

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

8. DELIVERANCE.

The Supposed Title to die to sin and the world.

If I were to put the question "How is deliverance effected for the Christian from sin and from the world?" the natural answer would be "By death." I admit it, and how is he to be brought to that? I daresay some would answer "We have died to it in the death of Christ." That will not do. I say the death of Christ is your title to die to it, to die to the one as to the other. "Our old man has been crucified with Him," that is your title to die to sin, and the world is crucified to the believer in the cross of Christ, that is your title to die to the world. I quite admit the title of the Christian to die by the death of Christ to sin and to the world, but my present point is what it is that gives power in the soul to die to sin and to the world. (Deliverance and its End p.p 7-8).

No one moderately acquainted with the New Testament and particularly with Paul's Epistles could fail to perceive, after reading these rash and unwarrantable assertions, that this is not the deliverance of Scripture, but a man-made theory involving an utter *impossibility* in the light of what God says regarding it. As for "title to die," that would mean a continual trying to die but never able to accomplish it, whereas what is essential for a quickened but undelivered soul to experience preparatory to the deliverance taught by the Spirit of God, is that it *cannot* succeed, that it is *not* to be had in that way at all. Nor would one, who had ever learned that indispensable lesson, dream of propounding any such impracticable human method as a substitute for the divine one, much less pretend to tell us,

"What it is that gives power in the soul to die to sin and the world."

Think of power to do what cannot be done by us, what Scripture never asks us to do, nay more, what we do not require to do, since the truth of God declares that death with Christ to both has already taken place, that it is not a question of our trying to *die*, or having a *title* to die, or *doing* at all, but the recognition of what has been *done* in Another! Then alas! for the temerity of the mere man, who, in the face of what God says, can get himself to make use of the following language:

"I say the death of Christ is your title to die to it, to die to the one as to the other."

It is like replying against God. That the believer has *died to sin* and been *crucified to the world* in the death of Christ, not in his own death, is just what Scripture emphatically teaches. It is never said he has to *die* to the one or the other, nor is he ever told to die *with* Christ. It is always something effected. On the other hand, the admission that we have "not to die to the flesh" and to the "law" (Deliverance and its End p. 12), saves us the trouble, and dispenses with the need, of taking up these two, except to point out that God's Word nowhere says we are to die to sin and the world, anymore than to the flesh and to the law. Hence to concede the latter and *not* discern that the same holds equally good as to the former betrays, to say the least of it, a most inconsequent mind. But what shall we say to this?

To die to sin, that is, to reckon itself dead unto sin." (p. 14.)

Imagine anyone taught of God assuming these two to be the same! Is to "die" yourself to sin not one thing, and to reckon yourself *dead* to sin for faith because you have died to it with Christ in the reckoning of God, quite another thing? The latter is the simple acceptance of a most blessed spiritual reality, the former is a phantom. There is no such thing in the truth of God. We are exhorted to reckon ourselves *dead* indeed unto sin, but never to *die* to it.

The Asserted Difference between the Flesh and Sin.

I think everybody will understand the flesh is a very different thought from sin. I will show you that it is in an instant. Scripture speaks of sin having "entered into the world" but you could not talk of flesh having entered in. I have said before sin did not originate with man, it came in by man, but existed before, "By one man sin entered into the world." As far as I have any insight into it. I think the flesh is man's natural condition, it is man's nature, the seat of what I might call his moral being; thought, feeling, will, and purpose all lie in the flesh. Now you can see that that is a very different thing from sin, it has become the "flesh of sin," but I do not talk of sin exactly as man's nature.

(Deliverance and its End p. 55)

No doubt 'sin in the world' is a different thought from 'sin in the flesh' while the "flesh of sin" is distinct from either, but 'flesh' and 'sin,' when they stand for the evil principle man got by the fall, do not differ. Observe how full of erroneous statements the above is, due to confounding two different meanings of both "sin" and "flesh" as spoken of in Scripture, namely, *sin* as a *fact* in the *world*, and sin in the sense of the *evil nature* inherited from Adam, the "sin;" in which "my mother conceived me" (Ps. li. 5); also *flesh* in the sense of man's bodily organism, "flesh and blood," and flesh in the sense of "in me that is in my flesh dwelleth no good thing," or that evil principle, the "flesh that lusteth against the Spirit." When things are mixed up like this, no wonder an imaginary distinction is supposed to be seen where it is not and a real distinction failed to be observed where it is. So far from not being able to speak of it, the truth is that "flesh and blood" in connection with the human frame entered the world at the creation of man on the sixth day, before ever "sin" did as a *fact*. After the fall it became what in Rom. viii is called the "flesh of sin," but that simply means fallen man's humanity, a very different thing from "sin in the flesh," which is the evil nature in man. Accordingly "sin" not as the fact in the *world*, for which this system constantly mistakes it, but as the nature, the "sin that dwelleth in me" of Rom. vii, and the "flesh" as the nature, that in which "no good dwells," are *not* different but are used for the same thing in Scripture. Indeed in Rom. viii the two are combined and blended into one single expression called "sin in the flesh." The worst of all, however, is to state that the "flesh" is the "seat of man's moral being," and that "thought, feeling, will, and purpose all lie in the flesh!" Surely all these lie in the soul and spirit of man, not in his flesh. But you need not be surprised at anything in this New Teaching.

The Denial of Two Natures in the Christian.

I have sometimes said that Scripture does not recognise two natures in the Christian, the flesh is the nature in an undelivered man. when he receives the Spirit he is "not in the flesh but in the Spirit. and the Spirit is not a nature

but a person. And when he gets more light, it can be said of him that he has put off the old man and put on the new." and then the nature of the new man is the Christian's nature (Deliverance and its End p. 58).

This is darkness not light, and that too from one who once *professed* at least to see, for if Scripture recognises anything it is the existence of two opposite natures in the believer. To say the "flesh is the nature in an undelivered man," and imply there is not another *there* is too bad. What means the struggle in the "undelivered man" of Romans vii? It takes two to make a fight. If there was only one nature there, there could be no "warring" between the "law of sin" and the "I" that hates it. Then what is intended to be inferred from "when he receives the Spirit, he is not in the flesh but in the Spirit, and the Spirit is not a nature but a person?" Does the Spirit take the place of the "flesh as the nature in the undelivered man" when he is delivered? Does "not in the *flesh*" mean that the flesh is not *in him*? Does the flesh not lust against the Spirit in the delivered man? Then "in the Spirit" is not a person, but a *state*, though the person is there, and there is an "inner man" besides the Spirit recognised in Scripture, "strengthened with might by His Spirit *in* the inner man" (Eph. iii. 16), and besides the flesh, or evil nature, mark, as well. The new nature by itself is not *power* as Rom. vii. shows. The Spirit, as a person indwelling the Christian, is the power, and hence it says the "flesh lusteth against the *Spirit*, not the new nature, but that does not mean it is not there. Then, is it not a singular notion, that after a man is delivered and receives the Spirit, it is only "when he gets more light," it can be "said of him that he has put off the old man?" This denial of two natures in the Christian, however, is just what was to be expected as the inevitable consequence of teaching that "new birth is not the communication of anything." Alas! one error leads to another. First there was the denial of anything *new* communicated in new birth, next the denial of *two* natures in the believer, and then what is *worse* than error, the denial of *two* natures—God and Man—in the One ever-blessed *Person* of Christ, disallowing *personality* to His manhood, reducing it to mere "human condition," having no *spirit* as man, and restricting all personality to His Godhead. Is that the Christ of Scripture? Nay, but a false Christ! There were those so far left to themselves as to defend this. The grave matter was dropped, but never repudiated, so that the entire following is responsible before God. This will be proved when we come to that. We are only dealing with *errors* at present, and we distinguish between error and *heresy* proper. But error is never single. Detect *one* and you are sure to discover a crop and such a crop of *errors*, too, as this New Teaching bristles with! Hitherto there has always been found, sooner or later under the surface, a *root* of *heresy* as the original source, and depend on it, this can be no exception. It is a simple but sure induction from the past.

There is not space for the exposure of more out of these Lectures on "Deliverance and its End," but there is a Reading on Deliverance in the first American Book, (the later one is not referred to in these Papers) which must be noticed, because it is really not deliverance at all, it being a misnomer to call it so, yet souls are deceived and misled by it.

Practical Sanctification, Growth, Partaking of the Divine Nature, the Renewing of the Holy Ghost, &c., all mistaken for Deliverance.

Salvation was from the Egyptian, but the people had the question of the flesh raised afterwards; that is where the need of deliverance comes in, from all that in which the flesh lives and by which it is recognised. The necessity for deliverance comes in from our being left down here upon the earth where things are unchanged, and actually living in flesh. What do you mean by detail? I spoke of all those things through which evil affects us, that is the detail. I think we get deliverance from what is in a way external (American Notes p. p. 101-2).

You have only to read this to see what sort of deliverance is taught here. It is "from all that in which the flesh lives and by which it is recognised." It is, in other words, just a gradual detachment from evil surroundings. It is said to be from "what is in a way external." It is something that is referred merely to our being "left down here on earth" in the midst of "things" outside us that are "unchanged." Or even plainer still, the progressive separation "from all those things through which evil affects us" "from without" "in detail." What is the right name for that? It is like what our Lord asked for His own. "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world but Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." "Sanctify them through Thy truth, Thy word is truth." There can be no doubt, therefore, that this is practical *sanctification*, not the deliverance of Paul's Epistles at all, nor could any proper understanding of what that means be gathered from these utterances which call something deliverance which is not deliverance. There is the "need" of deliverance, where the "necessity for deliverance comes in," and an extricating bit by bit from "things in detail," but no "hath made me free." As to the other statements:

And an important point is the secret of it lies in the divine nature. It is not effected in any other way. It means this that you get deliverance as you are prepared for it, you get such an appreciation of the love of God that deliverance becomes an absolute necessity and is effected by the knowledge of God (American Notes p. 102).

Nor does it ever go beyond what we are in the divine nature. You don't get enjoyment of deliverance by the presence of the Holy Ghost quite, but you enter into deliverance as you are prepared for it. It depends on the formative work of the Holy Ghost in the believer, what is called, the renewing of the Holy Ghost. Why do you say deliverance does not go beyond the divine nature? Because you are not prepared for it otherwise. As made partaker of the divine nature I am in the reality of deliverance; it is according to my stature &c. The need of deliverance comes in when the soul is exercised to enter into the purpose of God about it (The same p. 104).

Now take heed to the character of the deliverance propounded here. "The secret of it lies in the divine nature." "As made partaker of the divine nature I am in the reality of deliverance." It is clear from this that *partaking of the divine nature* is misunderstood for deliverance. To be "made partaker of the divine nature" is surely a wonderful blessing, but is not how we are *delivered* according to Scripture. It is invariably through *death with Christ*, never by the "divine nature," which is a different thing entirely: yet we are told "It is not effected in any other way," and then in the next breath almost, you have a different story that it is "effected by the knowledge of God," which Scripture never says.

Next we are assured "It depends on the formative work of the Holy Ghost *in* the believer, what is called, the renewing of the Holy Ghost." The *renewing of the Holy Ghost* is here mistaken for deliverance. But, though a blessed thing in its place, renewing is *renewing*, not deliverance.

Again though God's Word says "where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty," we are informed "you don't get enjoyment of deliverance by the presence of the Holy Ghost quite, but you enter into deliverance as you are prepared for it." Now the presence of the Holy Ghost is the very power of the conscious enjoyment of the deliverance taught by Paul, but this is not that, it is something "you enter into as you are prepared for it." It is not anything you *have* entered into, but a process of *entering* and continual *preparing*. The "absolute necessity" for scriptural deliverance is not "appreciation of the love of God" as here wrongly asserted, but consists in the fact that the struggle is hopeless, and the true "preparation" for it is in finding out that you cannot deliver yourself, but must have a Deliverer.

Further it is affirmed "It is according to my stature," that is to say, deliverance is confounded with *growth*, for "stature" is a question of that, and is just another way of saying that progress in holiness keeps pace with stature or growth, a totally distinct thing from what the Word calls deliverance.

Once more it is alleged "The need of deliverance comes in when the soul is exercised to enter into the purpose of God about it." Now Scripture does not recognize any one in the normal christian state at all, unless he not merely *needs* deliverance but is *delivered*. Nor can you "enter into the purpose of God" from the deliverance side of the truth. Ephesians which is purpose never alludes to it. Then, what is referred to as the "need of," the "necessity for," and the "absolute necessity for," deliverance coming in, comprise so many diverse things that it is amazing to note the vagueness and uncertainty which all this implies. It was said (1) to be *from* all that in which the "flesh lives" (2) from our being left here upon earth where "things are unchanged," (3) from what is in a way "external," (4) *because* of the appreciation of the "love of God," (5) because of exercise to enter into the "purpose of God," while (6) the *secret* of it was declared to lie in the "divine nature." You look in vain, however, for one of these so called "necessities" in connection with the deliverance of God's Word, not to mention the number of things it is wrongly thought to be; such as, practical holiness, partaking of the divine nature, renewing, stature and so on.

From all this confusion and error it is refreshing to turn to the Scriptures of truth and let God Himself tell us His thoughts about

True Deliverance according to the Mind of the Spirit.

Be not deceived, it is not the deliverance falsely so called—the ever *delivering* but never *delivered* sort of thing—peculiar to this New Teaching. Scriptural deliverance is that definite point in the soul's spiritual history when, after having been brought to cry "O wretched man that I *am* (not that I have *done* so and so, or who will mend it? but) who shall deliver me?" you *pass* for the first time *into* the proper normal *christian state* characteristic of Rom. viii and exultingly say

hath made me free," entering into, and standing fast in the "liberty," the "living in the Spirit" and the "walking in the Spirit" of Gal. v, and other parts of the Word. There is no mistake about it. It is a known positive *reality* in the Christian's experience, a blessed something for which he thanks God, in short a *fact* of which he is conscious in the power of the Holy Ghost. The three Epistles, Romans, Galatians, and Colossians, reveal and expound the thoughts of God on this great truth, what it is in *His own* reckoning and what it is for the believer in the reckoning of *faith* as strengthened by the Spirit. In Romans we have deliverance from "sin," "our old man," the "flesh" and the "law"; in Galatians from the "law," "self," the "flesh" and the "world"; and in Colossians from the "body of the flesh" and the "elements of the world." Then the divine expressions used as to these are "have died" as to sin (Rom. vi. 2), "been crucified" as to our old man (ver 6), "become dead" as to the law (chap. vii. 4), and "condemned" as to sin in the flesh, (chap. viii. 3); "have died" as to the law (Gal. ii. 19), "crucified" as to self (ver. 20), also as to the flesh (chap. v. 24), and likewise to the world (chap. vi. 14); while it is "circumcised" as to the body of the flesh (Col. ii. 11), and "have died" as to the elements of the world (ver. 20). Mark it well, *not* one of these is in the *present* tense; the death, the crucifixion, and the circumcision are *past*, having all taken place in the death and cross of Christ, of whom alone it was said "Away with Him, crucify Him." After that it is always "Crucified" in His crucifixion, not anything we have to do, but something we have to own as *accomplished* in His death and our death with Him. We are asked to "mortify" never to crucify nor to die.

Two things fatal to the understanding of deliverance by this system have been:—(1) the complete failure to grasp the right *division* of the Epistle to the Romans, inventing other ones which only serve to obscure the truth and lead themselves as well as others astray, and (2) the persistent association of the setting aside of "our old man" with *reconciliation*. As to this the ground must be cleared before we proceed. It has been falsely represented that the writer denies that "our old man" is *gone* judicially in God's sight as having been "crucified with Christ" by some who have not taken the trouble to master the contents of the paper on "Reconciliation" where it is stated over and over how God has dealt with that man. We do not deny but insist on his having been *set aside*. What we deny is that he is set aside by *reconciliation* as erroneously declared. It is by *crucifixion with Christ* as taught in the Word. We also object to the use of unscriptural expressions like "removal" and "removed" which go beyond the truth and mislead. More than twenty years ago (1875) some one was rash enough to teach "Strictly speaking the old man has no present existence," but the error was nipped in the bud by J.N.D., who replied, "Now what is the meaning of this? Has the flesh no present existence? and am I not to distinguish it? I admit the responsibility to keep the flesh down and I am to blame if I do not. But though the old man *may* be used to signify my Adam existence *without* Christ, yet it is so used *here*, as that the distinct existence of what lusts against the Spirit is ignored."

After that it was not heard of till it reappeared in this New Teaching, though no one called a brother till lately was ever so dark as to say it was by "reconciliation!" The evil effects of this false doctrine has been painfully manifest in forward and inexperienced brothers, who had not even learned themselves, standing up and glibly asserting that the "old man was completely gone," when it was patent to all eyes but their own that the "old man" was oozing out, so to speak, of every pore all the time they were speaking. Such have yet to learn that though their "old man" is *gone* before God as "crucified with Christ," he is anything but gone inside themselves. It is with *deliverance*, not "reconciliation" God has linked the old man question. There are other things, such as forgiveness, justification, cleansing and sanctification, as well as reconciliation, which do not apply to *old man* or *new*, but to the *individual*. The "old" is not forgiven, nor justified, nor cleansed, nor sanctified, any more than reconciled, and the "new" does not need any of them. In every one of these cases it is the individual "I" that is reconciled, forgiven, &c. The three "I's" must be kept in their God-given places. Scriptural deliverance could not possibly be apprehended by anyone who connected the fate of the old man with reconciliation. It is "*you* hath He reconciled."

The first part of Romans is occupied with what we have *done*, unfolding God's wonderful provision for us as *guilty* sinners through Christ's work *for* us from the righteousness of God standpoint, comprising *justification* with peace, access, standing in grace, and rejoicing in hope, and from the love of God side there is the *reconciliation* of us when enemies by the death of His Son, and the joying in God Himself, all the blessed results of that aspect of the truth from Chap. i. to v. 11. Then from ver. 12 a different side of things altogether is taken up by the Spirit. It is no longer that of which we *ourselves* have been guilty, or our committed *sins*, but what we *are* through the *sin of one man*, what we inherited from Adam as head of the race. It is with this that deliverance proper is connected in the Word, and it is a different aspect of the death of Christ, too, that meets it. This is not that "Christ died *for* our *sins*" (1 Cor. xv.) but that He "died *to sin*" (Rom. vi). That is, it is not *His* death *for* us, but *our* death *with* Him, which deals with this. The doctrine and practice of deliverance from *sin*, not *sins*, is in Rom. vi. Moreover it is surely seen that entrance by *Adam* of sin into the *world* and death *by* sin as in chap. v. is a very different thing from the death *to* sin, not *by* it, and "in your mortal body," not in the world, through our death *with Christ* of the sixth chapter, though one has actually heard the former pressed. Nor is it sin in the sense of *sinning*, or committing sin, but in the sense of the evil *principle* or nature inherited from our first parents. If we had time to analyse it, which we have not, the deliverance of Rom. vi. is sevenfold. Anyhow it furnishes the teaching and exhortation as to God's way of deliverance from, and victory over, "sin," "our old man" &c., in the sense of the root principle of evil in the nature, still it is liberation, not *eradication*. Then to be freed from the practical dominion of *sin* there must also be deliverance from the *law* which is the *strength* of sin. Hence the next thing is

Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body by of Christ" (Rom. vii. 4). Nevertheless, though I thus *experimentally* realise deliverance from sin and the law, by having died with Christ in the estimate of God, yet I do not properly speaking *experience* it, otherwise I would be *actually* dead, instead of in the reckoning of *faith* and would not be here in the body. The nails did not pierce my hands and feet. It is *with* Christ I have died, in *His* death, not my own, so that I do not, and cannot *feel* dead. On the contrary my *experience* contradicts it, for I *feel* very much *alive*. In the strict sense I could not *experience* crucifixion unless I died on a cross, but I have an *experimental* apprehension by *faith* in the power of the Spirit that I have been *crucified with Christ*, yet it is something for which I have to believe God in *spite* of what I *feel*. He tells me how He has disposed of me and I accept His verdict. But it is different with Rom. vii. That has to be gone through as an *experience*. I have to learn the exceeding sinfulness of the thing called sin in chap. vi. which can only be known by the law, for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." This implies a struggle that I have to *feel* and encounter as a positive *experience*. No one can go through this for me, nor can I avoid it. I come to the discovery (just as Paul did when the spirituality of the law was applied to what was inside him) of something *within*, which in its very nature is so incurably bad that, no matter how you may restrain it as to particular acts, you can never give it a *taste* for what is good. Its very essence is to do, and want to do, what is forbidden. The instant the law said "Thou shalt not," it said "I shall"—something so evil that the "holy, just, and good law" only made it worse instead of better. It only provoked the badness but never prevented it. Next there is found an "I" that hates this evil thing, and I discover that it is *distinct* from myself. "No more I but sin that dwelleth in me," which leads to another fact, that "In me, that is *in* my flesh, dwelleth no good thing," so that no good can be expected to come *out*. But this renewed yet undelivered man of Rom. vii. also finds the sin which dwells in him is *too strong* for the "I" that hates it and that he is powerless to free himself, so he has to give up the battle as hopeless. The cry bursts from him "O wretched man that I *am*, who shall *deliver* me from this body of death?" No sooner is he brought to this point than Christ is seen to be the answer to everything. He has learned himself and that God looks at him as having died with Christ. He can say, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." It was all done in Another, and never-to-be-forgotten moment in his soul's history and experience! he *passes into* the true christian state of Rom. viii., joyfully exclaiming, "The law (principle) of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus *hath made me free* from the law of sin and death." He now appreciates chap. vi. and enjoys chap. viii. but could do neither without going through chap. vii. It is henceforth his happy privilege in the presence and power of the Spirit to realize and appropriate all the precious blessings, not only of that chapter, but also what the other parts of the Word afford according to its full *extent*. To Him be the glory! This is the deliverance of Scripture.

April, 1904.

W.S.F.