

[FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION ONLY.]

PRESENT TROUBLES.

BELOVED BRETHERN IN THE LORD,—

If I can be of any real help to perplexed souls it will give me joy. I desire to write in the fear of the Lord, and to seek to please Him in helping His saints. I will first give you extracts from F. E. R's. letters as to eternal life (copied from his own writings by me. The italics are mine).

Mr. R. says:—"In regard to eternal life, it seems to me that it is a kind of technical expression, indicating an order and state of blessing, purposed and prepared of God for man. With Paul it is viewed as a reward or end, or hope—though the believer, being called to it, is to grasp it while on the road to it. With John, it is present and moral (not in display), *formed for us by incarnation of the Son of God*—and we having entrance into it through His death. The Son where His voice is heard gives us the privilege and entry and freedom of *this sphere* of blessing, which is expressed in Himself as a man—the privilege of blessed nearness to the Father, and of being the object of the Father's joy and love and delight. Hence eternal life is in the Son. He is it. So that eternal life is objective and practical, rather than subjective—*a sphere and order of blessing*. But not only does Christ give freedom of entry into *this sphere*. He gives also the Spirit as the capacity, the Spirit IN THE BELIEVER IS LIFE. Hence the believer has freedom, or entrance, and the capacity to enjoy *this sphere of blessing* which Christ has formed. And behind all he is born of God. This is no question of attainment, but I am quite sure there are many Christians who are not morally in it, and yet loudly claiming to have possession of eternal life. Faith is not in exercise, and they are not free of the world."

I grant it is most difficult to understand such obscure writing. I do not remember anything so obscure and bewildering. And further, I notice the absence of the plain distinct oft-repeated assurances of the Lord, that he that believeth *HATH* eternal life. This in itself is a great loss to souls. Let us now try to turn this strange mystic language into plain English, and test it by the word of God. The word of God is clear enough that eternal life is a Person, the eternal Person of the ever blessed Son of God. The true God and eternal life. (John i. 1-4, vi. 48, 51; 1 John i. 1, 2, v. 11, 20.) Now what is eternal life in this new teaching? Read the extract:—"A kind of technical expression, indicating an order and state of blessing," &c. "A sphere and order of blessing." And mark "He is it." He is what? In plain English He is a myth, a sphere, a technical expression, an order and state of blessing. The glorious eternal Son of God is gone, and you have in His place *a sphere, a myth!* And then precious words mingled with all this about the Father and the Son. There is no escape that I can see from this Christ dishonouring explanation of His words. He states what eternal life is to him—*a sphere, &c.* Can you say the Son of God is a sphere, &c.? and can you accept this teaching as eternal life? If he had said plainly, Eternal life is a myth, and the Son of God "He is it," would it not have meant Christ was a myth? Then when he says Christ, or "He is it"—and the *it* is a sphere, or a state or a technical term, &c., does it not in plain language

* If we take a few words out of Mr. R.'s letter alone, without their connection, they would present the truth. "Hence eternal life is in the Son. He is it." These words would be the truth that He is eternal life: but then he immediately goes on to say, "So that eternal life is . . . a sphere and order of blessing." He does not say Christ is a sphere or order of blessing; but suppose he means Christ is eternal life, and eternal life is a sphere, &c., it is then on the principle of a truth and an error put together, the error neutralising the truth.

mean Christ is reduced to a sphere, &c.? Surely, to say the least, this is utterly unsound teaching. And think of the sad havoc and effect on the sheep of Christ! What months of distraction, until they dread any one to speak on what was once so precious to us, and certain—*eternal life*. The Lord grant that such as hold and defend this doctrine, may be convinced and really return to the plain teaching of the word of God.

ON RIGHTEOUSNESS.

F. E. R. says:—"The point as to divine righteousness, is as to the force of 2 Cor. v. 21. It is, as I understand it, the text of the ministry of reconciliation. It gives us divine intent in Christ being made sin for us. Divine righteousness is to be displayed *in us* in Christ. We are to have a perfect state in a heavenly standing. God has secured this for us in Christ in glory, and the moment he appears it will be *absolutely* true *in us*. So long as we have the flesh and sin, I could not say it is absolutely made good *IN US*, but it is made good *IN US morally*, as we walk in the power of the Spirit. Hence it is not any way a question of attainment, but of walking in the power of the Spirit in faith and hope. Paul looked to be found having God's righteousness."

Again F. E. R. says: "First as to 2 Cor. v. 21. The subject there is not justification. In Rom. iii. and iv., where the question is of offence, justification through faith in Christ's blood is brought in, and the believer is justified now—is accounted righteous. The righteousness of God is upon him. But in 2 Corinthians v. 21, the point is not guilt, but *STATE*. This is met by *reconciliation* on the basis of Christ having been made sin for us, that we might become God's righteousness in Christ. Surely to become God's righteousness is more than to be held for righteous, as in Romans iv. *If it means anything, it means sin is to be completely displaced IN US by divine righteousness, and this cannot be till the Lord come.* Looking at the believer

abstractedly as in Christ, it may be true now—but the verse involves more than this—the full result of Christ being made sin ‘for us.’”*

According to this teaching, we are allowed to be justified now. But as 2 Corinthians v. 21 is the subject of reconciliation, and that is *divine* righteousness *in us*, reconciliation is impossible *now*, until sin in us is entirely displaced by this *divine* righteousness *in us*. We are thus robbed of all certainty as to reconciliation and eternal life. So far as I understand it, it is undiluted Romanism.

Council of Trent, Chapter vii.—“Lastly, the sole formal cause is the justice of God; not that by which *He Himself is just*, but that by which *He maketh us just*, that, to wit, with which we, being endowed by Him, are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are just, receiving justice [righteousness] WITHIN US,” &c.

Chapter xvi.—“Thus, neither is our own righteousness *established as our own* as from ourselves; nor is the righteousness of God denied or repudiated: for that righteousness which is called ours because we are justified from its being inherent *in us*; that same is [the righteousness] of God because it is *infused into us of GOD*, through the merit of Christ.”

Where is the difference between this and the system of F. E. R.?

It has been said, Did not J. N. D. in Synopsis teach pretty much the same as F. E. R. on 2 Corinthians v.? Did J. N. D. teach *divine righteousness IN US*? That it will be displayed finally in glory “in us *as in Him*,” surely all hold—that is, we shall be the display of God’s righteousness *as in Christ*. But we will turn and see what our dear departed brother did say about this very doctrine, now used by the enemy to bewilder souls. If he felt its obscurity, what may we? I refer to Vol. 2 of his Letters, beginning p. 567. He says:—

* So that we cannot be reconciled until Christ comes!

“ There is such thorough obscurity in the important passages, that it is not easy to lay fast hold of their import. Now I always found the effect produced by this teaching to be, not *Christ* before the soul, but *self*. They had got something wonderfully new and beautiful, what was not heavenly (that was common) but divine; and where Christ was spoken of, it was not Christ Himself, but Christ *in them*, conscious power of life *in them*.”

You will see the doctrine identical with what is now distracting the saints as our brother shews: “ Connected with this is that we are not merely justified, but actually and livingly God’s righteousness, we are it, we livingly.” Page 568: “ He being in God, such an identification with Christ as makes us to be actual *divine* righteousness, as so identified with Him, which sustains us wholly above nature.” Page 570: “ He is in the region of life hid with Christ in God; he enjoys the *state*, and breathes the breath of the new creation. . . . Righteousness is dwelling in life *in new creation*.” “ There is actual positive righteousness, not only justification by faith.” J. N. D. says all this is error. Page 571, he says: “ Resurrection is not looked at in scripture as victor-strength *in man*, but as a divine act towards man.” That is what J. N. D. says. He quotes further: “ Co-quickened with Him in the same righteousness (2 Cor. v. 21).” He says there is no such statement or thought in scripture; it is the system of *divine righteousness* in actuality *in us*—the exact doctrine of F. E. R., and read further, pages 574, 575, 576. You will be astonished how much that is current amongst us is utterly condemned as a wilderness of error—such as “ life out of death,” “ it is through death this life is reached.” He says: “ *All through I find the efficacy of Christ’s death lost in our dying.*” He further quotes, “ God’s righteousness revealed in heaven for us, and *in us* below.” “ Life hid in God,” “ a SPHERE of profession where we receive the power of glory.” He shows how in this

teaching, "*redemption and Christ's work are really lost in the work IN US.*" He further says: "*I cannot substitute this for redemption, nor give up Christ my righteousness before God for a fancied divine righteousness in me. I have lost Christ in Himself in your teaching.*"

Thus we have the very judgment of our dear departed brother on the very doctrine continued and developed amongst us, and which we are to receive as the heavenly truth on pain of being left behind *as pillars of salt*. Indeed, this teaching is much worse in one respect, as it takes away all certainty to the soul, now, of *having* eternal life, as well as ignores the fact of BEING NOW reconciled to God. The teaching is *divine righteousness IN US* by sin being displaced by righteousness *in us*. And we are not yet that, not in that state, so that we are only on the way to it, as we are on the road to the *sphere*, eternal life, and all certainty is lost to the soul. I beg you will compare Mr. R.'s statements with J. N. D.'s remarks. It is well known he dreaded this false teaching more than anything we ever passed through. I believe every word he says about it.

Now as to our beloved brother P.'s letter. Whilst we have all been suffering from the effects of this teaching, for long—it may be unconsciously—he has been walking with God, and greatly used of God outside, far away. I do not doubt he has seen it, as a work of Satan, and no one can deny that the effects prove this. I do not think that he means that F. E. R. *personally* has hatred to Christ. But he looks upon it as the work of him who, though he comes as an angel of light, yet is always filled with deadly hostility to Christ. I do not believe that B. W. N. was personally filled with such hatred to Christ, nor had he the least idea that Satan so used him. I have not a doubt Satan may so use any of us, if we are not in lowly dependence on the Holy Ghost. And this is the root of all our sorrows. He is rarely now owned in our

midst. But man and his everlasting lecturing takes *His place*. And what is the result? The present low blighted state of all such places where man and this teaching prevails. And we are told criticism must be resisted to the utmost. This will not do. We must humble ourselves in the dust. Yet not in unbelief. It is said dear P. made remarks against a brother highly esteemed. He first sent a letter for that beloved brother, and I gave that letter to him. I do not know whether he answered it or wrote to our brother P. And then, do not forget our brother wrote this solemn warning to us as he lay in a Syrian fever. Do not think of division—nothing will please Satan better. Surely brothers in London will have sufficient faithfulness to Christ to request that these false perversions of truth shall not be preached amongst them. C. S.

Mr. R. having seen the above, wrote as follows to C. S. :—

December 24th, 1889.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—

Mr. S. has sent on to me a letter of yours bearing no date, nor am I sure to whom it is written; but I feel I cannot allow it to pass without sending a line to remonstrate against the injustice both of its basis, and of its reasonings and conclusions. All is based on extracts from letters obtained from me by a brother eighteen months ago, and these extracts (which you have not taken the trouble to authenticate) are treated as though they were a careful exposition of a system of doctrine. I never knew a brother judged before on such premises.

Then as to the reasoning, I venture to say that in regard to both subjects in question, it is fallacious, and leads to unjust conclusions. Eternal life is said to be "the eternal Person of the ever blessed Son of God." Thus the Son of God and eternal life are made strictly

equivalent, and expressions used in reference to the latter are tested by their applicability to the former. I am sure such reasoning will not hold. On the one hand the Son of God is more than eternal life—He is God and the giver of eternal life; and, on the other hand, expressions may be used in speaking of eternal life which cannot be applied to Christ personally. The righteous go into eternal life. You cannot here substitute Son of God. John, in his first Epistle, declares to us eternal life, manifested in the Son of God, in the character in which we possess it here. It is in God's Son, and we are in Him that is true. He is the true God and eternal life. It is what He is to Christians. Eternal life, viewed as a subject in itself, has also other bearings.

Further, as to divine righteousness, it is reasoned that because it is maintained that divine righteousness in its fullest sense sets and displays us in glory in the life and state of Christ that therefore that life and state are held to constitute our righteousness before God. This latter idea is, I believe, Cluffism : but never had place in my thoughts. The former, I have no doubt, is the truth, and gives the fullest place to redemption. The righteousness of God which is upon us (Rom. iii.) has reference to our responsibility. We are freely justified in His grace through redemption ; but this is not beyond the brass of the tabernacle. The glad tidings of God's glory are far beyond the question of our responsibility, and through righteousness set us in a wholly new state and place for man. And here we come to the gold of the tabernacle. It is the fruit of Christ having been made SIN for us. This is 2 Corinthians v. 21. We have a place and a state in Him who is righteous and holy in the Holiest of all.

Any one reading without prejudice my letters to Mr. B. would see that the tenor of them is that eternal life means for us a completely new order of things which has come to pass *in man*, in the Son of God having become man, and into which we have

entrance through His death, and in power of the Holy Ghost. The Son being our life. And that as to 2 Corinthians v. 21, the complete answer to Christ having been made sin for us in our being perfected after His order in glory.

And now I add a word or two as to the details of your letter. On page 2, you endeavour to make me say that Christ is a sphere, and by inference that Christ is a myth. What I did say is, that eternal life is in the Son—He is it, that is, eternal life—as I have shewn at the beginning of my letter. I do not accept your method of reasoning between eternal life and Christ. And I add here that if eternal life does *not* denote to a believer a new sphere and order of blessing, he knows very little about it experimentally. “This is eternal life that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.” It is for us a wholly new order. The effort to charge me with Cluffism, I wholly repudiate. I never had an idea that anything in us constituted our righteousness before God. Christ is made that to us. And I should have maintained this as strenuously as any. Hence the charge of undiluted Romanism means nothing any more than the being robbed of all certainty as to reconciliation. The ministry of reconciliation is based on what *has been done*—the death of God’s Son—His having been made sin for us: and hence reconciliation is ever “*now*,” though the state consequent on it, holy unblameable and unreprouable, be in its consummation future. I suppose I have in my measure urged this as strenuously as most. In conclusion, I must say that the attacks made on me present ideas so foreign to my whole habit of thought, are so erroneous in reasoning, and in virulence are so utterly out of proportion to the offence given, or the weight of the person implicated, that I am unable to recognise in them the work of the Spirit of God, and am grieved for those that have taken part in them.

Believe me, your affectionate brother, F. E. R.

FURTHER REMARKS.

I do not know that I have much to add,—as my object is not continued controversy, but just to present Mr. R.'s own words in his letters to our brother B., which I copied with my own hand from his own handwriting. I do not know how they could have been better authenticated.

I have compared them with what was so strongly condemned by our beloved and departed brother, J. N. D., the root point being the danger of losing Christ Himself. There are points of contrast, but this is the root, divine righteousness IN US, that I refer to. I have also compared his doctrine with the Council of Trent. I also give you our brother R.'s reply. I have been much pressed in spirit to do this; it is also impossible for me, in my weak state, to answer all letters on this most painful subject in any other way.

I will briefly notice Mr. R.'s reply to me. It will be seen from the above that he was totally mistaken in supposing I had not clear authority for these letters. You must carefully refer to those letters.

First, the doctrine is most distinctly taught, that eternal life is a sphere, or new order of blessing. I still maintain that this is unscriptural, and confusion—a going beyond scripture. A sphere is that which surrounds a person or thing, as the heavens surround the earth, as water is the element or sphere that surrounds a fish, the air around the bird, &c. The heavens are very wonderful, but they are not the earth. The sphere of a fish, the water, is very wonderful; but the water is not the fish. The air is the sphere or order in which the bird is found, and full of wonders, but the air is not the bird. Now in whatever sphere we look at the Son of God, whether in the Father's bosom, or down here in the sphere, the order of this world, surrounded by the darkness and wickedness of this world, or in that wondrous new order of

things in the glory—a very wonderful, very blessed sphere—yet in each sphere, He was and is, the eternal life. It surely is very serious to confuse this, the order in which He was here, Himself all pure, or the new order or sphere in which He is now, is no more the Son of God, or eternal life, than the air is the bird, or water the fish. Surely a child should see this. Far be it from me to do any injustice, either in basis or reasoning, to our brother. But does he not teach in these letters that eternal life is a sphere, an order of blessing, and that Christ the Son of God is it? Indeed, I long that all such reasoning may cease on all sides, and that all may return to the plain clear scriptures.

If scripture said, "He that hath a sphere, or a new order of blessing, or enters morally into it, has eternal life," then surely Mr. R. is right, and we must all begin and preach quite a different gospel. But unless Mr. R. can bring scripture for these new theories, I must keep to that, the Lord helping me, which I have preached for near fifty-five years. It is quite true the Son of God is more than eternal life. Yes, truly God. But that does not alter the fact that He is Himself the true God, and eternal life. "God is love." God is also more than love, but that does not alter the fact that "God is love." Mr. R. dare not deny that the Son of God is personally the eternal life, as the scripture so abundantly shews in the texts quoted in my letter above. And I have not found a brother who does not see this, that eternal life is the Son of God, but tries to make it something else, a some "it," "it," that can really say what eternal life is. The moment we depart from scripture it is, as one dear servant of the Lord said, "all fog."

What I mean is this. After looking at all he has said about eternal life, as a sphere or order of blessing, until you are bewildered, just ask him, "Then do you hold that eternal life is really the Son of God?" "Yes, certainly." And many are satisfied—whilst the letters are not acknowledged to be error, and withdrawn.

Thus one statement slides over the other as a dissolving view.

So with the subject of Cluffism and righteousness. Read his letter. Mark how it points to righteousness *in us*. He could not say God's righteousness *in us*. But "Divine righteousness is to be displayed *in us* in Christ. Whilst there is sin in the flesh, I could not say it is absolutely made good IN US, BUT IT IS MADE GOOD MORALLY IN US." "If it means anything, it means sin is to be completely displaced *in us* by divine righteousness," &c. The mind is directed to self—divine righteousness IN US. It is not God's righteousness; it is not His act. It is not what Christ is for us before the face of God. And mark, this is all connected with reconciliation, the effect of the atonement—2 Corinthians v. 21. Now, whilst still holding all this, ask Mr. R. at a meeting for examination, on this very verse, "Do you then hold that Christ is our righteousness before God now?" And in a moment the slide is altered, and the answer is "Yes." Now is not this an illusion? The former teaching is not withdrawn, with confession of its evil, and the effect will be utter confusion.

I will not comment on the slight put on redemption as "the brass of the tabernacle." It came to my heart like a cold wind from Greenland's icy mountains. I have to learn yet from the word, that the foundation sockets of the tabernacle were made of brass. And it was the blood that touched the gold in the holiest. The redemption money was not brass. We should not make light of the great foundation truths. I believe they are needed more and more in this day.

I have seen Mr. R.'s printed explanations, as to eternal life. I cannot accept them. It is all misleading. It is not the Son of God before the soul, but "it," "it," "it." It is the blessedness, &c., anything but what we get in scripture—Jesus Christ. "He is the true God, and eternal life." With sorrow of heart, I must declare, so far as I can understand this teaching, I believe it will

undermine the whole truth restored to us in these last days. It is quite dangerous to be occupied with it, utterly unprofitable, yea, withering to the soul. And if a party is formed around this confusion, it will be most disastrous. I see no remedy, but resisting it, and *avoiding it*. I give my feeble but solemn protest against it, though I would not be tempted to attempt to define these grave matters connected with the blessed Person of the Son of God. Oh to be more occupied with Himself!

It is no question of splitting hairs: it is a revolution. It is a system of dealing with scripture, or setting it aside, that would displace all truth and make way for any errors. And, if challenged, you are deceived by the answer, for immediately truth is admitted, and the superficial are satisfied, and declare it to be "new and wonderful truth!"

We have beheld the righteousness of God, complete, glorious, whether as to justification or reconciliation. In the word of God we are *now* as truly reconciled, as we are justified. See Romans v. 1, for the one, and verse 13 for the other; also 2 Corinthians v. 10; Colossians i. 20, 22. The righteousness of God, accomplished and subsisting, is as true to faith now, as it will be to our unspeakable joy and enjoyment, and manifested to an assembled universe in the coming glory.

If you believe that eternal life is not the Son of God Himself, but a sphere, and you are seeking to lay hold on that sphere, an order of blessing, then you have not the Son of God, but a sphere, &c. And, thus, if you have the Son Himself you have life; and if you have not the Son you have *not* life. So that according to F. E. R.'s letters, which I have read, or his teaching, he and his followers would not have eternal life.

I think my reader will now see the difference. We hold the truth so plainly set forth in scripture—that Christ **HIMSELF** is the eternal life, not the

sphere, or anything else. F. E. R. holds the error that THE *eternal life* is the *sphere* or the *blessing*. And I do believe that the mass who have fallen under his power will soon see, and say, that they hold the truth above with us, and not the error with F. E. R.

I have looked to the Lord to shew me if I should expunge one word before printing this; and He gave me Jeremiah xxvi. 2, "Diminish not a word." In dependence, then, on Him I send it to my brethren. If you will read verses 3-9, you will see I may have to suffer at the hands of my brethren.

It is said that Mr. R. has withdrawn a sentence in his letter to Mr. B., a sentence which I have shewn to be Romanism. But his printed letter by J. S. O., has not been withdrawn, at least I have not heard it has; and that letter contains his errors unconfessed. And what is so strange, accepted by many young brothers. I would ask your attention to that printed letter.

*Mr. R.'s Letter of December 6th, 1889, printed by
J. S. O.*

It was said that at the meeting of Mr. H.'s, Mr. R.'s explanations satisfied every one (?). But now this printed letter upsets all again. It is very difficult to understand. Many times have I read it. This, I think, will help you. There seems to be the uniform principle of putting a truth and an error together so that the error neutralises the truth. Take the first statement. It seems dangerous to take simple scripture statements of what is true of a believer, "*viewed as in Christ*." Such a practice results in the statements becoming mere dogmas, conveying little sense of reality." Then follows the sample of truth and error. "This may be seen in regard to divine righteousness as spoken of in 2 Corinthians v. 21." Mark, "The believer is in Christ, and as there, is become God's righteousness in Christ; but besides this, he still is in

a condition here, in which the existence of sin and the flesh are taken account of (the Spirit lusts against the flesh), and this is wholly distinct from our state in Christ, to which divine righteousness, in its fullest sense, applies." The serious error is that sin and the flesh are taken account of in 2 Corinthians v. 21. Sin has been judged. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." Was this that our state, or sin, or the flesh, might be taken account of? No; it was for the very opposite: "That we might be made the righteousness of God IN HIM." And mark, this is the gospel subject of reconciliation! If this error were true, we are lost, and the gospel is destroyed. If, in this matter, sin and the flesh be taken account of, then Christ died in vain. And then to hide this error a scripture is quoted from Galatians v., on quite a different subject!—the conflict of the flesh and the Spirit in our walk. It is a marvel to see brethren falling beneath such soul-deluding errors. And yet he says, "The above in no sense weakens, or sets aside the reality of the believer's present standing in Christ"!

Reconciliation is my standing in Christ, through His death and resurrection. I am brought into a new standing, where my sin has been so judged, according to 2 Corinthians v. 21, that sin in me is not taken into account, but I am the righteousness of God in Christ. Mix up the question of your state and sin in the flesh, and reconciliation is gone, certainly for all present enjoyment, as the embracers of this error will soon find to their cost. Compare Romans viii. 3; 2 Corinthians v. 21. If this new doctrine, of sin and flesh being still taken account of, it is a different gospel, and must not be received, though presented by an angel. Every one that receives this error will virtually give up the gospel. (Gal. i. 6-9.)

It is just the same as to eternal life. All the old error is maintained, and the truth just admitted. It is not Christ Himself the eternal life. "It was God's purpose in Christ from eternity: *it* was, in essence,"

&c. "The apostles could see *it*, and afterwards declare *it*," &c. Then follows the truth and the error. "Eternal life is in God's Son." Then the error, "For us it is the heavenly relationship and blessedness in which, in the Son, man is now placed and lives before the Father," &c. Eternal life is thus still, with him, the sphere, a blessing. This subverts all that is said in scripture. There eternal life is the Son of God Himself, "his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life." With Mr. R., eternal life is heavenly relationship and blessedness! Thus the gospel that has been blest to thousands of late—the blessed assurance of Jesus in John v. 24—must be given up, as I hear some are doing.

All is utter confusion that follows in his printed paper. On page 3, eternal life and the Holy Ghost are confounded, "separating, in the believer, eternal life from the Holy Ghost—and talking about Christ manifesting to the unbelieving world, eternal life—the blessedness in which, as man, he was with the Father—are to my mind, not only erroneous, but repulsive." I will quote no more, it is too painful. May the Lord open the eyes of His saints to see the irreverent way these subjects, yea, even the Son of God, is treated.

Only another word. What is the Lord's voice in all this sorrow? Why is it allowed? Why have so many fallen under the influence of this new teaching? Is it not that we have been making "the brethren" the testimony, instead of the Lord Himself? I do not remember anything like it, since I passed through the sorrow of B. W. N., more than forty years ago. May we humble ourselves before the Lord.

Yours in Christ, C. S.

January 30th, 1890.

May be had of U. S., Moorgate Grove, Rotherham.

6 for 5d. ; 60 for 2/6 ; post free.