

No.

68.

"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.

GOD'S APPOINTED METHOD
OF PREACHING TO THE UNSAVED.

An Address (revised) at

Aldgate, E.

2nd February, 1912.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD.

Correspondence welcome:

Scriptural literature for Believers

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

GOD'S APPOINTED METHOD

OF PREACHING TO THE UNSAVED.

OUTLINE:-

1. Introduction.
 - (a) Importance of the Subject.
 - (b) Who are to PREACH.
 - (c) Daily PARALLEL Experience for all Believers.
2. WHAT are the Lord's sent ones to Preach?
The Gospel (Mark 16.15) Christ
(Acts 8. 5) The Word (2 Tim. 4.2).
3. TO WHOM are they to Preach?
 - (a) Every Creature (Mark 16. 15).
 - (b) Wise, Unwise (Rom. 1. 14).
 - (c) Jews, Greeks (Rom. 1. 16).See Ezek. 3. 11.
4. Man's CONDITION.
5. Scriptural COMMANDS, INVITATIONS etc.
6. EXAMPLES AND BEACONS - in recorded witnessing.
7. Misleading Expressions etc. Considered and Rejected.
8. Summary. Notes on
 - (a) The Work of the Holy Spirit in connection with Preaching.
 - (b) The Pride of Orthodoxy.

We come, dear friends, to our usual, and somewhat lengthy, subject. The heading is "God's appointed method of preaching to the unsaved." I do ask you to notice carefully the exact words - "God's APPOINTED method". We turn to the Scriptures to find out; we want to know NOT what we think, or what we believe will be resultful, but what GOD has said, what GOD has set forth in His Word, for we believe that Scripture contains a sufficiency of

guidance for all circumstances in which His dear people are placed.

The first point of introduction that we reach is the importance of the subject; and it is important because everything concerning the Scripture must be important inasmuch as it is related to God. Moreover, this is important because we cannot and would not get away from preaching. It is an appointed thing; it has pleased God to appoint preaching. Furthermore the importance is shown by the fact we realize that the true preacher represents God, that he is not merely going in his own name, but in the Name of God. Then, furthermore, the importance is emphasized when we see the solemn issues - if I may use the expression, the solemn issues of the preaching; it is a matter of life and death, "savour of life unto life or of death unto death", and "Who is sufficient for these things?"

A word might be spoken in passing on the subject, "WHO are to preach?" As Romans 10 puts it, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" Without a Divine sending there cannot be a true preaching. I do not mean a mere human appointment, but there must be a Divine sending. I lay a stress upon this at the outset for I do not want the subject of preaching to suggest to the mind of any that every believer is to "preach". There is a need for a distinct and definite call to preach, as much as a definite call to salvation. But although only certain ones are to preach, all God's people are to have a daily PARALLEL in their experience. They have the responsibility, by their life, and by their lip, of setting forth the things of God; they have to make manifest by their words and conversation the Gospel of the Grace of God, and therefore they are all interested in the best manner of presenting the Gospel before those who know not the truth. Our lives indeed preach

and our lips preach, apart from a definite "preaching". And this reminds us that the one who stands on a platform should have the beautiful "FEET" of a godly walk (Rom. 10. 15).

Now we come to the second point of our subject, **WHAT** are the Lord's sent ones to preach? This may be summarized in the words of Jonah 3, "Preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee". Not only must sent ones preach, but they must preach with an appointed message, and this message which the Lord bids may be described in a number of different ways, all of which give different aspects. For example, in Mark 16. 15 we read "Preach the Gospel to every creature"; that Gospel which is elsewhere called (in Matt. 13) the "Gospel of the Kingdom", and in Acts 20 "The Gospel of the Grace of God". Furthermore, we preach not merely a theme, not merely a doctrine, but a Person. As in Acts 8 we are told, and the fifth verse, that Philip went down and preached Christ, and then afterwards we find in verse 12 he was preaching the "things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ" Acts 8.12. I have also just noted down, "Preaching the Word" 2 Tim. 4. 2, which in Rom. 10. 8 is described as the "Word of Faith which we preach". There are, of course, other ways in which we might describe what is to be preached. Our beloved Lord, that great Example, said in Psalm 40. 9 "I have preached **RIGHTEOUSNESS**". We read of Noah in 2 Pet. 2. 5 that he was a "preacher of **RIGHTEOUSNESS**". But "the work of righteousness is peace", hence we are not surprised to find in Acts 10. 36 "preaching **PEACE**". And as we have referred to our beloved Lord as the Example, may I just mention to you that in Luke 4. 19 He tells us that He came to "preach **DELIVERANCE**" and to "Preach the **ACCEPTABLE YEAR OF THE LORD**". Consequently we see that the message is a wide one, including both grace and judgment, mercy and wrath. It is the **WORD** and the **WHOLE WORD** and with special reference to the coming Kingdom of

the Lord Jesus Christ, for never has there been a true preaching to the unsaved in Scriptural record which has omitted prophetic teaching. They have always emphasized what is to come, always emphasized the coming of Christ. Who have been rightly silent as to the coming of Christ? Before Christ came the first time, the prophets proclaimed His coming; John the Baptist emphasized the Kingdom; Christ spoke of the Kingdom and told His disciples to go forth preaching the Word of the Kingdom. "THIS GOSPEL shall be preached in all the world for a witness". And in Acts the instruction is always connected with the preaching of the Kingdom.

Q. You said that there has been no true preaching without the reference to the coming Kingdom, but what about the Middle Ages?

A. I said "IN SCRIPTURAL RECORDS": although I am not prepared to say that in the Middle Ages the doctrine of the Second Coming was so hidden as many people imagine. The fact of it is we have only the histories of Christendom, and Christendom wrote about Christendom, but you cannot find the true history of the true saints of God, the Lord's hidden ones; and furthermore, the boasting of to-day that we have an advancement over all the days gone by is reflected in the religious sphere. People think they have a remarkable intuition; it is possible that the Lord has graciously given a certain reviving but I think we have to be a little careful before we speak of ourselves as if in such great advance on some of God's dear people in the Middle Ages.

Next we are privileged to consider the point as TO WHOM are God's appointed servants to preach. This again is like the message itself, very wide. If the message is only limited by the "WORD", the sphere is only limited by the "WORLD". "Go ye into ALL THE WORLD and preach the Gospel TO EVERY

CREATURE" says Mark 16. 15 and the apostle said in Rom. 1. 14 to "both wise and unwise, Greek and Barbarian" he would proclaim the truth. The Gospel is the Word of God to Jew and Greek - yea more, there is a special stress upon those who would be thought the ones to be omitted. The Lord Jesus twice over, in Luke 4. 18 and Luke 7. 22, declares that He would preach the Gospel "to the POOR". There is therefore nothing in Scripture to suggest a limitation in the sphere of witness. We preach to those who have not heard and we preach to those who refuse to hear, as well as those whose hearts (like Lydia's) the Lord has opened. Ezekiel 3 makes it very clear that the Lord's servant was to go on witnessing whether men would hear or whether they would forbear, which implies a proclamation in spite of the moral condition of man. Of course, in Ezekiel the thought is to speak to Israel in spite of their moral condition, but now there is a broad statement, "Go ye and make disciples of ALL the nations"; even as men of all the nations are included in the covenant with Abraham and as Christ is the Redeemer from every nation, so our preaching must be to every nation. The parabolic sidelight on this is in the parable of the sower. The sower sows the seed, though he well knows that a large amount must go on the waste ground. We do not merely go forth to preach to hopeful cases: we do not preach to the elect as the elect, but we preach the Gospel to every creature, to all classes, to all sorts and conditions of men. There is a definite stress upon this throughout the Scripture. We preach the Gospel everywhere, or should be willing to do so (provided we are not in wrong associations).

And now we approach the very very solemn fourth point which must be dealt with by hearts of godly concern, and I take the opportunity, dear friends, of suggesting that as we were not alone at the beginning of our meeting^x and now are alone

^x An interruption permitted in God's wisdom.

among ourselves that we just have a little prayer before approaching this part of our subject. We were hindered at the outset, but now shall we have a word of prayer?

Thus we approach our fourth point, as to MAN'S CONDITION. I do not think that anyone can preach rightly unless he realizes the LOST condition of man - unless he realizes in measure how man is far off from God. Man is designated in Scripture as "LOST" and the term "LOST" implies both a ruined condition and a ruined position. It implies LOST in separation from God, and LOST in being destroyed as to all good. Man has no well-being, from the Divine standpoint, that is, he is viewed as nothing at all, destroyed, lost.

Q. As to the term "LOST"?

A. The term "LOST" is not only dealing with man's ruined position "afar off", but his CONDITION, for the word "DESTROYED" has TWO meanings, and is the very same as the word "lost". It means DESTROYED, AND IN SEVERANCE FROM GOD. It is a word to denote severance, but, moreover, includes the destruction of a WELLbeing, that is to say, a man is good-for-nothing, worthless; here is the Divine suggestion of the solemn word "LOST". Thus we have a twofold thought, and a most important bearing this has on eternal punishment. Eternal punishment is not a taking away of existence, but eternal severance from God, and man being left no good, worthless, utterly useless.

But Scripture gives a wealth of further language to describe man's lost estate. Not only do we read that "The heart is deceitful and mortally wounded" but we read that man is "CORRUPT" "UNRIGHTEOUS", that "the imagination of the thoughts of his heart were only EVIL CONTINUALLY" and that he is "DEAD IN TRESPASSES AND SINS". When we realize man's lost condition we feel as to the

preaching of the Gospel "Who is sufficient for these things?" When we realize man's 'lost condition' we see that a Gospel of human reasoning is altogether faulty and powerless. It is an attempt to raise a man while it does not deal with the fact that he is dead. All human Gospels of improvement, and education, and reform, are not only worthless but a denial of the ruined estate of man. If we once, by grace, realize that man is lost, this will affect our life and our preaching, our prayers and our conversing. All true doctrine seems linked with a realization that MAN is actually, truly and absolutely lost. At once a problem suggests itself to the human reason which always will intrude, "Why preach to man if he is lost?", "What will the preaching do?" People may say to us in the open air, "What is the good of you preaching to us?" and we reply "No good at all", and they cannot understand it. But we GO ON to explain that in itself our preaching will accomplish nothing, but that it is not by our works, that we have no merit, and no expectation that our reasoning or our attractiveness will attract any to Christ. It is the Spirit who quickeneth; we have to bring down our human reasoning, and our self-logic; it is not the first time this is brought down. Human reasoning has to take a low place when we think of the Triune Majesty of our God, human reasoning has to take a lowly place when we peer back into eternity; human reasoning has to take a lowly place when we consider anything of Scripture, for human reasoning only goes a little way, and it limps the little way it goes.

And now we pass to the FIFTH point - SCRIPTURE COMMANDS, INVITATIONS etc. May I ask first your prayerful consideration to the passages in the parables which deal with the preaching of the Gospel. They have a wondrous dispensational bearing. In Matt, 22. 2 we read "The kingdom of heaven is likened to a certain king who made a marriage for his son, and set forth his servants, to CALL them which

were CALLED to the wedding, and they would not come. And he sent forth other servants saying, Tell them which are CALLED" (it is the same word). And this word "CALLED" comes again in verse 8. Four times over we read that certain ones were called and would not come, and not only so, but we read that more than once the same ones were called - to CALL those that were CALLED, and then in the conclusion of the parable the Holy Spirit makes the Divine comment, or perhaps we may take it that the Lord Jesus Himself added these words when he closed the parable, "For many are CALLED, but few are chosen". Here then five times in Matt. 22 we have the thought of a wide call, and if we turn to the somewhat parallel parable in Luke's Gospel the 14th ch. we find there (Luke 14. 16) "A certain man made a great supper and bade many (the word is "CALLED" again) and sent his servant at supper time to say to them that were called, Come, because all things are now ready; and they began to make an excuse", and further on we read in verse 24, "For I say that none of those men that were CALLED shall taste of my supper". Here then we see that there is a call which is wide in its sphere, and which in itself is always rejected. "None of the men that were called shall taste of the supper", NOT ONE. It is a call universally rejected, this is a remarkable statement.

Having noticed therefore the eight-fold mention of the word "CALLED", shall we just go back to the Marriage feast in Matthew 22, and notice another expression, an expression which is not found in Luke in the same way. Says verse 9, "Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find bid to the marriage. And they gathered together (says verse 10) as many as they found, both bad and good, and the wedding was furnished with guests". Here then we see not only a call out but a gathering together of as many as

ould be found. We recollect, too, the somewhat similar parable, though in a different context, in Matt. 13, where we have the net cast into the sea which gathered of every kind. Now these parables suggest not only a general preaching, but a general calling and a general gathering; but how then are we to explain other Scriptures which are more numerous? Said the Lord Jesus in Matt. 9, "I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance". May I, at this point, say that where we are told they gathered as many as they found both bad and good, I am very doubtful whether we have not misinterpreted the good ones as if REALLY good ones. I believe the "good" ones are the SELF-GOOD in this parable, even as in this other passage "I came not to call the righteous" are the SELF-RIGHTEOUS. The good one specially mentioned was the one who had not the wedding garment, who came in his own goodness, which was no goodness acceptable before the Lord. Apart from that striking statement of the Lord Jesus "I came not to call the righteous" we know very well the other precious words in Isa. 55, "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money, come ye, buy and eat, yea, come buy wine and milk without money and without price". The invitation is there not only limited to the thirsty one, but limited to the one who has nothing. If we think we have anything we are not included in that invitation. It is not an invitation to those who have MONEY, or to those who have NOTHING, but ONLY to those who have NOTHING. The call is therefore entirely distinct from the other call that we have just been considering. We recollect too the passage, "Come unto Me all ye that LABOUR and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest". To the Pharisees who BOUND burdens the Lord had NO call but a "WOE". To those who BORE burdens He had a sweet and precious and gracious call.

Now is there any contradiction in these two

calls? By no means. The one is the general call, like the general seed-scattering which has a dispensational aspect at different times in different ways. Of old, the dispensational call was to Israel, now the dispensational call is to the Gentiles particularly, though Israel are not forgotten, but Israel called now are called on the same level as the Gentiles. We go not to the Jews AND the Gentiles, but to all nations on the same level. They are all part of "THE WORLD" and the dispensational call is to such, even as it was in olden times to Israel as a peculiar nation; but though we make the general call and say God welcomes Gentiles, there is a salvation to Gentiles, not limited to one race, - we have this general call and say that whosoever will is welcome to the grace which God gives, though we do not and cannot fully explain in open-air preaching whence comes the "will" for "it is not of him that WILLETH", but it is the WILL of God that we WILL! Although we do not fully explain that, and cannot, yet we realize without any contradiction that in our preaching there MUST be a peculiar emphasis on something else as well, namely that God invites THOSE WHO HAVE A FELT NEED. We shall have no difficulty in saying that God's Gospel is to all races, and then saying in the next sentence "God doth not call the (self) righteous, but only SINNERS". The call is to sinners AS SINNERS, not merely to man as man; nor proclaimed to the elect as the elect, but to sinners as sinners. But only the elect SEE THEMSELVES in the position of sinners. By nature man is too proud to see himself as an absolute sinner; it needs the Divine grace to lay hold of one, before he will see himself as a sinner. You remember when Israel were very willing to serve the Lord professedly, Joshua said, "You cannot serve the Lord", and when in John's Gospel the 6th ch. the people were cavilling and ready to promise anything to obtain some financial and physical return, the Lord said, "No one can come except the

Father which hath sent Me draw him".

Q. Were you referring to any Scripture when you said that God had not called man as man, but sinners as sinners?

A. I was particularly referring to the passage "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance", the remark was in that connection.

So that John 6, and similar passages, remind us that when men cavil we are to speak plainly and to say, "You cannot come". In other words, the present-day preaching of a cheap gospel which lays everything in the power of man, must make us more definite that man is nothing, and must cause us to lay a further stress upon the fact that the Lord INVITES the THIRSTY and the HEAVY LADEN.

Our next point is, "Examples and Beacons in Recorded Witnessing". Do we not have a precious example of preaching in Acts 13? There we have in verse 26 the invitation beautifully put, "Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, TO YOU is the Word of this Salvation sent". And again further on, "Be it known therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him ALL THAT BELIEVE" - notice a certain limitation here after the general wording of verse 38, which is very carefully put; there comes the further limitation that "By Him ALL THAT BELIEVE ARE JUSTIFIED from all things from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses".

Q. Verse 38 is addressed to "men", not to sinners?

A. True; addressed to them by the name of men, but looking back to verse 16, we find that it was addressed to the men of Israel who by taking their position in the synagogue at that time took

the attitude of being those who professed to acknowledge God - is it not so?

Q. Yes, but they did not take the position of acknowledging themselves, possibly.

A. But the Jews were understood to be so doing, were they not? The apostle goes out to them and says, "Men and brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God".

The beacon to which I referred is recorded in Acts 17 where we have an omission of the SCRIPTURE METHOD OF presenting Christ and Him crucified; recorded by the Holy Spirit, in a perfect inspiration to warn us lest we fail amid peculiar emergencies.

We come now to consider MISLEADING EXPRESSIONS and to reject them. These can easily be classified. Might I suggest to our friends that they will come across many which they can classify somewhat thus:-

- (a) Those which EXALT MEN are to be rejected.
- (b) Those which on the other hand DENY MAN'S ACCOUNTABILITY are to be rejected. and thirdly
- (c) Those which veil the glory of God as the Giver of salvation are to be rejected.

Among expressions which are misleading one finds, at the present day, such statements as "Give your heart to God", as though man could present anything to God, by a misapplication of the passage in Proverbs where it is "My son, give me thine heart" meaning as the context shows, attention to the things of the Lord. We have a similar misleading expression which seems to place everything in the creature's power - "Get right with God" - language without warrant in the Scripture and ENTIRELY misleading. Or "Make your peace

with God", an expression that ignores the fact that Christ has "made peace by the blood of His cross" and that man's attempts are only proud and resultless.

Q. In what sense would you use that expression "Give your heart to God"?

A. In what sense should we use the proper passage? "MY SON, give Me thine heart and let thine eyes observe My ways". We say, "Give your heart to anything", "Put your heart into it". "Give" and "Put" are somewhat similar in Scripture.

Q. Would you use that passage with children? (i.e. in the home).

A. It has a spiritual application of course, yet it was Solomon's instruction to his child, and still gives help as to the training of children in godly homes.

Q. We should be right in saying that a "son" was addressed?

A. Yes.

There are also misleading expressions, like the general words uttered freely and glibly to everybody, "Christ died for you". Now we know from Scripture that when the Lord Jesus died He did not die to make men "SAVABLE", but He died to SAVE and therefore He did not consciously bear the sins of any who will be finally lost. He knew who would be brought to believe in Him, and He gave His life a Ransom for many. It is remarkable that in the parable there is a wondrous accuracy - "Come, for all things are now ready" says the parable in the general call. "I have sacrificed" says the parable in Matt. 22 - "The sacrifice is completed", but there is never the application to say, "It is for you" till any come and partake, and thus prove it is for them.

Q. As to the Scripture "All things are ready", "I have sacrificed"?

A. The term "I have sacrificed" comes in the parable, but though the Lord says in both parables

"All things are now ready". Scripture never warrants us in going further than that. We can say, "All things are ready; the sacrifice is completed", but we cannot say indiscriminately, "Christ died for you" till we know who are to be brought by grace to believe in the Lord Jesus.

Q. But the word "for" is limited and explained. "For" is true if you do not mean "instead of". I would object to "Christ died instead of you", but I would not object to "Christ died for you".

A. That comes to a very important subject, the various aspects of the death of Christ, does it not?

Q. You could say, "Christ died for you" to anyone who was under real conviction of sin?

A. Undoubtedly, and you can always say, "Christ died for sinners" without the slightest hesitation, "Christ died for those who were worthless".

Q. But to say that personally is to assume that you know for whom Christ died.

A. You can, when you feel convinced that there is a work of grace in anyone, but in general indiscriminateness you cannot.

Q. What about the word "for" in the place of "instead of"?

A. I am inclined to think that is equivocal; I do not say on your part, but it would be on my part.

Q. Then "Come, for all things are ready" is the general call?

A. Never does the Scripture in the parable go further than that. It says, "I have sacrificed; the things are ready". So we may say "The sacrifice is made, the things are ready, death has taken place, and the work finished and the Saviour raised and in the glory". The Lord Jesus has borne the sins of guilty ones, but we cannot make a personal application; it is the work of the Spirit of God so to do.

May I suggest that it is unwise to take the passage in 2 Cor. 5 and apply it to the unsaved - "We beseech you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God". The Holy Spirit is speaking there directly to believers who had become almost quarrelsome toward God; it is sad to say so but this is true. The context shows that very plainly.

Q. The word "you" is left out.

A. Yes.

"God hath reconciled us to Himself" - "God was in Christ reconciling a world unto Himself". "A" world is the term; it is not "the" world but "a world" (mark the wideness). "Not imputing their trespasses unto them and hath committed unto us the Word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech by us, we pray in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God", and the next chapter goes on, "We then as workers together with him beseech you that YE receive not the grace of God in vain". This is addressed to believers who were wandering away from the Lord.

May I also suggest as to the word "OFFER" that, though in its derivation, the word "OFFER" is a perfectly satisfactory term, with regard to the offering of the Gospel, yet in its USAGE I am very doubtful of this word "offer". The term "offer", in its present USAGE, seems unsatisfactory in that it is apt to glorify the creature and suggest that something is brought before him which he by his natural will accepts; but, as we know, it is the work of God if any are brought to accept and to receive. Summarizing, we realize that we are sent forth to tell to man God's demands, His mercy as well as His judgment, and invite sinners to receive His free gift. The present-day Gospel, professedly kinder than the true Gospel, is only a cheap Gospel, and powerless, for it demands something from man. It meets him nine-tenths of the way, BUT seeks something in him. He must DO the believing, he must DO

something. The true Gospel of the grace of God meets poor lost sinners the whole ten-tenths of the way. It is not God's answer to man's preparation, but God's out-working of God's preparation. God is the Beginning, God is the Worker throughout, and God's glory is the goal of the Gospel of the grace of God.

Just a word on the work of the Holy Spirit in connection with the preaching. It is most important that there should be the work of the Holy Spirit in the preacher, as Paul says in 1 Cor. 2. "In demonstration of the Spirit and of power". If any are to be saved there must be the work of the Spirit of God in the hearer, for only that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, and the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness to him. That there must be the work of God IN the hearer is beautifully brought out in the parable of Luke. 14. You will notice, in Matt. 22, "They gathered as many as they found both bad and good"; but in Luke 14 where there is only one who gathers, he only gathers the bad. It is there the Holy Spirit gathering, and thus we see that all who are gathered are gathered BY the Spirit. And there is no one turned out in Luke 14, whereas there is when WE gather as in Matt. 22.

Thirdly, as to the work of the Holy Spirit, how is it to be brought into our subject? Are we to preach this to the UNSAVED? As a general rule we do not find that Scripture presents this aspect, thus we must rather preach Christ and Him crucified. We do not preach primarily a subjective work of the Spirit, but the objective work of the Lord Jesus. When men begin to cavil THEN we tell them that none can come to Christ except that it is given them of the Father, and we tell them of the secret things of the Lord God, but in the general preaching to poor, lost sinners, we do not

set forth, at the outset, electing grace or the hidden secret work of the Spirit.

A word on the Pride of Orthodoxy. There is much danger lest we should think so much of our accuracy of statement, and forget the intensity of desire; that we should think so much of careful wording and forget the need for heartiness. It is so easy to be proud and think that we know more than others when all the time they may be more loving than we, that their communion with the Lord may be, in measure, as real as ours, or fuller. Do not think that I plead for a recognition of failure, or that I suggest that those who are wandering from God's arrangements of accuracy are to be commended. My only desire is that while as to godly accuracy "these things OUGHT we to do", yet we ought not to leave other things undone. There is a need for all-round Christian character, and there is no room for pride. If we are clear-headed as to the Truth of God's grace the glory belongs to God. It is His work to bring us to realize the Truth that we may pass it on, even as it was His work to bring us first of all to the Truth, Christ Jesus Himself. Oh, dear friends, let us seek that we may not merely study this subject as a mental study, not merely study it with a view to more activity in preaching, but that we may see how this subject glorifies God and humbles both the preacher and hearer to the dust. The means are totally inadequate unless the Spirit of God works, nor are we told to alter the means to make them more effectual. We are to use means which we know can produce nothing unless the Lord works, for we are to rest on that precious working of the Lord, and thus to glorify Himself in our method of preaching as well as in the whole of our lives.

Now I am afraid I have continued rather a long while this evening, dear brethren, but there is a little opportunity for any conversation.

Q. There is one point about men being called to preach. If a man is truly converted and is able to speak and is very concerned as to the lost condition of men and has a desire to preach to them because he feels their need and is saddened by their need, is there any limit to that man's preaching?

A. There is grave difficulty suggested by the question. First of all, it is so hard to say exactly where preaching begins and where conversation leaves off. It is, further, difficult to make a general statement in a general way as to persons. If a man is led by God to preach - well and good; but a mere realization of the sad state of man and a mere enthusiasm is not enough. There must be a definite call.

Q. It would not be enthusiasm - the realization of man being lost does not awaken enthusiasm.

A. I do not know, I think it does, but if you would rather not have the word enthusiasm the thought of pity is not enough because there are so many other ways of reaching man besides preaching.

Q. I feel that the Lord's disciples are all true believers and they have their marching orders to go to the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, for "Lo I am with you always".

A. Would you say that they are all called to preach in the same way?

Q. No, some have one gift and some have another.

A. Quite so. In the early church, was all the body a mouth?

Q. No.

A. Hence we realize that there are a number of ways of making known the truth, do we not?

Q. Yes, but if a man has a talent, he should use it to the Lord.

A. True, quite true. I am not making any objection to that point; that settles the whole thing, "How shall they preach except they be SENT?"

Q. How would you define that you are called

of God? A true believer feels impelled to go and preach and might say that he is as much concerned for the souls of men as you are, and that God has given Him a gift. How can you say that this is mere enthusiasm, and that he is not to preach?

A. I do not know that our responsibility is to go and tell people they are not to preach. I do not think that is the attitude we have particularly taken in our position to the Lord. My position would be rather like this. "My" first sphere (whichever I am) is personal. "I" am personally responsible. My second sphere is wherever the Lord gives me influence with Him. Am I not responsible that those who preach in connection therewith set forth what I believe to be the truth? The third point would be this, that beyond that sphere one can only say "I rejoice that Christ is preached, even if of strife and contention - yea, and I will rejoice". Well, if we go as far as that and say that we rejoice in that, surely this includes all the true believers to whom you refer, and who are not so far astray as to preach Christ definitely of envy and contention - Does not this deal with your point?

Q. To their own Master they stand or fall.

A. Yes.

Q. And we have all one Master?

A. Yes, if in Christ Jesus, (but the judgment-seat of Christ is real).

Q. And that Master, Christ.

A. Yes.

Q. We are told to be instant in season and out of season, that means always?

A. No doubt, there is an application of that, but it was addressed originally to Timothy. We should not like to say that because Timothy was told to preach the Word, and to do the work of an Evangelist, therefore every child of God is to do the work of an Evangelist, nor do I like quite to say that when the Lord commanded His disciples "Go and preach the Gospel to every creature" that

everyone therefore is made into a missionary. The Lord commanded them as His servants, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" It is a difficulty to know what the sending of the Lord means, but our failure to grasp it does not alter the reality.

Q. I think it is an individual question. Would you say that if a man has not a true knowledge of human depravity, how can he be sent?

A. One feels inclined to say that, and further though we would own to His own Master he stands or falls, yet may we not hesitate to alter the words, and say it is an individual question. The failure of to-day is largely because there is a great deal of stress on an "individual question", and we want to reach a more unanimous position, in love's obedience (1 Cor. 1. 10).

Q.and if a man did not know the lost condition he would scarcely be converted.

A. How we wish that everyone who was saved REALIZED the lost condition to set it forth more definitely..

Q. Another point - you consented that you could say, "Christ died for you" to a man who came to you in real conviction of sin FOR "Christ died for sinners". Now all men are sinners, for the Word says "All have sinned", and how are you or anyone to know what is real conviction of sin or unreal conviction?

A. Do we not have to judge as to many things as to what appears to us, for example, I TREAT you as a brother in Christ, how do I KNOW?

Q. Well, of course, it is VICE VERSA - on my side as well as on yours.

A. Quite so; well then, if it is possible for us to do so, and yet to feel that there is nothing untrue in it, is it not possible that if we are walking closely with God we can tell when there is real conviction of sin? Moreover, can we not take people on their profession sometimes? For example, the Lord called the servant a servant

when he CLAIMED to be one. If a man said to me, "I feel I am a sinner", I should say, "I have a Saviour for sinners! Who died for such as you are", because he takes that position. We do not say he is saved, but when he takes that position as a sinner then are we not entitled to tell him that Christ died for such? By taking a place as not laying claim to anything he is putting in his claim for everything.

Q. I do not wish to emphasize that side of the question so much as that Christ died for sinners.

A. Christ died for ungodly ones. It is not that Christ died for the ungodly simply because in that condition. Christ died for UNGODLY ONES. Scripture does not mean to express the condition, as a proof all such are to be saved, but the character of those for whom He died. The English renders it, "THE ungodly", but actually it is "ungodly ones".

Q. Well then, if it is ungodly ones, all are ungodly ones, for all have sinned.

A. Yes, but when you use an expression without the article, you emphasize it as CHARACTERISTIC. It is "Christ died not for good ones but for those who have the nature of ungodly", for those who have the nature of sinners; this is their characteristic, their definition. If I were to say I have a message for sinners I mean those who know they are of that condition. They realize that they are the ones to whom it is addressed. Surely that is the only way in which the term "Christ died for ungodly ones" is to be understood. Those who have nothing but ungodliness, nothing worthy.

Q. How do you account for the statement of Christ that "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the Son of man be lifted up that whosoever believeth"? The serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, I believe, for the whole of the people in the camp whether they looked or whether they did not. Those who looked had their disease healed.

A. Whosoever was BITTEN, when he looked, lived.

Q. Yes, all are of course bitten by sin for "all have sinned". The serpent was lifted up for sinners and for all who locked.

A. If they locked.

Q. No, it was lifted up in the camp.

A. But man is by nature blind as regards a spiritual lock, and therefore the parallel with that will be the one who has received spiritual eyesight.

Q. No, I think the serpent was lifted up for the whole camp.

A. For any who felt their need.

Q. He bore the bite for those who locked certainly, nevertheless the serpent was lifted up for the whole camp and that is how I believe Christ was lifted up.

A. The proclamation is universal, but if we make the death of Christ universal, He did not pay our debt. There is no transaction. He has only made us savable, in which case I have no hope. Unless Christ absolutely paid my debt definitely. If I feel He only just died for me in a general vague way, I have no hope - no hope, unless He took the exact load which the Lord laid upon Him. "The Lord laid upon Him the iniquity of us all".

Q. I had not locked at it like that. I should have said my debt was paid, and because I lock of course I must live. Nevertheless, even if I had not locked Christ was uplifted, and it was not God's fault if I was lost, therefore there is the call to "whosoever".

A. None of us suggest it was God's fault. The point is this that when our beloved Lord died for sinners He died accomplishing a work of which He shall see the travail of His soul. "All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me" He says; He will give eternal life to as many as were GIVEN Him. If He died vaguely for others He took what was not given to Him, which would seem to me to cast a slur on the perfectness of His character. In the proclamation as soon as a man sees he has

nothing he is welcome to the Saviour.

Q. I feel that if I took it otherwise I should see inconsistency in God. I do not think God's proclamation is inconsistent with what He does.

A. If others of us were to take it your way, it would seem to them to be inconsistent to the character of God. It would be making the Gospel a mere expedient, and it would make the EFFECT of the work dependent upon ourselves.

Q. I feel that supposing I went out into the street and I called men to come to a certain place and I did not intend them to come, that would be inconsistent and when God says, "whosoever" I think He means "whosoever".

A. "Whosoever BELIEVETH". Do not leave out the verb. "Whosoever WILL", and we believe that God does mean Whosoever believeth and Whosoever will. If we thought that God proclaims the Gospel which did not provide One bearing the exact legal punishment it would seem a hopeless misleading Gospel, but if we know it is a Gospel to sinners, and any who feel their need as sinners, will, when they come, find that the very feeling of their need was graciously given of God, we have something to stand firm.

Q. But I felt that the sacrifice of Christ was infinite, that it was sufficient for a million worlds as great as this.

A. Sufficiency in a person is precious, but the sufficiency of a thing is limited to its efficiency. Christ was sufficient to save millions of worlds, quite true, but Christ's work was sufficient to do what it did, but if there was a surplus He paid too much, and the whole blessedness of the exactness of the transaction is spoiled. An over-sufficiency in a work is a failure. An over-sufficiency in a Person is a glory.

Q. But He could not do more than die, and He laid down His life.

A. Was that all? "He bare the sin of **MANY**".
 "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all!"
 Surely it was a definite equivalent when He paid
 our debt; but though the subject is precious we
 must not stay longer to-night. Yet we may
 consider it another time, if the Lord will.

It is a joy to have the gospel, which
 is God's power to salvation, and it will
 be a privilege to hear from any who have
 difficulties.

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