

I would humbly seek to speak more clearly
- especially on this subject, than after more
than 35 years. Meanwhile, I would, confessing
failure, cross out & alter certain words, seeking
God's forgiveness, + and fulness of accuracy, more
+ more to His glory. (1/4)

No.

32.

"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS
WHICH ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE
RIGHT HAND OF GOD." COL. 3. 1.

THE ONE BODY.

An Address (revised) at

St. Mary Axe. E.

17th October, 1913.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD.

Correspondence welcome:

Scriptural literature for Believers

Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – 74343 Sachsenheim – GERMANY

T H E O N E B O D Y .

An Address by Mr. P. W. Heward,

At. St. Mary Axe. E.

17th October, 1913.

OUTLINE:-

1. The exact perfection of Scripture Language.
2. What "The One Body" means.
3. Some common errors considered without bitterness,
with thoughts on the ground of gathering.
4. Eternal love, and our prospect of That Day.

There is perhaps no topic which is more full of solemn suggestiveness, than that which is now before us. Here we have a subject which has been used by God to cause some of the most earnest thoughts and earnest efforts of the dear people of the Lord, and here, moreover is a subject which, misapplied, has been used to hinder, and, in measure, wreck, that which begins as a wondrous work of God. Ah, beloved friends, our meditation to-night is deeply important. Oh, that we may have a heart-readiness for the fulness, or at least a larger fraction of the fulness, or (shall I put it?) a larger proportion of the fulness of our Father's perfect and wondrous truth. A right attitude is deeply important at the beginning of any study. If self says, "I will be heard", if the

2.

flesh says, "I have a right to my own opinions" there will necessarily be ruin, and all the meditations will only lead God's dear people into increasing failure, but if there be the attitude of "I will hear what God the Lord will speak", - if there be an openness of heart toward the truth, and a holy determination to "buy the truth and sell it not", then there will be a rich, and real, and lasting blessing. We have either met with low objects, or the all-embracing one, - the glory of God. If we have met with the object of the Glory of God! Oh, that our object may be our realisation! Oh, that our object may be our enjoyment! - that, though we do not realise it to the full, we may realise it in increasing measure, and know that God has met with us and caused us to meet with Him.

I do not dare to say that we are all of one mind concerning every portion of this theme. We do not come together to talk over everything as to which we are all absolutely agreed, but we come to seek after further knowledge and fuller agreement in the things of the Lord, by the enabling of the Holy Spirit. Differences are sinful; it is well therefore that they should come up that they may be thrown on one side. I have no doubt, however, that we have a wondrous background and basis of MUCH agreement in this connection. We alike recognise that God, in the plenitude of His wisdom and love, has been pleased to take out from earth a people for the Name

3.

of the Lord Jesus, that those people were represented by the Lord Jesus in His perfect and infinite compassion when He accomplished that meritorious work which is altogether counted to them, for they are viewed in Him, raised from the dead. We recognise that those who have been thus blessed in the present dispensation are made sons of God, that they have a prospect of eternal life and glory which no work of man or of demons can mar or undo. We recognise that their merits are simply and solely and entirely the merits of their precious Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and that the words "In Him" are not meaningless poetry, but the true expression of the relationship which is beyond utterance in human explanation but not beyond a divine utterance because expressive in Divine words of a Divine fact. We realise furthermore that those who are now walking this earth though despised and rejected as their Lord was, are, nevertheless, the ones who, receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, are enabled and encouraged to lift up their heads, for their redemption draweth nigh. They are conscious of the fact that their relationship to the Lord Jesus is inseparable; for to His sheep He gives eternal life, and they shall never perish, nor shall anyone pluck them out of His hand. We recognise that, in this connection those who have been born from above, and are indwelt by the Holy Spirit, should be careful to maintain good works, and to please Him Who hath chosen them

unto such a wondrous position and prospect. We recognise in our hearts, and I hope in our activities, that unworldliness befits those who are like unto their Lord. Not of this world, they should set their mind on things above, for they have been born from above. Christ, Who is their Life, is at the right hand of God, and the things of earth should have a decreasing hold UPON, and a decreased hold BY, those who know that they have a better and enduring substance in their beloved Lord, and that those riches which are never to be taken away from them; an inheritance, incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us, must more than transcend the best that earth can offer. Let the world scorn, its worst will not undo God's gift. Let the world offer its flattering attractions, its best will not draw us aside from that which embraces us with more than magnet grasp, as we have respect unto the recompense of the reward, and look off unto Him Who is the Author and Finisher of our faith, Who draws us with a love that knows no equal and which no power can destroy, because it has a most vehement flame. I want to make perfectly clear at the outset that all which I shall endeavour to bring before you from the Scriptures afterwards as to the losses of God's people does not undermine the fact that we are blessed with ALL spiritual blessings in heavenly p̄aces in Christ. It does not undermine the fact that we are linked with the

Son of God's love, but it does undermine a false boasting. It will set on one side the glib profession of blessings which is oftentimes associated with the denial of the ruin, or a carelessness as to that which has so grievously disturbed the present dispensation.

At the outset, may I plead with you, as well as with myself, for a prayerful stress upon the exact perfection of Scripture-language. "All Scripture is God-breathed, and is profitable". We believe it and should act accordingly. You will find myriads of saved ones, or professedly saved ones, who acknowledge this, yet do not search the exact words of the Scripture, but almost disparage the learning of the inspired words. I can understand a child of God being mentally unfit for this, but I cannot understand a child of God disparaging it in others. If there is the acknowledgement of the inspiration, verbal inspiration, there should be a stress upon the exact study of the exact "words which the Holy Ghost teacheth". Further you will find numbers who profess the name of the Lord who are very inexact in the use of Scripture expressions, and if you bring this before them they almost reply, - "Hair-splitting". If you remind them for example that the Lord Jesus Christ is not called King of the Church, they will think you are denying His authority, I believe that many common "arguments" are very similar to those of Sennacherib and his general. Hezekiah pulled down the high places, and the message comes,

to this effect, "If you (the people of Judah) say unto me, we trust in the Lord our God. Is not that He Whose high places and Whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away"? I believe, dear friends, that in most of the professed christian doctrine at the present day there are a large number of "High places", and if you pull them down, people will say you are pulling the truth down. But surely our hearts can enter into the meaning of that statement "Take away her bulwarks; for they are not the Lord's". We do not want to defend the Truth with human errors. There is a strange idea at the present day of defending Truth by piling up heaps of rubbish round its citadel, and the heaps of rubbish hide up the Truth, and make the attack on those within the Truth much more easy, though they cannot destroy Truth itself. Let the stern Rock of Divine Truth defend itself. No man will force that. Do not put your rubbish on top. Rubbish is shifting, but truth will stand. Clear away the rubbish, remove the things that are not of God, and keep to the oldfashioned Truth. In this connection may I plead for a stress on the exact perfectness of divine wording as to the "Church"; when the Lord says "The Church", He means to put that term, and not the term "Body". When He uses the expression "Bride" He knows just which word He uses. I am not saying just now that the Church, the Bride, and the Body are all distinct. My thought is that the terms are not

7.

ABSOLUTELY synonymous, that every word of Scripture has a sphere of its own, and an aspect of its own. We know how the names of God are used. Noah does as GOD commands him and THE LORD shuts Him in. And the critic would split up such a verse and hand it to two human writers, whereas the believer draws the exactly opposite inference, and says, "No human compiler would have produced such a strange expression, it has a unique Divine Authorship". "Every word of God is pure". We would not add to His words nor take away from them. We would take them as they stand and rejoice in them. We read for example, in 1 Corinthians 12. 13. - "In one Spirit were we all baptised into one Body", then at the end of the chapter, - "And God hath set in the Church some, first, apostles" and so forth. It is not an accident that we have the word "Body" in one verse and "church" in another verse. God has arranged the words perfectly. In Ephesians 3, we do not read of the whole Church in heaven and earth, but of the aspect of the Family, in heaven and earth. We are NOT told in Hebrews 12, that we have come to the Church of the firstborn ones who are in heaven, but the Church of the firstborn ones whose NAMES are written in heaven. The term "Church triumphant", as applied at the present time, is without Scripture warrant. The saints who have fallen asleep are not spoken of as the Church. I do not deny that they will be in that glorious Church which Christ will present to Himself not

having spot or wrinkle or any such thing. I do not deny that in the purpose of God they have the wondrous relationships that are oft suggested thereby, and that as a real fact they have an intimacy with their Lord, which means all that most people signify by the term "Church". But, the fact of it is that most people have a dictionary of their own, and when we come to God's Truth there is a sad decreasing of the fulness of God's language. If you were to say to people that at the present time there is not the ^{manifestation of the} Church, many with ritualism in their mind would look astounded, and others who hold a large proportion of the Truth would be surprised. Now I am not about to make so sweeping a statement that there is not the Church, but I would say that in the manner in which the term is USUALLY employed in Scripture there is not the ^{manifested} Church on earth. "Oh", people will say, "You are cutting at the root of the wondrous blessing which saints have in the present dispensation". No, beloved friends, we believe all that they mean by the term "Church" but we believe that the term Church includes more than they mean. Likewise is it with the word "Body". I should not, in general, speak now of the saints on earth as ^{manifesting} the Body of Christ, the One Body. Not that we deny His Finished Work, not that we deny the continuation of the results of that finished work, but the term "One Body" ^{reminds} means-to-us ^{all} that, plus something more, and though I could agree that every word, even the word "ALL" can be

used with a specialized context meaning, we need to be very careful when we improvise contexts in our own mind, and thus confuse those who are listening to us. It is not accidental that every word of Scripture is put just where we find it; that "the Church" is not mentioned in the Epistles of ruin, ^{weakness} that in the Book of Revelation we have "the CHURCHES". Do not say this is a small point, and that "the Church" and "the Churches" must be taken as identical terms. They are not identical terms in the perfect Scriptures. I would go further. If Scripture speaks of "Churches of the Saints" and "Church of God", there is undoubtedly a hidden meaning of each expression that is attached to the word "church" or "churches". It is another thing to say we have reached all that hidden meaning. I hope we shall not make such a pretension. As soon as we begin to assert what we know, it is time that we begin to realise what we do not know. Humility befits the Lord's people, for they have much ignorance. But, beloved friends, though humility befits us, there must not be a false humility, and false modesty which agrees with what everybody says, an uncertainty of mind, a condition of heart in which there is a willingness to accept everything. We desire to have minds that are prayerfully logical. There is no book more wonderful in its logic than Scripture, and the Holy Spirit's application of the Truth will train the mind as nothing else, and believers are expected to be of a sound mind in

this sense of the word as well as in other senses.

We now come to consider our subject, what the One Body means. The word *σωμα* for body has a unique advantage in that it is almost always translated in the same way. There is a contrast with the word *πτωμα*, which means a dead body, in far the larger number of places. There are three sets of passages that concern us just now. Those which speak of the Body of Christ, in connection with atonement, those which speak of the bodies of the Lord's people, and those which speak, as some would say, figuratively, of the redeemed as a Body. Let me warn against the careless use of the word FIGURE or FIGURATIVE. Earthly things are rather the figures of heavenly, than heavenly ones figures of earthly. The tabernacle was a type, the heavenly things themselves were the solid realities. Apart from those three sets of passages, we need not consider anything just now except the striking words "the body of sin", "the body of death", and "the body of the sins of the flesh". For examples of the use of the word "body" concerning the body of Christ, we remember His words "This is My Body" in connection with the precious breaking of the bread, In Romans 7. 4, we read "My brethren, ye are become dead to the law by the Body of Christ". I take it that as the word *δια* is here employed, the thought is because He died. It is not "IN the Body of Christ". That might suggest "In

resurrection union with Him". But "Ye became dead to the Law through the Body of Christ", - through His dying.

1 Corinthians 10. 16, speaks of the partaking of the Body of Christ. Colossians 1, The Body of His Flesh, through death. There are one or two passages which are a little doubtful in this connection. Ephesians 2 tells us that our beloved Lord has brought near His people and made both one, that He accomplished this in His Blood, in His Flesh, in Himself, in One Body. The "ins" of verses 13-16 are very beautiful. Our translation fails to give their fulness. Now does it mean in this last passage that the Lord's redeemed are now in one body? I think not; at least, that is not the PRIMARY meaning here. The thought is His One Body dying for sinners was the means of making those who were far off from God into one precious saved company. Now you will notice that the expression "One Body" suggests two meanings, even in the same passage; - The one Body of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the One Body of His people, formed in connection with His gracious offering thereof. Both meanings occur in Ephesians. Indeed in Colossians the two views of the body are mentioned in almost adjoining verses. "He is the Head of the Body the Church", and then the Holy Spirit goes on to say "In the Body of His Flesh through death....He reconciled you". Why does the Holy Spirit bring the two together? Because the thought is that the Body of Christ given was the cause

of His people becoming one Body. The other use of the term as to the believer's physical body is also closely related to the term "Body", with reference to the company of the redeemed. Romans 12 illustrates; "I beseech you, therefore, brethren.... that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice" and when you have continued a verse or two further down, you read "We are one Body in Christ". "Your bodies" and "one Body". The two thoughts are related. I have sometimes thought that where we have "Your Body" as distinct from "Your bodies" there is at least a special reference to the company of the saved ones together, - "Your Body" having an allusion to the redeemed as a little company. May I illustrate what I mean from 1 Corinthians 6, there we read in verse 15 "Do ye not know that your BODIES (plural) are the members of Christ". But further on in the chapter, verse 19, "Do ye not know that your BODY is a temple". Not "Your bodies are temples", although most people quote the verse that way. The passage does not say "Thy body is a temple", but "Your (plural) Body (singular) is a temple (singular)" and I have thought that though there may be an allusion to the individual believer, there is particularly a reference to the company of redeemed ones, where you have "Your" in the plural, and "Body" in the singular especially as in the same context where the word means "physical body" the Holy Spirit uses the

plural. In the 20th verse the Apostle says "Glorify God in your Body", not simply in your bodies, but in your body. I do not deny that these words have an individual force, but I think the passage may go much further. "Your body" also occurs in Romans 8. 23. We ourselves are waiting for the redemption of our Body. It is quite true this includes the redemption of our bodies. But the language is primarily the redemption of OUR (plural) BODY (Singular). Do not say this is hair-splitting. The Holy Spirit could have put the wording differently. He is pleased to put it in this way with at least a twofold thought. 2 Corinthians 4. 10. The Apostle says "Always bearing about the dying of the Lord Jesus in the body, that the life also of Jesus may have been manifested in our Body". You will notice where there is the dying, it is in the physical body, where it is the life manifested it is not only in the physical body, but it is in OUR (plural) BODY (singular). Surely more passages than we think allude to companies of saved ones under this term "BODY". I have long thought that Hebrews 13. 3 has the twofold meaning. There we read that the Lord's people are to remember those who are in affliction, as being themselves "also in the Body". Further we have a striking suggestion of the body in James 3 where, if the tongue is in order, the whole body can be bridled. But there are other passages which UNMISTAKABLY speak of the redeemed under this term "BODY". 1 Corinthians 12 from verse 12 is the

first occurrence, I mean historically. Then we have Romans 12. 4-5. In both of these we have the one Body brought before us. 1 Corinthians 12 speaks of saints baptised in One Spirit into One Body. Romans 12 says, "We being many are one Body in Christ, and every one members one of another". Then Ephesians 1. 23 says definitely "The Church...which is His Body". Here the use of the article implies that the Church is the Body, and the Body the Church, even as Colossians 1 suggests, by putting the two words in apposition, - His Body, the Church. And a second time in Colossians 1, the apostle is willing to endure all things and to suffer affliction that he may go through those sufferings that belong to Christ, in his (that is, Paul's own) flesh, for Christ's Body sake which is the Church. (Colossians 1. 24.)

Apart from these passages, Ephesians 3. 6 says that believers are "bodied" or "embodied" together. Ephesians 4. 4. again contains the expression ONE BODY which we have already found in 1 Corinthians 12. 13, and Romans 12. 5. Ephesians 4. 16 says that the whole body receives its supply from the Head, and according to the effectual working in the measure of every part keeps on making increase of the body unto the building up of itself in Love. Ephesians 5. 30 says "We are members of His Body". Colossians 2. 9. says that in Christ there dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily". Possibly this includes the thought "With reference to His Body", the Church. Colossians 2. 17 says "Which are a shadow of things to

come, but the Body belongs to Christ". This may mean the Body is in Christ, in contrast with the shadow, but I think, here the wording goes further. Colossians 3. 15 is almost the last of our passages naming the One Body, "And let the peace of God rule in your hearts to the which also ye are called in one body, and become ye thankful".

Apart from these we have in 1 Corinthians 10 the statement, "The bread which we break is it not a having in common of the Body of Christ, because one loaf, we the many are one body". Here then we have five different passages which with the word ONE BODY, and we notice that the testimony of Corinthians and of the Epistle to the Romans must be borne in mind as BEFORE the prison Epistles, for some have sought to make a distinct dispensation of the One Body subsequent to the Acts. The Holy Spirit has guarded against every error, if only by grace we have eyes to see and ears to *emphasizing* hear. The ONE BODY therefore was a divine expression ~~for~~ the unity of the redeemed accomplished by the work of Christ, and the application of that work by the Holy Spirit. A company of the redeemed in wondrous unity on resurrection ground. Entrance into it was by baptism in the Holy Spirit; - IN one Spirit were all baptised INTO one Body. It was characterised by acknowledgement of the Head. The Lord Jesus, "from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual inworking in measure of every one part

maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself
in love"

The terms "BODY" and "BRIDE" are not absolutely contrasted, for Ephesians 5 brings the argument, "Husbands, love your wives as Christ loved the Church", and/whole point is that Christ's relationship to His people was that of the husband to the wife, although the figure of Adam is a fuller picture, for Adam's bride was not only united to him, but received her beginning from him and was built up from Adam's own rib, taken while he was asleep, a faint picture, yet real, of the Church of God receiving its life from Christ, and built up on resurrection ground from Himself, because He entered into that which was more than a sleep, more than a deep sleep, when God caused to fall upon Him, just as God caused this sleep upon Adam, - God caused to fall upon Him the awful judgment, and He tasted death for His beloved people, that they might receive an everlasting life. I suppose these passages make clear that the One Body is not a term belonging to the old dispensation.

We now pass to consider "some errors", and what is the ground of true gathering. The term "One Body" we have agreed, belongs to the present dispensation. That Abraham will be in the Church in the resurrection I believe, He WILL be likewise in the kingdom of heaven and without us those Old Testament saints will not be made perfect, but together with us. Yet he WAS not in the church, he WAS not

in the kingdom of heaven when he walked this earth. He had a dispensationally distinct position. Every dispensation has had a partial anticipation of the final climax. Undoubtedly the climax will transcend every anticipation. Abraham had one anticipation, the saints at Pentecost another, and so forth, but the climax will exceed all. Eternal relationships, eternal glories are beyond their dispensational pictures and earnest. In this connection we should remember that there is a very common error at the present time which demands the common use of the word ONE BODY. You will have noticed where that word is used in Scripture. 1 Corinthians is the first Epistle, Ephesians and Colossians are the last. In other words, we cannot find the term ^{do} used in the ^{emphasized} Epistles which lay stress yet more on weakness. The entrance into the Body was, as we have seen, by baptism in the Spirit. Baptism in the Spirit must be carefully distinguished from birth of the Spirit. This birth is invisible though it leads to activities. ~~Baptism is visible, both baptism in water, and in the Spirit.~~ ^{seems to be related} The two baptisms ^{seem to be included} are mentioned in Hebrews 6 where we read the doctrine of baptisms. Some will say this is a contrast with Ephesians 4 where Scripture says "One baptism," but no more a contrast to a true believer, than the Divine revelation that there is One God, yet three Persons in One God. Everyone can see that the expression "One baptism" in Ephesians 4 is in holy contrast with sectarianism. There were, in another sense, baptisms, says Hebrews 6, one in water, and one in the Spirit, both visible ($\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\omega\iota$).

Baptism in water was a setting forth of birth out of water of which Christ spoke in John 3. Baptism in the Spirit followed birth of the Spirit of which again the Lord speaks in John 3. ~~Baptism in the Spirit was always linked with the signs following. The theory of an invisible baptism in the Spirit is not Scriptural. Though I am ready to acknowledge all that most dear believers mean by saying "We are one body in Christ", I feel that when God used the expression He meant more than most believers mean, and therefore, it is not right, in usual language at the present day, to speak of the Lord's people, in disorder and confusion as "The one body". Ephesians 4 speaks of the One Body as not only linked with the Head, but ^{appointed to} executing the arrangements of the Head. The Lord Jesus arranged the body that there should be no schism in it. That schism has ^{externally affected} come in; we can clearly see. The epistles that deal with schism, no longer mention the Body. Believers cannot declare that they have been baptised visibly into one body at the present time. Those who claim that baptism in the Spirit as something-subsequent to salvation, and profess to have experienced it in themselves, are often most careless as to the Lord's arrangements. Those who assume that every believer has the baptism in the Spirit are confusing things that differ. Birth of the Spirit, indwelling of the Spirit, the Spirit of senship in our hearts, - these precious facts remain, but we must not misuse the Divine language. A little~~

1947
 vessel is
 visible,
 the Spirit
 is not.
 have long
 refused in
 an unworkable
 baptism in
 one spirit
 with one
 body and
 hearting

company of redeemed ones can be, in its measure, a miniature of the "One Body". "Because there is one loaf, We, the many are one Body", just as we have a little miniature of "The Church" called "A Church". There should be, wherever saints are gathered, a local expression not of the disorder at the present time, but a local expression of the Church that will be presented to the Lord. ~~Do not think it is an unwarranted statement, beloved friends, to say that the word THE Church is not so employed of saints in days of ruin.~~ It is not employed of saints that have fallen asleep. If their falling asleep takes them out from the divine phraseology "The Church", we can understand that the word "The Church" has special meanings in this present dispensation. When the present dispensation is over, the saints will be in THE CHURCH, when raised from the dead

Sanford

I know there are one or two passages that suggest a wider use of the term, and that wider use I think we all sometimes employ ourselves. I do ~~not deny~~ ^{rejoice} that in God's purpose ^{before Him} we are the Church. I do ~~not deny~~ ^{rejoice} that in the heavenly relationship we are the Church, but in ALL that fulness which the word "Church" meant, and its usual Scriptural signification, believers in days of apparent ^{manifesting} ~~ruin~~ ^{fulfillment}, are not in this full and wondrous way, the Church. To ignore God's instruction herein leads to much confusion and much lack of godly sorrow. Take the matter of gathering. Generally believers should be gathered to

rejoice?

the Name of the Lord and without sectarian acknowledgement. They should be gathered in recognition of Christ's Lordship, Christ's authority, and to carry out His arrangements implicitly. Any company of professing saved ones that has in its texture anything against the Lord's arrangements has no claim upon my conscience or yours. If you want to simply follow the Lord, that which has in its texture anything against the revealed will of God cannot be to you a church, but must be a system of man. But then when we do seek to gather to the Lord and the exaltation of the Lord, owning His Name alone, on what ground do we gather? ~~Some will say on the ground of the One Body. We have seen the inappropriateness of that expression.~~ I am not quite clear if it is wise to employ the term "ground" of gathering at all. All terms that are often used become misused, therefore it is wise to have a fresh expression, or to go back to the simple wording of Scripture. How should we rightly meet now? ~~If we say on the ground of the "One Body" we shall be assuming supernatural gifts.~~ Many say they assemble ^{separately} as in 1 Corinthians 14. We find seven speakers there, all inspired, not one uninspired speaker, and yet that is made the usual argument for open ministry. Then beloved friends, how SHOULD we gather? I believe that we should gather in simple reliance on the Lord, acknowledging our weakness, but acknowledging any individual

gifts that the Lord does still give in days of great need. Those gifts will keep on, some of them, unto the end, for though there be but the FOUNDATION of apostles and prophets, the risen Lord also gave evangelists, pastors, and teachers. These, I believe, still exist, and it is incumbent upon those who receive such gifts to use their talents for their Lord, that they may have some result now and His "Well Done" and a fuller result in that day. I trust we do not believe in the theory of a one-man, two-man, or twenty-man ministry, but in the fact of the Lord ^{wealthiness} arranging as He pleases. But in days of ruin there is a large cutting off of the supply of those who have gifts for ministry, and we must acknowledge this, and be gathered in simple obedience to the Lord. But you will say, Is every believer welcome "in fellowship"? "If a believer is excluded" remark some "It is sectarian", yet the majority who take that expression exclude many, because they put on the table, The Lord's table, that which is not His appointment, which excludes every simple minded disciple, who has been brought in mercy to see this, and who has no bias against the truth. Beloved friends, it is easy to use the hackneyed expression that every believer who is sound in doctrine, and godly in walk has a right at the Lord's table. But who is to decide what is soundness in doctrine, and what is godliness of walk? We do not require to use expressions glibly but to search into the true meaning.

we cannot tell who are believers by their profession. All along Scripture has emphasised that disciples alone are welcome in the gatherings of the Lord's redeemed. In days of departure we need to emphasise this still. ~~We do not meet on the "ground" of the "one Body"~~. We do not meet on the "ground" that "the Lord knoweth them that are His" without remembering the other part "Let everyone that nameth the Name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness", otherwise we cannot tell who are really in Christ Jesus. Oh that His eternal love and the prospect of that day may be rightly used to spur us on, but let us never forget our responsible position as well as our glorious position, - our responsibility to carry out the commandments and arrangements of our beloved Lord while we walk this earth, - our responsibility in days like these, not to boast, not to assume we have that which we have not, not to use glibly the words which speak of the saints before ruin came in, but, taking a lowly position, to seek that the Lord may be exalted in the Holy Spirit's application of His truth to His own glory.

Question as to 1 Corinthians 10?

A. I think every local assembly of the Lord's people who have the one Loaf that He appointed, having partaken of that one loaf become typically and suggestively one body, locally a miniature of the whole. But while

"Disciple" (Gr. μαθητής: "a learner": i.e. one who is ready to LEARN from the Lord Jesus. Cf. Mat. 11:29; by grace meekly WILLING FOR HIS WILL of John 7:17. to go forward as HE leads.). J.W.

Christendom has, to take one case, altered the loaf that the Lord appointed, and substituted something else, it is manifest once more that there is not the one body, as there was in the early church.

Q. Would it be right to say you can "add" now?

A. One ^{may} question ^{our emphasis on} the ~~use~~ of the word "add" in days of departure and disorder, ^{God adds}

Q. Receive?

A. I do not know that we can particularly use the term "receive-in", though there seems no particular objection to it. In 2 Timothy 2 it says "Follow righteousness, faith, love, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart". If every one that names the Name of the Lord departs from unrighteousness, and goes on "following", then there will be a true gathering. One hardly likes to speak about adding to a little "body", or even to stress "receiving" into an "assembly", because it seems to me that is taking a term which has a wider application, ~~and using it now to avoid the revelation of the man's ruin, or to~~ ^{I may} assume a dignified position for a little company that those who are observing will naturally translate to mean:- "You claim to be the church of God, and everybody else to be outside it."

Q. That was the position of Israel of old (was it not?) going back to a certain position in building the temple, but not having priests with Urim and Thummim etc.

A. Yes, but let us take more fully the type of remnant times. Let children of God come back from Babylon to Jerusalem and they can carry out the Lord's arrangements at Jerusalem. Now their attitude to those who remain still in Babylon, is, as far as I can see, not to keep on informing them what they are not, but rather to keep on encouraging them to come up from Babylon to Jerusalem, and when they have come up from Babylon to Jerusalem, then they can be welcomed as manifest disciples. You could not have the Passover at Babylon, and you could not have a line of those partaking of the Passover from Jerusalem to Babylon, all shaking hands a little further along till they gradually were farroff from God's centre. They needed to come to Jerusalem to have the Passover, and so at the present time. We cannot have a stretching out toward evil and error. But on the other hand, we have no evidence that on the arrival of anyone from Babylon to Jerusalem that those found there would refuse to welcome. Such an one must come to Jerusalem, that attitude must be sought, but God's people did not spend their time in proudly saying what those at Babylon were not, they had more than enough to do, to put the arrangements at Jerusalem right.

Q. Still, they took the first position as far as they could reach it, did they not?

A. Undoubtedly, I believe that we should seek

to do that at the present time, and to ALLOW no failure or compromise, "filling a gap". "Let everyone that nameth the Name of Christ depart from iniquity" and we must in meekness instruct those that oppose themselves, if the Lord calls us to that privilege. But I do feel that there is a tendency in days of disorder and transition, to try to make a dictionary that will be out of date in a few months. We must walk slowly and prayerfully.

Q. As to welcoming to the Lord's table?

A. But there is nothing in Scripture, so far as I can see, of welcoming TO THE LORD'S TABLE. The Lord's table is not something at which all who profess the Name of the Lord can meet, and then go their respective ways. It is within the limits of manifest fellowship. There must be a oneness manifest in other things first, or otherwise the meeting at the Lord's table, is, though with the best intentions, a ^{Variation from} caricature of the Lord's appointment.

Q. Do you assert that there is only one place where the body or the assembly of the Lord's people meet to the exclusion of every other?

A. Every company of God's dear people needs to be tested in the light of Scripture, and that if there is one error in the warp or woof, or the texture of that assembly.....

Q. The Holy Ghost sifts, the Spirit of the

Lord sifts, every individual believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, that is if he has any sensitive spiritual feeling about Him?

A. True, but I do not think you quite follow what I mean. Every believer is responsible to be careful to do only what the mind of the Lord is as far as He sees it.

Q. Quite true, but do you assert that there is only one place where the body of the Lord meets, to the exclusion of all others?

A. I do not know that the expression the "Body of the Lord" should be particularly used, it is liable to mutual misunderstanding.

Q. Part of the body, the local assembly of the Lord's people?

A. Personally I know of no gathering at the present time (except those of the Lord's people with whom I am in fellowship) that carry out the mind of the Lord as far as I can see it. In other known gatherings, I should find something which would grieve my conscience. Then I could not say they are assemblies of God if they have arrangements which are not according to the mind of the Lord as far as I can see them. This is a responsibility before the Lord. It is important.....

Q. The conclusion that I draw is that you would exclude all but your own?

A. Have you not missed the whole point? The position we take is that God's dear people are largely *in weakness* ~~amid ruins~~, at the present time. (Q) I thoroughly agree with you there.) If there is any arrangement that is not the mind of the Lord, it grieves God's Holy Spirit, and if there is any arrangement we can see to be not the mind of the Lord we have no right to have any share in it. You would not take it to be a church of the Living God, a pillar and ground of the Truth, if it taught for example, infant baptism, would you?

Q. Certainly not.

A. Well then, equally we feel that if it teaches the use of leavened bread at the Lord's table, it cannot be *fully illustrating* a pillar and ground of the Truth.

Q. But do you not believe that there are some in that church who are washed in the precious blood?

A. Without question there are myriads. That is what I want to make perfectly clear, that our position is not to emphasise what we are. (Beloved brethren who attend most of our meetings have not heard me say often what we think of ourselves). We are not particularly anxious to emphasise what we are. We are very conscious of weakness and failure among ourselves, but I know of no gathering without ARRANGEMENTS which would pain me, apart from where we meet. We should not be canded if we carried out arrangements there which we thought against the Lord,

and yet still stayed therein. But we know of no other gathering where they carry out the arrangements of the Lord, AS FAR AS WE CAN SEE THEM. Consequently though I rejoice in seeing saved ones at any gathering showing some love to the Lord, though I rejoice that Christ is preached even of strife and contention, though I believe that the Lord's hand is not shortened, that He can work everywhere, I could not honestly sit down at gatherings of the Lord's people where I felt there was something in the arrangements that grieved God's Holy Spirit.

Q. Then you exclude all others?

A. What do you understand by "excluding"?

Q. I mean would you not have fellowship with any other?

A. In the Lord's table?

Q. No, in ecclesiastical arrangements.

A. I should rejoice to have every possible form of humbling together and fellowship, but not share ^{as an} ~~in~~ ^{assembly} ~~ecclesiastical arrangements~~, unless we were of one mind. Otherwise I should be untrue to the Lord's arrangements, as far as I can see them. Just as untrue as if going where there was infant sprinkling instead of baptism. Have I made myself clear? It is not a question of attacking an individual relationship of a believer to the Lord, or the collective relationship of believers to the Lord, but it is a question of local responsibility.

Q. It is a very large subject, and requires prayerful consideration.

A. I quite agree with you.

Q. "To the word, and to the testimony".

A. Undoubtedly. II Timothy 2 is the passage that perhaps most clearly sets forth what we believe to be the mind of the Lord in this matter. We might go into that subject after those we have on hand. We need a gathering of this kind where these things can be brought up and prayerfully pondered. It is delightful to be able to gather with hearts, I trust, in measure, subject to the Holy Spirit to consider differences and to consider difficulties, realising that the Lord not only keeps us from getting irritable, but that He draws us together which is better still.

Q. But of course you fully understand there are considerable differences between you and others who say they are gathered in the Name of the Lord?

A. One quite realises that. To take others apart from ourselves, there are considerable differences between various sections of the Lord's people known as "Brethren" and are there not? There are considerable differences just as between those of years ago, are there not?

Q. I can only see perfection in One, that is all.

A. True, but we agree to follow after perfection.

Q. Perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord.

A. That is our reason for talking together, with a

view to perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord,
in the enabling of the Holy Spirit. We acknowledge
our weakness and inability. It is not "our position"
that is the theme, it is not our desire to take a great
stand, and to speak of what we are, but of what Christ is,
and to seek that His people may be gathered more and more
on the lines of their Lord's will.

Further literature, concerning the Lord, gladly sent (international) to
exercised believers for personal perusal, and **passing on** to God's
glory, some also in German, Spanish, Russian, Polish, Czech, Romanian:

– ***To Testify the Gospel of the Grace of God.*** –

COPIES FREE (as the Lord enables) on application to:

Scriptural literature for Believers

Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – 74343 Sachsenheim – GERMANY

**BAPTISM IN THE SPIRIT
AND YET
BAPTISM IN WATER**

An article by the late Mr. Percy Heward appeared in the November-December issue of 1955, under this heading. The first paragraph has called forth some comments by readers. One seemed to think it was a plea for baptism in the Spirit with the signs accompanying, such as is claimed by some today. This was definitely not the object of the writer. Another thought that birth of the Spirit and baptism in the Spirit take place at the same time. Scripture, however, does not seem to bear this out. Yet another reader, referring to this first paragraph, asks for further remarks by way of explanation. This it seems the duty of the editor to give.

The writer, at the time he penned this article—in the year 1913—emphasised the fact that, whereas birth of the Spirit was invisible, baptism in the Spirit was visible, that is, was invariably accompanied by "signs". In the book of Acts, our only source of knowledge of such baptism historically, it was undoubtedly after salvation was received and was accompanied by "gifts". Baptism in water was also practised. The church at this time was marked by a **unity**, wherein there were no "sects", as the word is understood today, and it is **such** a church that was marked also by the possession of various "gifts". The persons using them were "inspired". See 1 Corinthians, chapters 12 and 14. The **unity** was **manifest**, and so were gifts, which were associated with the baptism in the Spirit.

Our author held, at one time, that as the **unity** no longer exists **manifestly**, the fact of the "**one body**" could not be now emphasised. Hence he concluded that it was not correct, in the present state of "weakness" (he abandoned the word "ruin") of the church, to speak of being baptized in the Spirit. Later, however, he felt, in the light of the words of 1 Corinthians 12.13 that this view could not be honestly maintained. Let his own words be quoted. "I was very conscious (in 1912) of the sad disunity of God's dear people (and would ever feel this) and, realising that the earthly manifestation of unity was **not** being set forth as a witness, I thought we could not speak of the "one body" and of being baptized into it, in its heavenly (and primary) aspect, at it does (blessed be God) still exist before **Him**. O to learn more of His truth and to have a full-orbed view, to His glory.

"May I now briefly summarize thus:—

(1) The early church was brought into a new

position and dispensation, and there is an appropriate record of being manifestly baptized in the Spirit, in the **fresh** spheres, fulfilling the gracious prophecy of Acts 1.8.

(2) The gift of tongues was fittingly linked, setting aside the primary use of Hebrew, and thus contrasting with the olden days; going to all nations **where they were**, and not bringing in via Jerusalem, nor incorporating with earthly Israel.

"But we do **not** read of this sign twice in **one** place, and the Lord gave the blessings sovereignly (even when in the house of Cornelius the Jewish disciples might have hesitated as to baptism) as a **witness** that Gentiles were brought in. The evidences of God's work seem to be always granted by means of special signs at the **commencement** of a **new** dispensation.

"May we not truly say that, if we fulfill Acts 2.38, God still grants us the Gift? He does not fail. The word of 1 Corinthians 12.13 surely still applies. There was no **promise** of the continuance of the gift of tongues (which served a special Divine purpose then) nor of other similar manifestations, but the present dispensation is not ended, and the unity "In Christ" is secured by His finished work. We **believe**, and do not require "signs" (1 Cor. 14.22). We walk by faith, and experience God's gracious gift of the Holy Spirit. But we would enter more fully into our Lord's prayer in John 17, and pray more fervently for more manifested unity amongst the redeemed, "till we all come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4.13)".

