic" wave has flooded this land, and who can trace any promise of an ebb? Convents and monasteries are multiplying, and broken up families are found everywhere. "Wives have quarrelled with their husbands, and husbands with wives; the son has been set against the father and the father against the son; thousands of households have been made miserable by young people dissatisfied with their spiritual condition, and throwing themselves upon Catholic Priests, because they require, as they think, something deeper and truer than was enough for the last century."

This is the testimony of one who can speak with authority as to the influence of the "Tractarian movement," (J. A. Froude). And what must be our own testimony as to the "new movement" among us? How many households of dearly loved saints of God, that we know, are now in the same distressing condition? "The cries of God's children in the broken up families, the ruptured friendship, the ruined fellowship, the clouded joys in Christ, the blighted fruits of the Spirit, and the discredited excellencies of the Lord, go unheeded to this grim idol ("the testimony

committed to Brethren"), while rises upwards this exhalation towards God, the smoke of asperity, evil speaking, slander and revenge choking the soul and intoxicating the sense with its noxious wickedness"—(Letter from Stroud.)

One of the ablest advocates of the "new movement" says, that as regards the Church, there "are *two very distinct things* for us, but of course *one* for God.....In other words there has been much confusion as to the Church in its double aspect,—the body of Christ and the house or dwelling-place of God; and some who hold most clearly their blessed place in the body have not perhaps discerned what was their special place in the house, or the Assembly of God on earth. Satan knows well how easily a dart can be thrust into the minds of saints through the apparent difference between these two aspects of the truth." And *this* is to sever and divide poor bewildered saints, perplexed and harassed by "two things" where to God there is but one! What enemy has done this? Who has made, not an "apparent," but a real, vital difference between these two aspects of the truth? If for God they are ONE, who has authority to make them two for His saints?

That they are *one* for God, the following Scriptures clearly prove:—

First. The head of the body is Christ (Eph. iv., 15-16; Col. i., 18-24; ii., 19). Without Christ there could be no BODY. The foundation corner-stone (*akrogōniaios*) is Christ (Eph. ii., 20). Without the foundation stone sustaining and *uniting*, there could be no HOUSE.

Second. The whole BODY is fitly joined together (*sunarmologeomai*) (Eph. iv., 16). All the BUILDING is fitly framed together (the same verb). (Eph. ii. 21).

Third. It is *in Christ* that we being many are one BODY; (Rom. xii., 5). It is *in Christ* that we are builded together for an HABITATION of God through the Spirit. (Eph. ii., 22.)

Fourth. It is *by one Spirit* (*en henī Pneumatī*) that we

are all baptised into one BODY (1 Cor. xii., 13). It is *by the Spirit (en Pneumati)* that we are builded together for an HABITATION of God.

Fifth. Those who are thus baptised into one body were Jews and Gentiles (1 Cor. xii., 13). Those who are builded *together* were Jews and Gentiles (Eph. ii).

Sixth. The BODY increaseth with the increase of God (*auxō*); (Col. ii., 19). The BUILDING groweth (*auxō*); (Eph. ii., 21.); *i.e.* by union of and for God. Note the steps in verses 13, 16, 18, 21: "nigh," "reconciled," "of the household," "fitly framed."

Seventh. God gave Christ to be "head over all things to the Church, which is His BODY, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i, 22-23.) God laid Christ as the foundation of His HOUSE (1 Peter ii., 5-6.)

Eight. The building up of the BODY has been confided to the hands of men (Eph. iv., 11,-16). The building up of the HOUSE has been confided to the hands of men (1 Cor. iii., 9.)

Ninth. Yet the BODY is presented as a complete body (1 Cor. xii., 27.) And the HOUSE is presented as a complete building or temple (1 Cor. iii., 9-16).

That they were *one* for the apostles is clear.

"The Apostles uniformly identify themselves, as regards their Christian standing and hopes, with those to whom they wrote—'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed *us* with all spiritual blessings in Christ';—'That I may be comforted by the mutual faith both of you and me.' Did St. Paul, when he thus wrote, regard himself as but *nominally* interested in the blessings of redemption? Was his faith nothing more than a *profession* of christian doctrine?"—(E. LITTON.)

They were also *one* for the saints.

The church at first was definitely, as a whole, the "within," and those not of it, the "without" (1 Cor. v. 12). Every Christian belonged to the "within" as a right, "for God had received him." None could be rightly excluded,

save by discipline in the power of our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. v.), and in this case the person is judged as one within, that his spirit may be saved. There was but one circle, the "within." All not of it were "without." Witness the case of Saul of Tarsus. Why should Ananias be so reluctant to baptise him, and even expostulate with the Lord as to it, if mere profession was all that was required for an outer circle? Not less careful were the disciples after he was baptized, though he had been received at Damascus. The question was, had the Lord received him? Were there fruits of discipleship? They had to "*believe* he was a disciple" (Acts ix., 10, 13, 18, 26, 27). The normal place for a saint is among saints. They are "the flock," "the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." But where is the place, in Scripture, for one in sheep's clothing? Where is this second circle, neither the "within" nor yet the "without?" "Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judges." Satan has an object in this second "circle" on earth, even as he has invented a purgatory hereafter. He knows there is no better way of practically effacing the "within" and the "without" here, or fear of eternal separation hereafter. There *is* a body of real christians. Paul planted, Apollos watered, but *God gave the increase*. This is the *one* divine circle for God. Who gives the increase for the second? Serious question at this moment, shelve it who may.—If to God, to the apostles, and to saints at first, the house and body were *one* circle, commensurate, of true believers, who has authorized the enlargement of the "house" to a "circle" so great as to practically efface the limits of the "within"? This I say, is a serious question for "Brethren." *Truth* is of God—a lie is of Satan (John viii., 44.) To call that the house of God which is not the house of God, and to deceive souls by it, is not of God. Yet we are now in the presence of able teachers, and others, who would enlarge the "circle" of the "house," not only to the water baptized of so-called

Christendom, but would urge into it known unbelievers, under the plea of authority *derived from God* as heads of households. And strange to say, these teachers, while on the one hand so liberal with the Lord's ordinance of baptism, on the other would restrict the Lord's supper to the narrowest limits, excluding all who conscientiously refuse a judgment that is without the warrant and authority of the Word. The avowed unbeliever is baptized; the known believer, for whose exclusion from the privileges of the gathered Assembly, there is no *line of Scripture*, is refused the Lord's supper.

The SIN OF INDEPENDENCY attaches to every Assembly that does not recognize the right of every Christian to all its privileges, unless in evil doctrine, in sin, or sinful association, such as by God's word, would call for his exclusion.—“Those members of the body which seem to be more feeble *are necessary*.” And again, “The whole body, fitly joined together, and *compact*ed by that which every *joint* supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of *every part*, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.”

This sin of independency is the special subject of warning in 1 Cor. xii. It is independency of God. “God set the members *every one* of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him.” And it is independency of those members, or limbs of the body that are wrongly excluded, as though God had made them in vain. “The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you.”

Still graver sins attach to enlarging the “house,” (were it possible) by the admission of known unbelievers.

It is sin against God. He suffered not Moses to make the Tabernacle for His dwelling-place according to any design than His own. Not a board, not a pin, but according to the pattern shewn in the mount. David too, received the pattern of the house, of all its courts, and chambers, and treasuries, by the Spirit. Now there is a

“spiritual house” *and no other.* “The temple of God is holy, which temple *ye* are.” The “*ye*” being the same persons as the Spirit of God speaks of further on as the body of Christ. “Now *ye* are the body of Christ.” (Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 17, and xii. 27). Not one soul was found in the temple that was not also in the body. Who shall add the unconverted to what is holy in defiance of Scripture?

It is moreover sin against Christ.

He died “that he should gather together in one the *children of God* that were scattered abroad” (John xi. 52). Who shall build together those who manifestly are *not* the children of God? (1 John, iii. 10.)

It is sin against the Holy Ghost.

For He is declared to dwell in a mass of sin and wickedness,—millions not cleansed by the blood of Christ, and wholly after the flesh, which cannot be subject to God; in a house which, from its very nature, He cannot rule or guide; in a company that cannot sing by the Spirit, nor pray by the Spirit, nor call Jesus Lord by the Spirit.

It is sin against the Word of God. Baptism is frequently mentioned in Scripture, but not in connection with building. In baptism we are “planted together in the likeness of his death,” “baptised to* (eis) his death”; but there is no *dead* Christ to *build on*. Scripture speaks of coming to Him as “unto a *living* stone,—*ye* also as *living* stones are built up a spiritual house.” “Add thou not unto His words lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar.”

It is sin against the unconverted, for it gives them a false position, perilously false. Scripture, it is affirmed, tells them that, if baptized, “they are *in* the Church, *out* of the world,” &c. Where is that Scripture? The blessed Lord tells His own “I have *chosen* you out of the world,” and His servant John writes—“We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness,” (or more literally “the wicked one.”) That is to say Scripture does speak

* Or into all that it represents for believers.—ED

of a blessed company, chosen of Christ, a company of which the apostle can say "*we are of God*," in contrast with the world. It teaches that to be out of the world (not physically of course), we must belong to God, and there is no belonging to God but by being drawn "out of the world" by Jesus. (John xii., 31-32).

Does it not approach to blasphemy to ascribe to an ordinance that which only can be done by the sovereignty of the Lord, and will not the blood of deceived souls be required at the hand of these watchmen? (Ez. xxxiii).

This paper is already too long, but most interesting questions remain. There are privileges that have come to the world by the rejection, for a time, of Israel. (Rom xi.) There is the partaking, by the Gentiles, "of the root and fatness of the olive tree." There are "hearers of the Word;" there are "servants," "vessels," &c. All these subjects, if prayerfully taken up, lead to clearer apprehensions of Scripture, and of what is the real ground it puts souls on. If your magazine, in the rich mercy of God, should thus meet a very real want of the present day, many will have to bless God for it, but count upon many adversaries (1 Cor. xvi., 9). It is Scripture that souls want, and what a wondrous character of blessing is disclosed there to the hungry and the weary! Oh, it is sweet to say, *all there is ours*, fruit of the sufferings and death of Christ, the travail of His soul.

Yet, alas! who hinder His joy in giving, and our's in receiving, so much as christians? It was disciples that besought him, saying "*send her away*"; but she did not go, for His was the Master's table, and there was a portion for her.

TEKNION.

NOTE.— God has put His name, and the name of His Christ on the house and on the body. He does not put His name, or the name of His Christ on all Churches or Assemblies. Not observing this has led to much confusion as to the Church, the House, and the Body. When Assemblies could be called "*Churches of the Saints*," then they could be also called "*Churches of God*" (1 Cor. xi., 16) and "*Churches of Christ*" (Rom. xvi., 16). See also 1 Thess. ii., 14; 2 Thess. i., 4, and notice the absence of this in the addresses to the seven churches in the Revelation,

“BRING THE TRIBE OF LEVI NEAR.”

AMONGST the striking proofs of the illimitable grace of God, presented to us in His precious word, there are few more touching than the call of the tribe of Levi. The painful story of the dishonour done to Jacob's daughter during the Patriarch's unfortunate sojourn in Shechem, (Gen. xxxiv.), exhibits the character of Levi in all its natural repulsiveness.—Treacherous, fierce, cruel, unrelenting, quick to avenge and a stranger to mercy and forbearance, we read, verses 25-29, “Simeon and Levi, took each man his sword and came upon the city (Shechem) boldly, and slew all the males. They took their sheep, and their oxen, and their asses, and that which was in the city, and that which was in the field, and all their wealth, and all their little ones, and their wives took they captive; and spoiled even all that was in the house!”

In Genesis xlix., the Patriarch Jacob in the quiet evening of his life, reviewing the past and foretelling the future of his sons, views with undisguised loathing the deeds of Levi. It is not, as in Gen. xxxviii., a question as to the possible results of the Shechem massacre upon Jacob's own position and prospects, but in calm dignity he now speaks as the oracle of God about it all. “O my soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united, for in their anger they slew a man, and in their self-will they digged down a wall. Cursed be their anger for it was fierce and their wrath for it was cruel!”

Such then was Levi when God called him. How inimitable the grace that could stoop so low to find and to fit a vessel, meet for the Master's use! which could say concerning such an one as this “Bring the tribe of Levi near unto me.” But this is God's way in grace, blessed be His name; He called Abram from the darkness of idolatry, David from the sheep-fold, another Levi from the receipt of custom, and Zaccheus from the sycamore tree; and, “that He might shew forth all long suffering, for a pattern

to them which should hereafter believe," he arrested Saul of Tarsus on his headlong career of persecution, putting him "into the ministry, who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor and injurious."

"And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, 'Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron, the priest, that they may minister unto him.' And they shall keep his charge, and the charge of the whole congregation before the tabernacle of the congregation, to do the service of the tabernacle, and they shall keep all the instruments of the tabernacle of the congregation, and the charge of the children of Israel to do the service of the tabernacle, and thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and his sons, they are wholly given unto him out of the children of Israel," (Num. iii.) There are two essential points to be noted here, the first, that this henceforth highly privileged tribe were to be wholly occupied with, and devoted to tabernacle service; the second, that the Levites were to keep the charge of *the whole congregation*.

On that terrible night, when the angel of death visited every house of the Egyptians, and passed over the sprinkled lintels of the Israelites, the Lord adopted Israel as His own in the first-born sons. He now chooses the Levites in the place of the first-born as His own possession, whilst the whole congregation of Israel on their part identified themselves with the chosen tribe by the imposition of their hands. (Num. viii. 10.)

But, as with His servant Moses, with the Baptist, with Peter, with Paul, and all other whom the Lord calls into His vineyard, so with these working Saints of old, God does not take up human instruments to be used for His own glory, unless, and until the sentence of death has passed upon everything that is of nature in the individual. We are therefore told in Num. viii. 7, that Moses was to "sprinkle water of purifying upon them," that they were to "shave all their flesh, and wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean." They were then to take a young

bullock for a burnt offering, and another young bullock for a sin offering, upon both of which they had laid their hands, signifying, the one their acceptance and part in the value of the sacrifice as consecrated to God, the other as confessing their need of the atoning blood to put away their sin; these sacrifices were then to be "offered unto the Lord, to make an atonement for the Levites," (Num. viii., 12.). Oh! the ineffable grace of our God, who has Himself "provided the sinner with an answer to His own demands in righteousness" as one has fitly said; who in the bruised seed of the woman in Genesis, and right through the word has interwoven a golden thread, the *blood of the Lamb*, which was believed in by Patriarchs, foretold by Prophets, announced by Evangelists, enforced by Apostles, and confessed by Martyrs; for even after the church is taken up, there are those on earth in millennial days of whom it is said, that "they have washed their robes and made them white in the *blood of the Lamb*." (Rev. vii., 14).

"And Aaron shall offer the Levites before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel, that they may execute the service of the Lord." (Num. viii. 11). So with the individuals composing the church of God now, dear christian reader, for let me remind you, that the Levites represent the church as the firstborn in Christ, and their ministry, the carrying about, and the display of Christ in all His various beauties, "shewing forth the virtues of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light." And this was the *only occupation* of the Levites; there were those whose calling it was to fight the Lord's battles, to blow the silver trumpets and the like, but the Levites were "given to the High Priest, and to Aaron's Sons." "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service," (Rom. xii., 1.) Oh! dear reader, what a service! what a calling! to be wholly the Lord's, devoted to, and

dependent upon, the High Priest on high, having no object, no desires, but those which have reference to Him and to His saints! Redeemed by His precious blood, free from condemnation and from judgment; at perfect peace with God, and at leisure from ourselves, we are His bondslaves who has bought us, we are His freemen, who has delivered us. And *we* are called to be like Levi, henceforth *on the Lord's side*. This will involve thorough self-renunciation, it may lead to the severance of family and social ties, for "he that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me." (Matt. x. 37.) "Of Levi," Moses said, "let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with Thy holy one, whom thou didst prove at Massah and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah; who said unto his father and to his mother, *I have not seen him*; neither did he *acknowledge* his brethren, nor *knew* his own children; for they have observed Thy word, and kept Thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments, and Israel Thy law: they shall put incense before Thee, and whole burnt offerings upon Thine altar." (Deut. 33: 8-10.)

Again, I say how wonderful the grace which could transmute the cruel, self-willed Levi of Gen. xxxiv, into the self-abnegating, devoted, servant, concerning whom the Lord of hosts says (Mal. ii., 5-6), "My covenant was with him of life and peace; and I gave them him for the fear wherewith he feared Me, and was afraid before My name. The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with Me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity"

"If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away, behold all things are become new, and all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation."

Whilst each Levite had his allotted burden to carry and work to do, all alike were "*on the Lord's side*," and I would ask is this not especially a day when all true Levites are called to stand for God? Men, even christians, are run-

ning after this, and that *ignis-fatuus*, the Lordship of Christ is in practice denied, intellectualism is sapping the foundations of christian life and faith, and the plodding, diligent, ministry of the Lord's Levites is more than ever needed in these perilous times. "Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal body." (ii. Cor. iv., 10.)

J. M. H.

EXTRACT.

"THERE is a Man, a glorified Man, sitting now on the throne of God in heaven—that Man is Jehovah's Fellow."

"Men and Brethren! permit one whose name is not worth naming (save as found *in* Him) to beseech you to think of Him—for His sake who has claims over you, and for God's sake who is a jealous God, and who insists on the claims which He has recognised in the Son of His love being recognised by you; own Him *alone* as worthy. He is the only Man worthy of God's thinking about. But He is worthy—for His name of Jesus means "Jehovah-a-saving."

Do not, I beseech you, go on setting one fallen man's name against another fallen man's name...as you have done in your intercourse about questions in which the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit alone should be cared for, and the honour due to God. You have done so till you seem to me to have well nigh forgotten the Sinless Man, the One who, because He knew no sin, could be made a sin-offering, and who was made and did make Himself such, that so, through faith, we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

Unconsciously, it may have been, at first, you have been setting one merely human name against another merely human name, until the name of "Jesus," and the revelation in it, has been forgotten amid talk about men and their doings and claims.

The Spirit has thus been grieved and quenched among you; and blindness, and the fervour of party spirit have got sway and a heavy fog of mystification broods over your actings.

It is a poor sinner in himself, and not a prophet, who writes to you; but, in the light of the Sinless Man (Peerless and without equal, He!); 'tis one who fears lest—*under that cloud of mystification* which rests upon you as a company—there be another spirit (not man's) far more subtle than Ahitophel's of old—far less scrupulous than he, and, at his rear, dangers as to the *honour* of Christ. For if His name be used by any as a cover for darkness and evil, and the name of "the Church" be used as the name of a place where those on earth, *who are indifferent to Christ's honour and to holiness, in faith, doctrine, morality, or walk, may congregate*, His name is put to shame and the Holy Spirit dishonoured.

Would that I were mistaken as to your danger. If not may God give you deliverance, and *victory over every lie and delusion of the Wicked One*. So prays your's, in brokenness of spirit,"

G. V. W.

INTELLECTUALISM.

2ND TIM. ii., 16-18.

THE deductions of Hymenæus and, Philetus drawn apparently from the truth recorded in Matt. xxvii, 52-53, would seem to be given in this Scripture as an example of Intellectualism in divine things, which is compared to gangrene or *death in living tissues*. No stronger figure could be employed to illustrate the deadly character of those "profane and vain babblings" by which intellect supplants the Holy Ghost as Interpreter of the Word, and deceiving the simple, overthrows the faith of some.

If "their word WILL eat" (*i.e.*, spread. J.N.D.), it is mainly because such deductions are too readily mistaken for "deep truth," while a bright earnest advocacy of theories, well put together by men, otherwise godly and irreproachable, is regarded as evidence of a high order of spirituality and intelligence in divine things. Thus, the simple are deceived. Moreover to "reason out of the Scriptures" is surely legitimate, (Acts, xvii., 2, 17; xviii., 4, 19; xix., 8-9; xxiv., 25.), but nothing is easier than to slip into *deducing intellectually from the Word*, and no man is safe but he who learns all at the feet of his Lord in uninterrupted communion. "Much study is a weariness of the flesh"; but it is more than that, for it too often leads (if apart from communion) to inflation, and thence to "leprosy in the head" (Levi. xiii., 44), which I have no doubt is a figure of Intellectualism in divine things (Comp. v. 45 with Titus i., 10-11.)

Those who listen to, or read the skilfully arranged inferences and conclusions of an intellectualist, may not be able always to distinguish between the course he pursues, and that referred to in the Scriptures above given; but one simple rule will always suffice, viz.: the divinely given rule of Isa. viii., 20. He who "reasons out of the Scriptures" gives Scripture for all he says, or he would cease to reason *out of them*; but he who *deduces from Scripture* (or no Scripture) cannot give a

solitary, "it is written" for his conclusions. Hence you always find that such men will shun this test if possible, or if they give you a text, they invariably put their own interpretation upon it, and thus supplant the Holy Ghost both *in you* and in the Word. Some go further, and boldly assert that "Saints must not expect Scripture for everything," forgetful that the Lord found a Scripture for every assault of the enemy; that it is to Scripture we are referred by the Apostle (Acts 20); and that the Spirit pronounces the Bereans of old "noble," in that they "received the Word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so." Why do this, if we "cannot expect Scripture for everything" relating to doctrine and practice? How this must "overthrow the faith of some" is evident, for the first feeling of a simple trusting soul, in listening to such teachers is, that the Bible has lost the meaning they once attached to it—that without some such self-constituted guide, they can no longer understand it. This is a deeper and a more subtle thing than Rome was capable of introducing. It gives the Bible, yet at the same time, takes it away.

An anonymous writer, in his anxiety to evade the demand for Scripture in support of his theories, has put the following into print:—"It has been often said to me, 'Give me a single command for baptising your infant.' I reply, (1) 'Give me a single command for Moses' breaking the two tables of stone; (2), for his pitching the tabernacle outside the camp; (3), for putting away a murderer from the table of the Lord; (4), for women being at it; or (5), a Scripture for the Godhead of the Three Persons of the Trinity. You cannot find a *single* Scripture for one of these." If these are not "profane and vain babblings," calculated to "overthrow the faith of some," I know not where to find them.

In brief reply, I would ask whether the inspiration, guidance and control promised (Exod. iv., 12-15,) were not to Moses what the written Word, and "the unction from the Holy One" are to Saints now, *i.e.*, a Standard and a Guide as to all things relating to God's glory and service? "Taught

what to do" by the immediate personal guidance, control, and inspiration of Him who spake with him, even apparently face to face (Exod. xxxiii, 11) ; he needed no "single command" to break the two Tables of Stone, although a divinely given reason for doing it is found in Gal. iii., 20. His Mediatorship on *that* ground was ended ere it had well begun, and the inspired servant of God knew it (Exod. xxxii, 13-14). "Now a Mediator is not of one," it needs *two* parties for a mediator to act. "God is one," but where was the other when Moses came down from the Mount with the Tables in his hands? Nowhere. Hence the folly of the poor Gentile Galatians for attempting to stand where none had ever stood; viz.: "to do the whole law" and without sacrifice! (Gal. v., 3). Hence, also, the divinely given wisdom of Moses in what he did.

The same remarks as to inspiration, guidance, and control, apply to No. 2 ; and moreover, as inspired of God, his action, in view of Israel's utter failure, was undoubtedly prophetic. (Comp. Exod. xxxiii., 7 ; and Hebrews xiii, 13, as addressed specially to *Hebrews*.) This author might, with as much reason, ask for "a single command" for Moses' song in Deut. xxxii., for if God had promised to put "words into his mouth," and did so not only in this song, and all through five books, He had also said "I will teach you what you SHALL DO." Hence, the folly of asking for "a single command" in his case. One might add that the point in question, "a single command for baptising an infant," is "*a single Scripture*," as indeed, the author admits. Had Moses Scripture? Rationalists imagine a Bible before the Bible, but we know of no Scripture before Moses. We now have *all Scripture*. The cases are in no way parallel.

As to No. 3, it is, if possible, even more extreme. In 1 Cor. v., we are commanded not to eat with an abusive person (J. N. D's. version). Of all abusive persons a murderer is the worst. And further, if a murderer is a wicked person, it is written "put away from among yourselves THE wicked person," *i.e.*, any and every wicked person. Is not that

“Scripture for putting away a murderer from the Table of the Lord”?

The answer to No. 4, is found in Acts ii., 41, 42, taken with chap. i., 14. In chap. i., 14, there were women in the company. To this company there were *added* about 3,000 souls, and they (the women with the rest), continued steadfastly breaking bread. See also, 1 Cor. xiv., 34, 35, where women have their given place in the Assembly as well as at home; and according to Scripture, the first and central thing in the Church was to break bread (Acts xx.) Moreover, the table expresses in 1 Cor. x., 17, the unity spoken of in Gal. iii., 28, unless indeed, as some are bold enough to affirm, the momentous facts “neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus,” are the stupendous results of a mere ordinance! Hence, we have “Scripture for women being at the table.” (1 Cor. xi., 5-16).

If these four queries may be justly called “*vain babblings*,” that which follows is assuredly “*profane*.” To ask for Scripture for the Godhead of the “Three Persons of the Trinity,” in view of the fact that his tract would fall into the hands of very young Saints, is a solemn thing for the author, whoever he is, and he will find it so, sooner or later (1 Cor. iii. 15; Heb. xii. 29). It is vain for him to say that *he* has “the concurrent testimony of Scripture,” for these things. He is no authority, and young Saints know little about “concurrent testimony”: they need plain Scripture. And their gracious God and Father has taken care that they shall have it (even though this author may be ignorant of the fact) from end to end of the New Testament. But a few passages will suffice.

For the Godhead of the Son, John i, 1, 2; viii, 58; xvii, 5; Heb. i., 8; Rev. i., 8; &c.

For that of the Spirit, Acts *v., 4., comp. with verse 3; John iii., 6, with 1 John v., 4; 2 Tim., iii. 16, with 2 Peter, i., 21; 1 Cor. iii., 16, with 1 Cor. vi., 19, &c.

For that of the Father, see Eph. i., 3-17; John xvii. 3; and passages from Matthew to Revelation, too numerous to quote, for which the most ordinary reference Bible will suffice.

Still, one must add, as another has remarked, that it almost surpasses belief, that in a tract on Christ's death, the writer should have forgotten that the immediate fruit of that death (let it be said with reverence of heart), was the revelation of "the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"—the unfolded fulness of the Godhead (Matt. xxviii. 19). Surely here is the "single Scripture," for "the Godhead of the Three Persons of the Trinity!" For *each* is claimed divine equality ("the Name"), and in the most emphatic manner. There is either *no* Godhead, or it is here affirmed of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Must we become Infidels, Arians, or what, as to this text?

It is difficult to understand how the author could have so far committed himself as to say of all we have been considering, "You cannot find a *single* Scripture for one of these." Still more so, that such a pamphlet should have passed through two editions, and be very generally quoted among Brethren, from England to the Antipodes, as I happen to know it is.

But the above are far from being all, or even the most important illustrations of the dangerous and blinding nature of Intellectualism, given in this tract. I would only take a few examples:—

In quoting Rom. vi., 3, the author remarks "*Observe, it does not say into Jesus Christ. Scripture uses the same word when it says 'baptised unto Moses.'*" Now who, on reading this, would suppose it possible that *the same word* is rendered "into," in our venerable version, at the least some 500 *times*, where it cannot possibly mean anything else? Yet such is the fact, and a Greek Concordance will prove it. Moreover, to cap the climax, the learned of two Continents have given *their* judgment of the *primary* meaning of *eis* in the margin of the very Scripture this author refers to (See 1 Cor. x., 2, margin New Rev.) If they have put "unto" in the text, it may have been as not apprehending the Spirit's meaning, which is, that the Israelites were baptised, not of course "into" the man Moses, but *into all that he represented, as apostle of Jehovah* (comp. Acts xxi, 21.) Nevertheless their united

judgment on a question of pure Greek is certainly to be respected, and preferred to that of *any individual*, however learned. But was it honest to lead the reader to suppose that some special word, meaning *exclusively* "unto," is employed in these two passages? "Observe, it does not say into...Scripture uses the same word when it says 'baptised unto Moses!'" "This is too bad," writes a brother on the margin of this tract, when he sent it me; and so it assuredly is thus to "deceive the hearts of the simple." Another brother remarks that in 1 Cor. xii, 13, it is the same preposition (*eis*) after the same verb. Who would say "unto one body?"

Further on, this author informs us that Hannah "in taking her child to present him to God, brings three bullocks. God says as it were, Do you mean it? "I do," she says, and puts Christ's death in symbol before His eyes, and her child into His house."

Passing by the irreverent, not to say profane familiarity of this altogether imaginary conversation between God and Hannah, it is only needful to remark that Hannah's child was a Levite (1 Chron vi, 26-28; 1 Sam. i., 1 & 20), and had a divinely given claim in connection with the service of "God's house," (*i.e.*, the Tabernacle), Num. viii., 15), quite apart from anything that Hannah did, or could do. In her adoring gratitude for the gracious answer given to her prayer, she did indeed *anticipate the time* when Samuel should go in to wait upon the service of the Tabernacle, which was 25 years of age (Num. viii, 24), and thus deprived herself of the presence at home of her only son for a quarter of a century; no light sacrifice assuredly to a mother's heart!

As to "Christ's death in symbol," viz: the three bullocks, two of them were for herself as burnt offering and sin offering (Levi xii, 6, 7), and if she offered the *largest* rather than the smaller sacrifices, it was but a further evidence of grateful adoration.

The third bullock was for her son, *not as* "presenting him to God" as a child in the power of sacrifice, but in offering him as a Levite according to the law (Num. viii 8, 11-14). This

is important, because our author's aim throughout his pamphlet is, to shew that every child should be *presented to God under a symbol of Christ's death*, or of "the Cross which puts off the old man," as he remarks in a note, that is, a *sin offering*. But more than this, even in thus offering the child Samuel as a Levite, *the sin offering was omitted altogether!* Instead of two bullocks as required for an adult, one for a sin offering and one for a burnt offering (Num. viii, 12), only *one* was sacrificed for Samuel, and two for his mother. It is especially noted that "the child was young," and that they slew only one bullock, "and brought the child to Eli" (1 Sam. i, 24, 25).

The truth is that *no sacrifice or any other symbol of the Cross of Christ was ever required, under the law, for a child as such*. God had specially guarded this, for most solemn and important reasons, as we shall see shortly. Yet this author assures his readers that "*if we follow down the whole line, even to the Lord Jesus Himself, we shall find God's character always cared for, by presenting children to Him in the symbol of Christ's death.*" How is it that Intellectualism in Divine things, not content with supplanting the Spirit and wresting the Scriptures, invariably attacks the Person of the Son of God, as in this statement "God's character cared for by presenting," under a symbol of death—"even the Lord Jesus Himself?" Is it not because spiritual Intellectualism has its source in the most intellectual of fallen beings? The earliest instance of intellectual deduction is recorded in Gen. iii., 4: "Ye shall not surely die;" a conclusion arrived at (it would seem) from God's known attributes of *goodness* and *love*, and if so, the most awful illustration, save one, of the character and attributes of the speaker, who "was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth" which he knew, and used thus, to corrupt and destroy God's innocent and best creation, by bringing in *death* through sin (John viii., 44). Well may intellectual deduction be compared to gangrene. But if that is the earliest instance of intellectual deduction, this which we are considering is one of the latest. A symbol

of death, which as already stated, the author carefully distinguishes as sin offering, *i.e.*, that of the Cross which alone "could put off the body of the flesh—put off the old man," is declared to have been employed in presenting the Lord Jesus, that "God's character" should be "cared for!"

Nothing can qualify such a statement, although the author makes an abortive and partial attempt by remarking that "in the case of the Lord, it was pure grace on His part," "a symbol of what He had undertaken to do for others," &c.; but how that could be, if a symbol of the sin offering was needful in presenting Him to God in order that *God's character should be cared for*, he fails to tell us. And although he adds that Christ "was never at any time subject to death: He was capable of it but not liable to it," that does not touch the question, except very indirectly. *If a symbol of that which "puts off the body of the flesh—puts off the old man" was necessary for God's character's sake in presenting the Lord Jesus to Him, the conclusion is inevitable that our precious Christ had in Him that which the symbol was to put away from before God's eye; or how otherwise is "God's character cared for" in it? The rest is either self-contradiction on the author's part, or worse.*

Moreover, the circumcision of the child Jesus, to which the author refers here as a symbol of the Cross, or sin-offering (!), was neither that, surely, nor "presentation."

Presentation was effected *without any symbol of death whatever*, save for the mother (Comp. Luke ii., 22-24 with Lev. xii., 6, 7). The first-born son only was brought to Jerusalem, and presented to the Lord (Luke ii., 23; Exod. xiii., 1-2), but *without sacrifice, as "holy."*

Circumcision, on the contrary, was performed *at home* (Luke i., 50-65); it was accomplished for *every* male child, whether first-born or not, and it had nothing whatever to do with "presenting children" to God. The author has not only confounded circumcision at home with presentation in the Temple, but has assumed that the former was a type of "the Cross which puts off the body of the flesh—the old man," and

that the latter was accomplished for children generally, all of which is wholly untrue.

Circumcision was not a symbol of the Cross. It is true indeed, that the cross is the basis of everything, but that does not make everything a symbol of the Cross. Circumcision in the Jew was "a token" of the Covenant given of God to Abraham (Gen. xvii., 11); God's Covenant in their flesh "for an everlasting covenant" (v. 13), and clearly pointing to the blessing into which Abraham's seed will be brought, in and by a glorified Christ (Rom. xv., 8, New Rev.; Deut. xxx., 5, 6; Jer. xxiv., 6, 7; xxxii., 37-41; Ezek. xi., 19, 20; xxxvi., 24-29; Rom. iii., 29). Hence it was performed on the *eighth* day, which, I need hardly say, is not connected in figure, with *death*, but with resurrection and full redemption glory (Luke ix., 28-34; 2 Peter i., 16-18). Our circumcision now, is by and in a risen glorified Lord (Col. ii., 10, 11. J.N.D's. version). If "the body of the flesh" was put off for us at the Cross, it is in Him risen that we have been circumcised; 'cut off round-about' from the body of the flesh "in the circumcision of the Christ," "not in the flesh," "a new creation." (Rom. viii., 9; Gal. vi., 15.)

In our precious Lord's case, it was doubtless in obedience to the law (Isa. xlii., 21; Ps. xl., 8; Matt v., 17,) and as identifying Himself with His people in their future blessing (Isa. viii., 18). As begotten of the Holy Ghost (Luke i., 35); as having no other *nature* than His own—Son of God *before* He came; *when* He came, and after He "came of a woman" (Gal. iv., 4. J.N.D's. version) though in flesh and blood (Heb. ii., 14; Rom. viii., 3, the '*likeness*' is *not the original*), He needed no "symbol of death" when presented to God in the Temple. To say He did is Newtonianism in its worst form and a lie direct from the great Intellectualist of old time. He who as Jehovah of old (Comp. Isa. vi., 9; John xii., 40-41) gave the law on Sinai, provided before-hand, that when afterwards He should come in flesh and blood, His *own* "character," and that of God, His Father, should be "cared for" in a way exactly opposed to that so confidently

asserted by our author all through his tract, viz. : by seeing to it that no sacrifice of any kind should be required in the presentation of any child as such, before Jehovah. This is of all importance. Had the law required *any* symbol of death in the presentation of a first-born son, need I say that Joseph and Mary must, of necessity, have obeyed it, and that in that case both "the holy child Jesus," and His Father, would have been dishonoured? Hence *not a solitary instance can be found of any such thought between the covers of the Book of God.*

Imitate the Bereans of old, dear reader, and "search the Scriptures daily whether these things are so," and whether you can find a shadow of support for any one of the statements we have been considering, but especially the last, which affects the very foundations of your faith. If you cannot, what shall we say of those who quote and commend this tract in all directions? Some, who take the place of teachers, do both the one and the other; sisters carry it from house to house and commend it to young saints, who read and receive its teachings with confidence, and, thinking they have got hold of "deep truth," learn to regard those of their elders who have not accepted it, as "unintelligent and lacking spirituality," and so, becoming lifted up with spiritual pride, they fall into the crime or judgment of the devil, which is, I doubt not INTELLECTUALISM IN DIVINE THINGS.

EXTRACT.

"In this epistle (2nd Timothy), we find that the great point pressed on Timothy is clear and positive separation from profane and vain babblings. Previously he had been exhorted to hold fast the form of sound words; and again, rightly to divide the word of truth; thus intimating that His great and constant work would be to separate the precious from the vile *in doctrine*. What a state of things for a servant of God! His chief and most difficult enemies from within, corrupting and misrepresenting the truth of God, which they professed to maintain." Pres. Test. Vol. xiv.

LETTER ON THE KINGDOM.

BELOVED BROTHER,

The Kingdom has been much on my mind, I may say for years, and your suggestion revives the importance of the subject to me in all its force, hence, if the Lord will, I purpose writing a series of letters upon it.

You doubtless know that it has been often pointed out that the force of "Kingdom" in Scripture is *rule* (Dan. iv., 25, 26). To those who bear this in mind, the subject will be much simplified. A Kingdom in Scripture does not necessarily involve the thought or existence of a *King*. Satan is no King, yet has he a most extensive "Kingdom" or rule (Matt. xii., 26; John xiv., 30, &c.)

Beside the three Kingdoms you refer to in your letter, viz.: "The Kingdom of God," "the Kingdom of the Son of His love," and "the Kingdom of the heavens," Scripture also speaks of "the Father's Kingdom," and "the Kingdom of the Son of Man."

The Kingdom of the Father is mentioned in Matt. vi., 10, xiii., 43, xxvi., 29; and Luke xi., 2, and is entirely a future thing; (See Rev. xi., 15,) as is also that of the Son of Man. These will have to be considered in their place when we come to the Kingdom of the heavens. I would draw your attention first, to "*the Kingdom of the Son of His Love*" (Col. i., 13; Rev. i., 9.)

That this is a moral and spiritual sphere is evident from the context; *i.e.*, it is not physical, not a "place," except in the moral sense. Of Saints, the Apostle speaking of the Father, says "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness," viz.: the moral sphere above-mentioned, called Satan's Kingdom or rule (Eph. ii., 1-3; Titus iii., 3.) "and hath translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of His love." Every believer therefore, is the subject of the rule of the Son of His love; the very Expression and Embodiment (may I say), of the LOVE OF GOD! How gracious to put it thus, and how should it

touch our hearts! For after all, it is a question of the *affections* (2 Cor. v., 14, 15,) for although in the riches of His grace, the Father has *drawn* us to the Son (John vi., 14), and thus every believer is within the sphere of this rule, and the Apostle's heart rises in thanksgiving to the *Father*, not only for meetness for glory, but for present deliverance from the power of darkness and translation into this Kingdom, the Kingdom of the Son of His love; yet it is only as duly affected by "the love of Christ," that he will manifest that subjection to a "rule" so gracious, so deservedly absolute. Nevertheless, even if any do not, they are *there*, and hence this Kingdom relates rather to "standing" than to moral state or condition, and Saints only are within it (1 John v., 19.)

"THE KINGDOM OF GOD" on the other hand, *as a present thing*, is purely *practical* and experimental where the Spirit is ungrieved; although it is well to observe that inasmuch as Christ is *God*, the subjects of the rule of the Son are necessarily within the Kingdom of God. Yet, as a *present rule* now, it is spoken of in the Epistles as experimental. "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy, in (the power of) the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xiv., 17.) Here it is evidently both individual and practical, the fruit of the rule of the indwelling Spirit ungrieved, and the privilege of every child of God (Gal. v., 22, 23; Eph. v., 9, &c.) Hence, also, where manifest, it is connected with power (1 Cor. iv., 20,) and is sustained by communion (Gal. ii., 20; John vi., 35, 56, 57. Mark those words "cometh," "believeth," "eateth," "drinketh," in the present tense, and involving *continuance*. See also 1 John v., 13, 14.)

This Kingdom, or rule of God, now in this present time is therefore *by the personal presence of the Spirit of God* and in no other way. It is thus also, that it is spoken of in the Gospel of Matthew, as distinguished from the Kingdom of the heavens to be hereafter considered (chap. xii., 28). And let me say, in passing, that the Scripture just

referred to, gives direct evidence of the Godhead of the Spirit. "If I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom (rule) of God is come unto you." That is plain enough. *God was ruling because the Spirit was there in manifest power.* Taken with the context, I suppose, more solemn evidence of His divinity cannot be found anywhere. And though, He who spake, was Himself God, He, making nothing of Himself as ever, blessed be His peerless Name! but exalting the Spirit alone, only gives the more emphatic evidence to *His* divinity.

The presence of the Spirit in manifestation was then the rule of God, when Christ was on earth. He was the living Temple (John ii., 19), and the Anointed One (Isa. lxi., 1; Luke iv., 18; John i., 32, 33; Ps. ii., 2; Acts, iv., 26, 27, &c.) and Himself God. He could therefore say to the Jews, "Behold the Kingdom of God is among (or in the midst of) you" (Luke xvii., 21), blind though they were to the blessed fact, and to the evidences of the divine presence, rule, and power, given so plainly, that for any to say it was Beelzebub, was open-eyed, wilful, and deliberate blasphemy (Matt. xii., 31, 32). The rejection of Jesus, was the rejection of **THE ANOINTED**.

The Kingdom of God is spoken of, I think, but five times in Matthew (ch. vi., 33; xii., 28; xix., 24; xxi., 31-43.) All who were *subject* to the rule of the Holy Ghost, present in the sealed and anointed Jesus, and manifested in His works, as well as in His Words (John xv., 22-24); all who *did* the will of God, thus owning Him practically, were within the moral sphere of this Kingdom (ch. xxi., 31). The Chief Priests and Pharisees, though occupying the leading place in *professed* subjection, were not (v. 45). This is important as again shewing that 'Kingdom of God' in Matthew, as in the present time, is spoken of *in the practical* sense.

That the Scriptures already referred to in this Gospel, will have application in the *future*, as they had in the past, I have no doubt whatever. When the Church is gone, the

Kingdom will be again preached (Matt. xxiv., 14), but not as now in association with the Gospel of the grace of God in its *heavenly fulness*, and in the whole Counsel of God, unfolded in the union of *Christ and the Church* (Acts xx, 24-27). and a remnant will be raised up by grace with whom the Spirit of God will be present, as on the disciples of old. It was in His power that they healed the sick, cleansed the lepers, raised the dead, and cast out devils (Matt. x., 8); and in reading this chapter down, you will see that the Lord addresses the Twelve as representing the active remnant of the last days, (see particularly v. 23). If there was a Judas among them, there will be "false prophets" among the disciples of the future (Matt. vii., 22, 23; xxiv., 11; 2 Peter ii., 1-3; Ps. lxvi, 3, margin).

In the 24th chapter of this Gospel also, it is abundantly evident that the disciples of old are looked at as representative of a future remnant, for I need hardly say that the disciples of the past, never saw "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet" (v. 15, Dan. xi., 31; Rev. xiii., 13-15); "that they never passed through *the* great tribulation" (v. 21, 22, Dan. xii., 1); nor saw the sun darkened, the moon not giving her light, the powers of the heavens shaken, and the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and Himself coming with power and great glory (v. 29, 30; Luke xxi. 25-28). Hence it is a future remnant that is here addressed, as in other Scriptures; subjects of the rule of God, when we are in the glory. For His omniscient eye scans all His own, looking onward through all time and circumstance; His divine heart cares for, and His ceaseless love anticipates their needs and sorrows, though nigh two thousand years may intervene since He stood on the earth, ere they shall arise (through grace) to own in the teeth of the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet, the rule of God down here by the presence of the Holy Ghost in manifested power—a competent testimony to His claims (Rev. xi, 3-6; xiv., 6, 7). To them in the future as to those of old, "the Kingdom of God and His

righteousness" (Matt. vi., 33 ; comp. Rom. x., 3), will be the one aim of a devoted life and walk, as sustained by Divine love (Matt. xxiv. 24). Then too, as of old, it will be easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye, than a rich man as such, to enter the Kingdom of God (Matt. xix., 24), in other words, to become the subject of the Spirit's rule ; and this for reasons manifold, but one of which will suffice, viz. : that given in Rev. xiii., 14-17. Then also, as in the past, such as the publicans and harlots will enter the sphere of this rule, doing the will of God from broken hearts, before those who will then be the successors of the wicked generation addressed Matt. xxi., 31-45, (comp. ch. xxiv., 34 ; Dan. xi., 32). Then endurance to the end will alone be salvation (Matt. x., 22 ; xxiv., 13) ; for unlike Saints now, they will not be added to the body which is a saved thing (Acts ii., 47, New Rev). Yet shall the elect be kept, subjects of the Spirit's rule, by divine power, waiting for the grace to be *brought unto them* at the revelation of Jesus Christ (1 Peter i., 5, 13 ; Rom. xi., 33-36).

But that this phase of "the Kingdom of God" is not the only one, you well know. (See 1 Cor. vi., 9, 10 ; xv. 50 ; Gal. v., 21 ; Eph. v., 5 ; 1 Thes. ii., 12 ; 2 Thes. i, 5 ; Rev. xii., 10.) The same title is here applied to a condition of things, brought in when the sorrows of the Remnant shall have passed away for ever ; and when He, to whose sufferings and death, all the glories of the future are owing, shall drink with us all, the New Joy for which He yet waits in "the Kingdom of God" (Luke xxii., 18) ; when heaven and earth united in the Person of the Son of Man (John i., 51 ; Gen. xxviii., 12), shall tell forth the priceless value of His blood and infinite perfections ; and the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, of the scope of glory, shall be the one vast sphere of *the Kingdom of God* (Eph. iii., 18). This is properly called the Kingdom of the Father (Matt. xxvi., 29), as giving all the glory to Him, by His Son, through the Holy Ghost, and must, if the Lord will, be considered in a future paper.

Thus far, we have considered but two aspects of the Kingdom, viz. : first, the sphere of the rule of the Son of God which is a present thing, into which every believer is translated, and which involves the Lordship of the Son over all His own.

And second, that of the Spirit who is God, and whose rule in the hearts of the Saints is therefore the Kingdom of God, but always *by* and *in* Christ (John v., 22, 23). This relates to three periods, viz. : the past, when Christ was on earth, and so the Spirit abiding *with* the disciples ; the present, or Church period, during which the Spirit is *in* the Saints, and His fruits manifested ; and the near future, when once more on the disciples or elect remnant, He will be *with* them as of old, in power. It is the rule of the Holy Ghost in visible display on earth.

Yours in His love,

J.L.K.

BUILDING BY ORDINANCES.

EXTRACT.—“The Spirit is *truth* ; unity in error, therefore, has another origin and source. I Peter, ii. 4, 5, was addressed by the Apostle ‘to the strangers scattered,’ &c., evidently converted Jews, true Christians ; and applies no less to true Christians now, none the less if true Christians are sadly scattered in the days in which we live. Living stones themselves, and coming unto Christ as a Living stone, they are built up a spiritual house, *in the binding power of the Holy Spirit.*”

“The figment of baptismal regeneration, in place of the quickening power of the Spirit by the Word, producing bricks instead of living stones ; church ordinances holding people together, instead of the binding power of the Spirit, slime for mortar ; *This is the Babylon which Satan is building.*”

EXTRACT—“BUILDING FROM THE TOP.” Confessions of a high church clergyman, written after his conversion to God.

“From the commencement of my ministry I did not, as a general rule, preach my own sermons, *but Newman’s*, which I abridged and simplified....My thoughts dwelt very much on forgiveness and salvation, but I preached that these were to be had in and by the church, which was as the ark in which Noah was saved. Baptism was the door of this ark, and Holy Communion the token of abiding in it, and all who were not inside were lost. What would become of those outside the Church was a matter which greatly perplexed me? I could not dare to say they would be lost for ever.”—W. HASLAM’S “From Death unto Life”

CORRESPONDENCE.

To show the extent to which the false views and doctrines now afloat among God's saints are exercising consciences, the editor purposes to reproduce, under this head, *bona fide* letters written from time to time by himself, or others, with such changes as are needful in publication.

LETTER TO A FRIEND.

(Continued from p. 20.)

AND now, dear Brother, allow me to refer to the reasons you advance, as having induced you to take the step I mourn over. You say that, "whilst acknowledging that there is no direct Scripture to guide, still we have both analogy and principle to act upon." Very, very dangerous ground! *Faith* can only be in what is *revealed*. Analogical reasoning is no ground for faith, and if reason is my leader, who can say into what quagmires of error I shall stumble? Nor can I take "principles" as my guides without a clear statement of the living Word as their foundation. By faith I know myself as dead and risen with Christ. This is a clearly taught truth, and my life and conduct should be conformed to the principles flowing from it, but this is vastly different from principles founded on the result of *careful reasoning* and *analogy*. Beware, dear Brother, lest you be "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Full well ye reject the commandments of God that ye may keep your own tradition."

Again, you say, "In baptism I own before God that my child is dead, and look to Him to give it life.—Eph ii, 1." I reply that as in His word, God gives no directions whatever for such a course, your action implies that a most necessary ordinance has been omitted from the word. Christian baptism is into Christ's death (Rom. vi., 3), and sets forth death *to* sin (v. 10 and 23), not death *in* sins. There is no ordinance to set forth this. But I should like to ask whether you quoted Eph. ii. 1, in sober earnestness? I do not see how a babe not twelve months old can be said to be dead in *trespasses* and *sins*. One cannot of course define the exact age when responsibility commences, but I have no hesitation in saying that whilst born in sin, the judgment of which was borne by Christ (Heb. ix., 26), your babe had never committed either trespasses or sins, nor could therefore be said to be dead in them. Know you not how the Lord says of them "Suffer little children to come unto Me and forbid them not," for "I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," showing clearly the place they have with the Father, for "His Son came to seek and save that which was lost."

Not a word about baptism being requisite to bring them to Christ, nothing of the kind, though adults were baptized (John iv. 1.)

You may be right in saying that "it needs clear reasoning to understand this doctrine." There you and I fully agree, but I submit to you that most honest simple followers of Christ will prefer for their guidance one plain assertion of the Word to all the clear reasoning or traditions of men. Mr. Hibberd, a methodist, says: "That the force of the argument does not lie embodied in terse isolated passages which require but a single effort of the mind, but that a *process* of reasoning must be gone through," &c., then excuse me if I say that I prefer the "terse isolated passages" and leave the reasoning for whoever fancies it.

With respect to the manuscript handed about privately, which you are so kind as to say you wish I had read, I cannot but condemn these secret attempts to disseminate doctrine. If infant baptism is from above, where is the necessity for underhanded dealing with it? If not, it is of the darkness, and I can understand that it loves darkness.

You ask "were not households baptised, and there were infants among them?" Dear Brother, who told you that there were? Lydia is not spoken of as being a wife, there is no mention of a husband, it was "her house," and her case decides nothing. In all the other households named, the Holy Ghost records that which could not be true of infants (Acts x., 2; xvi., 32-34; xviii., 8; 1 Cor. i., 16, with xvi., 15.) Why then should "her house" not be as all these? (See Acts xvi., 40). Of the jailor's house (Acts xvi., 34), it is at least said they *all* heard the word and rejoiced with him (New Rev.) The house of Stephanas, whom Paul baptized, it is written, "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints" (1 Cor. xvi., 15.) Were these infants, dear Brother, or were they not rather stalwart believers who stood in the front ranks in a day when a prominent Christian was a mark for many archers?

And now a few words upon the "great house." I fully agree with you that "a great house," spoken of in Timothy, is used by the apostle simply as an illustration, he does not say more than that *in a* great house *there are* such things as he mentions. But from the conclusion you draw from Eph. ii, 22, I entirely differ. To say that the Holy Spirit does not dwell in the church but in the house, and that house Christendom, and that you have brought your children by this baptism into the sphere within which the Holy Ghost acts, and thus placed them on Christian ground, is simply theory and unscriptural; but even if the house you speak of is Christendom, and "my child is born within it," as you speak, it *is* within the sphere of the Spirit's action, it is already by natural birth in the very place you speak of as having brought your child-

ren by baptism! You say, "The holy Temple in the Lord" (Eph. ii., 21), is the assembly composed of all true believers; whilst the next verse "In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit," is that house in which man has built wood, hay, stubble—the corrupt thing which we call Christendom and where alone the Spirit is said to dwell. That 1 Cor. iii., teaches the same thing, man adds to the "building in which the Spirit dwells," &c. Now, this theory sounds well, but there are two little words which destroy the fabric. The apostle says to the Ephesian saints, "In whom ye also are builded together." In whom? surely in the Lord; and do you expect me to receive as the truth, that "In the Lord" is built up for God's holy habitation, that which you call a *corrupt* thing, composed of believers and unbelievers? "Ye are the temple of the living God, him that defileth the temple, him shall God destroy." "Ye are built up a spiritual house, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." Of what, then, is this house composed—saved and unsaved? clean and unclean? No; a spiritual house is built up of *living stones* alone, and the apostle says we are baptised by one spirit into one body; the one and the self-same Spirit, who, thus in-dwelling each believer, forms the whole, as united to Him, one body; forms also this holy habitation of God, so that the saints are built together for a habitation of God through the Spirit; "In whom ye also are built," &c. I beg you, dear Brother, to weigh well these important truths—most important in these last days. The Spirit of God is in the world to convict of sin, righteousness and judgment; it is He who restrains the progress and development of evil; and His habitation is in believers, builded together by Him in Christ—a habitation of God in the Spirit (Eph. ii.,) and the Temple of God (1 Cor. iii.)

To return to your argument: I understand you to imply that by baptism you have made your child holy. Now, in 1 Cor. vii. 14, I find that the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife by the husband, and "now are the children holy." The man under law who married a Gentile wife was unclean (Ezra x., 3), but under grace it was quite the contrary, the converted husband sanctified the wife and *vice versa*, and their children were reckoned clean before God. Of fitness for baptism the text says nothing; if it did it would assert it for the unbelieving husband or wife (placed in the state of holiness by the faith of the other), equally with the children viewed as in it already. This is the sense of the word holy in connection with order and outward relationship towards God. I might mention that the same word is used (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5,) where it is a question of meats which are sanctified for our use by the Word of God and prayer. Now, dear Brother, you will admit that the SILENCES

of God's Word are deeply important and to be carefully weighed, as here, and mark there is not a word which indicates the necessity of baptism as a means of ensuring the sanctification of the children of believers! "Now ARE they holy." The apostle (Col. i., 25) speaks of fulfilling the Word of God; dare you say that an indispensable direction as to infant baptism as a pre-requisite to holiness had been omitted by the apostle? The man of God is said to be "thoroughly furnished." Do you question this because infant baptism is not plainly indicated and commanded? Excuse my remark that your arguments and your acts reply affirmatively.

Unlike Mr. Hibberd, I glory in the fact that Christ has given us plain, simple guidance concerning the two ordinances—Baptism and the Lord's Supper; so simple that a wayfaring man, though a fool, can understand them, and that without Mr. Hibberd's or any other man's logical and careful "reasoning and analogy." He who gave such ample and distinct directions to Israel concerning the redemption and circumcision of their children, who ordered the arrangements of the camp and of the sanctuary, and indicated the colours and fabric of their clothing, has not left His church without guidance; nay, all things that pertain to life and godliness are written for our learning; but I repeat, that when the Word is *silent* our hearts ought to bow in subjection, lest, peradventure, I may be found in my heart *adding* to the Word of God, and bring myself under the condemnation of Rev. xxii., 19.

I submit therefore, that altogether, irrespective of baptism, the children of believers ARE holy, and that therefore baptism is utterly valueless as contributing to that end.

You say that your children are in association with the assembly on Christian ground, although not yet in fellowship! This is a sad mistake, dear Brother; it almost involves the thought of hereditary saintship, and is in reality degrading the Lord's ordinance to suit your morbid sentiment. By all means, commit and commend your children to the Lord in prayer as often and as earnestly as you are led to do so but do not touch with a rude hand that which He has ordained for those who believe, and only those. There is not a thought nor expression that by the finest "reasoning or analogy" can be made to mean that baptism under any circumstances can be performed upon the faith of another than the one baptized. Paul grounds his exhortation, in Rom. vi. 3, on the fact of believers having been baptized, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?" &c., &c.

What, then, does baptism signify? In a word, that I have died to sin because Christ has died not only for sins but "unto sin once." It was

when the Eunuch was arrested by the words "His life was taken from the earth," that he said "See, here is water, what doth hinder *me* to be baptized?" Again, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Dear Brother, can a *babe* put on Christ? Col. ii., 12.—"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." Has your child faith in the operation of God? "We are buried with Christ by baptism in which also we are risen with Him by faith in this operation of the power of God, whereby He was raised from among the dead, baptism was the sign and expression of this." (Synopsis vol. 5, page 27). In baptism I give public expression of my faith in the death and resurrection of Christ; through faith in Him I have remission of sins, and, therefore, it is not a question of the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer (or testimony) of a good conscience before God.

I now quote your last statement, "I have by baptism placed my child in such a position before God, that I can say to him you must not do this or that, because you have been baptized and brought into a place of responsibility before God." This is not only exceedingly legal ground to take, but it is really, if you will allow me to say so, positively false. Should it please God in the future to reveal His Son in your child, and, misled by your precipitate action, he never takes his place as a believer, by baptism, the purport and significance of the ordinance are lost to him; the scriptural object of it is set aside; the public profession of death with Christ and resurrection with Him, of having put on Christ, and of the enjoyment of remission of sins are all foregone; a meaningless ceremony worse than useless has been gone through in other years, and you have robbed your child of a precious privilege, and bolstered him up in a false position with respect to truth.

You call me a Baptist, you might call me with equal truthfulness a Lord's-Supperist, for I desire to maintain in their integrity both of these ordinances of the Lord. Whilst repudiating the thought of making baptism a test of communion at the Lord's table in anywise, I do maintain that it is incumbent upon every Christian to observe God's order, faith, baptism, and then communion; and therefore I cannot but view with astonishment and sorrow, the carelessness and indifference which so lamentably prevail respecting the institution of the Lord; nay, more, if the one ordinance is flagrantly disobeyed, upon what ground can I expect the second ordinance to be maintained?

You remark that some hold baptism who have not themselves been baptized; this is doubtless most true, but lukewarmness and carelessness of this kind do not for a moment invalidate the direct Word of the Lord.

There are, you are aware, other thoughts and arguments not mentioned by you, and all more or less absurd or untrue, as for instance, that straightforward statement concerning infant baptism, that "therein I was made the child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," &c. But I forbear: this letter has outgrown my original purpose; and in conclusion I beg of you to bring this most serious matter to the standard of God's Word, and to lay aside the philosophy and vain deceit which haply may have entangled your feet, appealing, as they do, to reason and sentiment which are no guides. Let the Word be sufficient for you, and when the Word is silent be you subject to the silence as to the teaching. In these days of human theories and many inventions, we need to have our feet upon the Rock and our goings established by the Word, or the endless surmisings, analogies, reasonings, fancies and feelings,—a quaking quicksand,—will engulf us.

Dear Brother, would you have these things usurp the authority of the Word? Away with them and the latitude they give for error of every kind. An Irvingite defending his errors uses the weapons you wield. Let us use the Sword of the Spirit, and no other. I now leave the matter with you in the secrecy of your soul with God, and that you may be brought into clearer light and sounder judgment, and enjoy much happy communion, is the prayer of your affectionate Brother in the Lord,

J. C.

BELOVED BROTHER,

Your letter is full of Christ from end to end, and tells that you "know Him, that is from the beginning," in the sense in which the Spirit speaks in 1 John, ii., 13 (New Rev.), and I fully agree with you that the presentation of *Himself* in all His fulness, is the most blessed employment of the Servant of Christ.

But, when positive error has come in, and is being diligently circulated, and but too readily received by many, to seek, in the power of the Spirit, by the Word of God, the maintenance of the truth, is enjoined in Scripture. Not to do so, is to help on the deceits of the enemy.

I may have told you in my last, that I have a small portfolio full of *printed* matter, sent me from all quarters, and abounding in error. The contents of that portfolio are increasing week by week. Now, if any object to the endeavour to meet all this by Scripture, they must settle it with Him who gave us Scripture, that we might meet and frustrate the artifices of the Devil, and who (wondrous fact), used it Himself for that purpose (Luke iv., 1-12; Eph. vi., 10-20).

In a very extensive correspondence carried on daily for many months, I am most thankful to say, for God's glory's sake, that Saints are everywhere exercised as to these things. A few indeed there are whose timid counsels recall the weakness of the men of Judah (Judges xv., 11), and the sin of Meroz (ch. v., 23), but they do not number half-a-dozen.

Some also there are who, from much graciousness of disposition, while deploring and mourning over these shameful errors, hesitate to "go down to the war," as I may have remarked in my last. If so, I repeat, let them "tarry by the stuff" (the whole body of the truth given for our sustenance), and pray over it that the Word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified.

Again; I have, unhappily, met with one or two who, deeming *themselves* secure from the poison of Intellectualism, seem to have forgotten the exhortation of Phil. ii., 4, 5. Had *He* looked only on *His own* things, where should we have been to-day?

To make the "Occasional" a Baptist Magazine is far from our purpose; but, in its place, we dare not slight baptism. Our conviction is that while those who have the truth on this part of God's revealed will, have been silent, fearing to "stumble" any; those who hold gross error have been most active in spreading it, both in printed articles, and in manuscripts privately circulated; in going also from house to house, and in holding private reading meetings, to which the young and inexperienced were alone invited.

But it is rather with the fruits of Intellectualism than with differences as to ordinances that the Occasional will have to do, *when* and *as* the Lord shall give the needed power and opportunity. Those who love Him pre-eminently will not object to this.

The part that ordinances may yet play in completing the departure of "Brethren" from "the principles acted upon at Pentecost by God, and Christ and the Holy Ghost" is not, however, unimportant. Rome maintains the power and operation of the Spirit *in* baptism. These Brethren, *after* baptism. Both meet in this, that **THE ACTION OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD IS MADE DEPENDENT ON THE ACTION OF MAN**, and in exalting the so-called "Church" against Christ, as the Ark of safety, the Treasure house of the Holy Spirit, the Meeting place of the soul with God.

* * * *

Yours very affectionately in Him,

J. L. K.