

Vermont Meetings
Informal Lectures
October 21 & 22, 1995

...It didn't matter that there was a loaf at 10 o'clock there and one at 11 at Corinth. It had nothing to do with the hour or the geography. It's a spiritual unity that God has formed in Christ that is expressed. If the brethren in India are around the other side - I don't know how many hours different from us - it has nothing to do with it. We're expressing the truth with them that we are one body. That's a spiritual thing. We understand that and they do too. We are all partakers of that one bread. Now it's about time to stop and I just want to take one minute yet on this verse 18 and we can speak about this verse 18 a little more later. Now here - what's Paul doing? He said, Now here brethren, I'm going to direct your eyes to Israel. I want you to take a look at Israel because I'm going to illustrate to you something about what I'm talking about. I'm going to ask you to look at Israel, and I want you to make an application of this to the subject in hand. Is that unreasonable to do? To believe that's what Paul is doing here? Or is he just changing the subject and then going to come back to it? No. He says, Look at Israel. You see them? You see those people eating of the sacrifice? He says, What does it mean? "Behold Israel after the flesh." That means the nation, in connection with Judaism and what God had set up in their worship. Look at it, "Are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" It's the same word, "in communion with the altar?" Now the question then is, How did the Jew get in communion with the altar? Who can answer that?

MW: By partaking of the sacrifices.

That's it. And if he didn't, he wouldn't be, right? There's a principle here that Paul is drawing on and wants to apply this to the Lord's table. The man is in communion with an altar because he eats what's on it. And we can pick up on this. He's going to show that if you went to the idol temple and ate there too, that's absolutely no-no and it'll show that you're going to lose your place at the Lord's table if you do that. That there's a principle there. He says, you can not do both. Physically they could do both. Right? They could walk in Saturday night. What does Paul mean, "you can not", when he says, "you can not partake of that and the Lord's supper." Physically they could do it. See, we have to get away from this "physical." We've got to see it spiritually. Morally and spiritually you can not. Well, how so? Well if the Corinthians were faithful and the man kept it up, they were to put him out for the practice of idolatry and he wouldn't be eating at the Lord's table any more. You can not do both. That's a moral statement. That's got spiritual force in it. That kind of thing can't be allowed, you see, because it's a destruction of the truth that Paul is developing.

Well that's an hour up, and that's a lot of food already to try to digest these things. Maybe during the break we can be thinking of things and questions that might bear on all of this, because this is a very very great application. It's clearer to some minds perhaps more than others, merely because we haven't thought about it and we haven't reflected on it perhaps, but there's a lot of precious truth and it will show us where our feet belong. I can not say, "You know, I just feel that the Lord wants me in Shrewsbury. I think I

belong in Shrewsbury,” because next week, I might feel like I belong in Chatham, because my feelings shift, you know. Do yours? Mine do. I have some ups and downs. My feelings shift. That’s subjective! I have got to know where my feet belong by the directions of God’s Word. I must understand the truths and principles that are in there so as to know how to be here for His pleasure. That should be our number one objective, that I want to be here for God’s pleasure, because the Lord Jesus was here, number one, for God’s pleasure. Peter says, “He has left us a model that we should follow in his steps.” That’s got to be paramount before us - that God’s Holy Word has to govern our actions: where we go, when we go and what we do and everything about us. That calls for spiritual exercise on our part to do as Ezra who got down before God - back to Jerusalem and said “besought of him a right way for ourselves and our loved ones.” We’re involved in this too, because who knows where our little ones are going to end up. I think we can trust God for our little ones if we’re giving God the glory, and we give Christ His place, because there is the household principle of scripture. That’s another subject.

Second Meeting

Looking at 1 Corinthians 10. If somebody asked, “How does a Christian partake of the Lord’s table?” Now, how does that happen? If some Christian says to you, “The Bible speaks about the Lord’s table, the Lord’s supper, and all these things. How does a person connect with the Lord’s table? How would he express that? How does he get at the Lord’s table, or how are we expressing it?” What do you say?

How about if a man comes in the meeting room, and he sits down, and he sees you and you go through the meeting and you all partake, and he’s just sitting here and he watches it. Does he walk out and tell his friends, “You know, I partook of the Lord’s table this morning.” You’d say, “No you didn’t.” He was just physically here. He was a Christian, he was watching. How does a man get into connection with the Lord’s table? That’s the question.

DW: He eats from it.

Well, how do you prove that. Supposing he says, “Well, where do you get that from. I’ve been reading my bible for 30 years, I don’t see anything about that. Where do you get that from?”

See, this is the point to saying, “Well, I feel I was at the Lord’s table.” No-no. It’s all great to have feeling after you have proof from God’s Word, then you can feel it. If you want to feel saved, be saved first and have some point to - I feel saved? Here - this tells me I’m saved and I’m rejoicing in my Saviour and I feel saved. The feeling comes after God has done a work in the soul and in the conscience and there’s the understanding, and then you rejoice in the truth.

Prove it! How does a man partake of the Lord’s table? How is he at the Lord’s table? Supposing he says to you, “All Christians are at the Lord’s table. What are you talking

about? That's a characteristic communion in the church of God - the Lord's table. There's only three things, I'm not at the other two, I must be there." What do you say to him?

SJ: I don't know. I guess I understand it better from the point of, where is the Lord? Does that make sense?

That's a very co-relative truth. They are intimately linked together. Right. We haven't really touched on that, but that goes together. Right. The Lord's table, the Lord's presence. - they are absolutely connected together. That's true.

SJ: Because you might go to a group of believers where you have a lot of young believers that are newly saved. A lot of people that might have come out from liberal circumstances or Romanism and there might be a real energy and zeal that would feel - it would feel like the Lord was there. I mean it would be kind of exciting, and there'd be that first love. Do you know what I'm saying?

Yeah, a Pentecostal once wrote that a man that has an experience has it all over the fellow who has a theory. You see? That's experience-oriented religion. He's got the experience and whatever you may say to him doesn't count. But he's dead wrong; he's got it backwards. You can't go by those feelings. I'm not saying that it can't be sensed that the Lord is in the midst, but that has to follow from the fact that he's really there and that he is there - because. That's conditional. "Where two or three are gathered together unto my name." Not just a couple of Christians that happen to get together and squat down on the floor and have a little confab about the Bible and they say, "Oh, we're gathered to the Lord's name." No, that doesn't mean that. There's a lot more involved than just a couple of Christians that have gotten together. You know? All the churches and what-not say, "Oh, sure we're gathered in the Lord's name. "In" His name is not quite exactly the same as "unto" His name either. That's another subject.

SJ: Well, then there's the thought that the Lord is within every believer. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not of His." But then it's like - well, here's the Lord; He's within me. But it says, where two or three are gathered together unto His name, there is He in the midst. Well, He's already inside me. But then somehow it's a special - where they're gathered together in His name. That doesn't just mean that you and I get together and say "we're gathered together in His name now..."

Because the Lord is on our inside, yeah.

SJ: Or what about in Romanism. There's two or three there in probably every meeting they have where there's two or three together there. Is He there? Or is He in a group where there's known iniquity? I don't know if I'm getting off the subject, but...

No, no. It's related.

SJ: ...to me, I understand that better. Maybe I own that better than the other – the other part I'm just not as clear on. But that's how it...

Both of these lines of truth are good for looking into. They run together in parallel and they're intimately linked together, and the things together form a rounded whole. When the Lord says, "I will never leave you nor forsake you." That's true. We can be walking somewhere as an individual – the Lord hasn't left you. He's there with you, but that doesn't mean you are gathered to the Lord's name. You're an individual. You can only express the truth of the Lord being in the midst in a corporate way. It takes at least two, we have scripture for it, and not one. So that the truth that the Lord will never leave or forsake us is not the same line of truth as being gathered together unto His name. That's not the same thing, though. The other is conditional. When He says, "I will never leave you nor forsake you," that's not conditional. When He says, "Where two or three are gathered together unto my name," the implication is that two or three just may not happen to be gathered to "my name". Yet, He's with them individually, He will never leave them or forsake any of them. But that's a statement of condition. There's a condition to be met. Where you are so "gathered together unto my name, there am I in the midst of them". And in the beginning of Corinth - Corinthians 5, when the assembly was to put away a person, it says, "When ye are gathered together with my Spirit and..." What does it say? "...the power of our Lord Jesus Christ." You see, because it's the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the midst of His gathered saints that gives power to the action of the assembly. When there's a care meeting, a care meeting does not have that authority. A care meeting is not a meeting of the assembly gathered together unto Christ. You see, and though things are brought up there, it's the assembly that acts, because the Lord is present in the midst. That's what Paul shows us there – "with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ." That's because He's present, and as present, He is acting by the Spirit through the assembly to clean, and to purge out the leaven. "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." So that some other meeting, or some particular group of brothers, it doesn't matter who they are, or how prominent they are, they have not that power; that's reserved for the assembly, because it's the power that resides in the Lord Jesus, acting in the midst of His gathered saints. Because, all consciences in the assembly He would have engage so as to purify themselves and declare that this evil has to be put out. And just because some person is recalcitrant about it and says, Well, "I don't see it," when it's a clear cut case of wickedness. Well you don't wait on a person like that. There might be cases where there might be some waiting. Some weighty brothers might have some difficulty, or some Christian has some weighty consideration. Maybe something needs to be looked into further. There's no laws about it. But the principle is, is that the Lord is in the midst. It's His table. Not all Christians are at the Lord's table. So that people say, Well it doesn't say in 1 Corinthians 5, 'put away from the Lord's table. It doesn't say to put them away from the Lord's table because everybody is at the Lord's table. You can't put them away from the Lord's table.' Well, you know, all these things sound so clever! That's right, it doesn't say, put them away from the Lord's table. It just says, "put them out from among yourselves." See, so a defender of this doctrine that all Christians are at the Lord's table could come up with a reasoning like that. 'See it doesn't say, put away from (the Lord's) table.' You know what Mr. Kelly answered? He says, sure it doesn't say that, because then you'd think that you didn't have to put him away from your table

at home too. That's why it doesn't say, 'put him away from the Lord's table.' That would have circumscribed it and only applied it to the Lord's table, and then these Christians would make an excuse to have a wicked person like that at their own table. He says, no! He says, it means you put him away from the Lord's table and you put him away from your table too. When it says, "with such an one not to eat." You see, that's why every Word of God is pure. It's us! We don't understand why the Spirit of God caused a thing to be written a certain way until we get it from Him as to just why. Each one of us as an individual, we need our brethren in Christ to help us. You see, and that was so helpful, when I read that I said, that's right! That would have limited it just to the Lord's table and given people an excuse to have private fellowship with leaven. You see, can you imagine that – privately fellowship with leaven. I don't have it in public – that's the Lord's table. No, he says, it's everything, it's your... "Put away from among yourselves that wicked person." So it's your table and the Lord's table. XXX (16:18) God has written His Word very wisely. The longer we look at it the more we find that out – how carefully everything is worded. It's just not slovenly put together. That's why it gets studied much, with diligence, and years later we're reading a passage and say, 'Oh yeah, I've read that so many times and I never saw the force of that. Yeah, the altar sanctifies the gift. There's a principle in that. Yeah, I see principle. You see, and then our understanding starts to enlarge.

But here's the man. He says, 'I want to partake of the Lord's table. How does one get in communion with the Lord's table. Shall I visit you Sunday morning? Will that do it?'

SH: Your question assumes we know where the Lord's table is. Right? You're just assuming that for the moment, and the question is, knowing where it is, then how does a man get in communion with that table?

You could take it either way. Just what is the principle of how a person... I mean even independent of where it is, how does a person get into communion with the Lord's table? What is the process? The principle of it is given in verse 18. You're allowed to speak up Steve.

SR: You eat?

You eat what's on the table. Right? Now tell me, why would eating what's on the Lord's table, put me into communion with that table? That's redundant somewhat.

SR: Well, why would eating at someone else's table put you in communion with that person? Just speaking in a physical way. We would assume that that person would let you be there, you'd want to be there...

Yeah, those are all features that definitely go into it. Of course that question was kind of circular – because you eat what's on it, because this verse says so, in verse 18. I'm claiming that the Word of God in verse 18 tells me that the way a person gets in communion with the Lord's table is by eating what is on it. Right? And you know that, you agree. Right? That's what he is doing. He says, brethren I'm going to show you an

analogy to the truth I'm developing here. Look at Israel. "Are not they that eat of the sacrifice in communion with the altar?" You see, because the sacrifice was sacrificed on that altar, and they're in communion with all the good of that before Jehovah by eating of that sacrifice. OK? So, a person is in communion with the Lord's table because he eats the Lord's supper. Is that clear? Because I want to make a consequence of this now if that's clear. The person who doesn't eat, then, is not at the Lord's table. Just as simple as that. The idea that every Christian is at the Lord's table is expressly refuted by this scripture. A man is not in communion with an altar or a table unless he eats what's on it. And the idea, this mythical idea that's been manufactured that all Christians are at the Lord's table is the reasonings of the human mind in divine things, in violation of the divine principle expressly stated here – right where the subject is brought before us. Right where we learn about the Lord's table, there is the principle clearly announced that a man is communion with an altar because he eats what's sacrificed there. Well, you say, well that's not a sacrifice. Oh, don't blame me for the analogy! That's the apostle Paul who made the analogy. I didn't pick this out. I mean, if I had picked it out, you could argue with me and say, well it's not parallel, you see, because you're talking about a sacrifice and there's no more sacrifice for sins, so the Lord's supper is not a sacrifice – see? If I made this up, you could argue with me and get around me that way. But this is the inspired apostle who brought this out and we dare not talk that way about him pointing to Israel and making this analogy. Right? And he's made that analogy. Very clearly he has – that a man is in communion with an altar because he eats what's on it. So that a person is in communion with the Lord's table, wherever that might happen to be, if he eats what's on it. And if he doesn't eat what's on it, he's not at the Lord's table. Isn't that clear, that that's the converse of this? It's just the opposite of it. He doesn't eat – he's not at the Lord's table. So somebody walks in Sunday morning, wonderful Christian as he may be, if he's doesn't eat of it, he's not at the Lord's table. And if somebody left Corinth and went somewhere else, would he be at the Lord's table? Well, supposing he said, 'I'm going down the street. I'm going to set up down there. I'm going to...Sunday morning, a few of us, we've decided to go down there.' That's what Paul warned them about in the next chapter, there are sects, schisms, or rents, or divisions among you. That was internal fractures. "There shall be heresies amongst you." That means that brethren are going to leave, and they're going to set up something else. Just like Jeroboam set up a competitive center in Dan and Bethel. Nice convenient ones, nice ones that look close to the real thing. So that, I think that, and I suggest to you that this verse 18 explicitly proves that not all Christians are at the Lord's table. Take a man who sits at home, Sunday after Sunday. He says, 'Oh, I can worship God in my home.' He doesn't go anywhere. I take a good extreme case, and there are some people like that. And he never eats of anything that he professes to call the Lord's supper. He's not at the Lord's table, because he isn't eating the Lord's supper which is on the Lord's table.

You see how this principle also links the supper and the table together? Now were coming to another point about it. This is a wonderful verse, this verse 18. There's so much in it. The sacrifice and the altar were linked together for the Jew. You couldn't have the sacrifice somewhere else. It had to be that altar. We have just seen that all Christians are not at the Lord's table. The Lord's table is someplace, but it's not everywhere. And, the sacrifice is linked to the altar. That supper is linked to the table.

That's why brother Beg said, "The Lord's supper is on the Lord's table and that's the only place it is." And then I had a...oh, all of a sudden it hit me, you know, it was clear in my mind. Oh, I was so happy, I'm telling you. How old was I? I was 34 years old. It just – it was so wonderful to understand that point. And I looked at brother Beg and I said, "I understand what you were saying." And then brother Armstead Barry came around, he was a dear brother, and he was an able teacher of God's Word. You wouldn't believe this. You know, in my enthusiasm – you see this 34 year old fellow all enthused, "Oh! brother Armstead, here's what I found." He just sat there and listened to me, and listened to me and I didn't get any reaction. Well, he didn't want to say anything to offend me, but he didn't believe in that, you know, and he went to brother Beg and he said, "Hey, brother Beg, well now—" (You see, I found out, because brother Beg told me all about it.) He says, "Brother Beg," he says, "that young Huebner there, he seems to be alright, but you know he's got this notion, and I don't know who he gets that from." Brother Beg says, "I said to him, 'I believe that too!'" You see, the man was stunned, you know. Brother Beg was a very – he traveled all over the country on business and what-not, and visited the saints, and was highly respected. I remember brother Gordon Hayhoe said to me with a lot of feeling one day, he says to me, "You know," he says, "John Beg is a real gift of Christ to the church. That's what brother Hayhoe said, you know. He was a very capable man. And so, Armstead Barry said to him, he says, "Beg, if I—" (this is brother Beg telling me all of this), he says, "if you have your supper on your table, your table cloth and I pick that table cloth up and I bring it over to my house and put it down on my table, that's still your supper." "Oh no," Beg says, "I told him, 'No-no, you take that off my table and put it over there, that's your supper, that's not my supper. My supper's on my table and that's the only place it is.'" It turns out, Mrs. Armstead Barry understood the truth. She was in on this and she says later to brother Beg, "Let me try to take care of this with him." The dear sister must have understood the truth, and her husband wasn't quite convinced of it. Now he believed, of course, that the saints that were regarded as gathered to the Lord's name, that there was the Lord's table and that was giving expression to it, but he felt more generous about the Lord's supper, and thought the Lord's supper could be elsewhere. But I find here the principle is, is that the sacrifice and the altar are connected together. You couldn't pick up this sacrifice and put it somewhere else and go with it and say, 'That is the Lord's supper,' because that sacrifice would not have received it's character from the altar. "Which is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifies the gift?" That's another principle that comes to bear on it, and that's not the only one, because we have it here in XXX26:23XXX. So for myself, you see, I became clear in my mind, before the Lord, this is the truth of God. I saw it from the Word of God. And then it becomes a question of putting this into practice, of course – that's another matter. But now, seeing that, I have a responsibility for the rest of my life to carry out that truth, otherwise I'm going to sin against the light that God gave me, if I don't practice that thing I know.

SH: So, if I understand you correctly, no matter how sincere we are, when we come together on Sunday morning to remember the Lord, if we don't have the Lord's table, we are not eating the Lord's supper.

No, we made up a fellowship of our own, and then we have a supper that derives its character from that. Now, I may be thinking about the Lord. Now, you know, for many years...well, let's see, I guess I was about 18 when I started to break bread in the Paterson meeting, a KLC meeting, and I was in another meeting up until I was 33. So all those years, I was breaking bread there, you see, with the saints. See? So, you say, what do you say about that now? Well, I say, that was a KLC supper. That's all it was! And I wasn't thinking about the devil. I wasn't worshipping the devil. I wouldn't want anybody to say that what I was partaking of there, not just because it was me partaking of it there, but because it wouldn't be true, that that was the table of demons. That's absurd. That's not the table of demons. You see, that comes from this kind of mentality in divine things that's kind of stuck on that there's just these three things and that man can't make up something within Christendom. The Jews could make up separate fellowships, and in fact let their table become a snare unto them. They had a table. They had the table of showbread which had twelve loaves on it and those twelve loaves symbolized the national unity of Israel composed as twelve tribes, and it was in the tabernacle and in the temple, before the Lord. That signified that unity. Now what happened when Jeroboam started those other two places. You remember, in 1 Kings 12, the prophet Ahijah comes and he takes his garment and he rips it into twelve pieces and he gives ten to Jeroboam. That is, ten of the tribes went with Jeroboam and became known as the "house of Israel", the northern tribes, north of Jerusalem. And principally Benjamin and Judah were in the south and Jerusalem was in the province of Judah and there was a dividing line between that and Bethel, which means the house of God, where the false worship was set up, where Jeroboam set something up. Now, what do you think when that happened? Did the priests go and say, 'Well, next Sabbath when we change the showbread, we're going to chuck ten out and we're going to just put two on from here on – because ten are gone?' 'The national unity of Israel as composed of twelve tribes before Jehovah has come to an end. Israel is in ruin and ten are now gone, so – we have to represent the truth – so we're going to put just two loaves of the showbread on there and not put the other ten on there.' Is that what they did? No. Why? Because, do you think that in the eye of God, and in His divine purpose, that that unity was smashed? No. Israel, in responsible testimony down here had come to an end, but in the divine mind, the divine purpose for Israel, (and he's going to make it good in the Millennium), but in the divine mind, in His purpose, that unity subsists, as to His purpose. As to them seen in responsibility here, they ruined it. But, what did the priests do? Which did they go by? What Israel had done? Or did they go by the divine mind? They went by the divine mind and kept putting out the twelve. And so what do we do? Do we try to find, because we're so small, we take the slightest little piece of bread we can find and still call it a piece of bread, under a microscope, and put that on the plate on Sunday morning because of the character of Christendom? Or do we go by the divine mind – how God is looking at his people? Now, the apostle Paul said, "There is one body," and that still hasn't changed from then until now. "There is one body." And every time that loaf is put there, that is making a statement of that fact - "There is one body." And though the church looked at in responsible testimony down here on earth, is in irremediable ruin, in the divine purpose, the thing subsists as God set it up and He's going to display it in all its glory in a coming day, according to His divine purpose. So that remains untouched. And therefore what we are in Christ, not what we are in the ruin – we don't want to give expression to what we are in the ruin – we want to

give expression to what we are in Christ, and in Christ we are one body. And how is the one body represented? By one loaf, not a little teeny piece of it. So we keep putting the loaf out on the table, it doesn't matter what the state of Christendom is. We continue to do the same thing. The Lord's table hasn't gone yet, the Lord's supper hasn't gone yet, and in all weakness and without any pretension whatsoever. And we don't want to go around and say to people this, that and the other thing. We have no claims to make. Look at us! Throw water on the ground; you can't gather it up. That's what we're like, in this time that we're in. We're nothing to nobody. And Mr. Darby in his day said that, "We're nothing to nobody, and as soon as we think we are, that's the end of us." You see, and the brethren got to think they were something, and God sent division after division – big powerful divisions, I mean, thousands and thousands gathered to the Lord's name. Now brethren look back on that and say, 'Naughty, naughty.' Yeah, that's right, naughty, naughty. 'It shouldn't have happened.' Yeah, that's right, it shouldn't have happened. But we failed in our responsibility and we're all part of that failure, of the church in general, and even with respect to that truth God raised up. So it's no good to hold our head up high in the air. We need to feel the state of things. But if there are brethren that are going to challenge the truth of God's word, we ought to be able to answer them. We're to be stewards and not budge on what God has said. And if that offends some others – people, well, so be it. Yet, we have to stand for the truth of scripture and support it. And if they want to call us Pharisees, so be it.

MW: The thing about the altar being at Bethel, they weren't the tables of demons, were they?

I hadn't thought about that question, in just those terms. I know the altar was denounced. It was competitive with the divine ones. I guess I tend to take it more like in the sects of Christendom where there is something set up in competition with the one that God had set up, rather than like the heathen. Although it partook of elements of what went on around them, you know. But there was a design intent on the part of Jeroboam when it says that he devised a feast in his own heart like the feast at (Jerusalem). See, it was intended to supplant that one and set up something that looked like it to ensnare people. People today, they say, 'Well, you go to that meeting, or that one, and they're not in fellowship and things look the same.' Well, so did they maybe at Dan and Bethel in that measure with what went on in Jerusalem, and that was intentional, of course, on Jeroboam's part.

SJ: What about, like the Roman system. I mean, would you consider that a demon, or no?

I would think there is demonism involved in that. There is something in Revelation 17 and 18 about it becoming the hold of every hateful and unclean bird – that's symbolic for that kind of thing. In fact I think that there is quite a bit of that in Christendom in general because it tells us in 2 Corinthians that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light and his ministers as ministers of righteousness. So there are groups of people where they are high on righteousness and holy living. Take, for instance the "Jesus only Pentecostals", there's about a half a million in this country, and they're what we call Sebellians after an ancient heresy that God is one divine person who has manifested himself in three

different ways, as Father, Son and Spirit; but they're all the same divine person. In other words, they're not true Trinitarians. It's what we would call modal-trinitarianism, where God, with this one divine person – sometimes he manifests himself as Father, and other times manifests himself as Son and so-forth. You ought to see some of their books, though about holy living, on the matter. That reminds me of that scripture “transforms his ministers as ministers of righteousness.” So there's poison in it. That's the fundamental character of it. I couldn't really regard them as – I wouldn't regard an anti-Trinitarian as a Christian.

You know, even with Mr. Raven – you know that, you'll find in this book here. He said, “No doubt there will be brethren to denounce me for my language.” But he didn't spare. He said, “Mr. Raven had a mission from an unclean spirit.” And I agree with him; I believe that too. Somebody can criticize me. I don't care; I believe that. He called the new light – they called it new light – Mr. Kelly said, “It's the light of death!” He called it “Smoke from the pit!” and went on like that throughout a book called, “FER's Heredox.” That's what it is. And I'm convinced that the fogging of minds is in that system of Mr. Raven's. He one of the most wicked men that have arisen in church history. Now that's another story. I don't want to get side-tracked on Mr. Raven right now. But, yes, it's an awful thing to think that among brethren gathered to the Lord's name, that a thing like this could come. There was a big, what we call, a big powerful meeting in Greenwich sheltering Mr. Raven, and a little assembly down there at Bexhill – they stood for the Lord! Finally a letter of commendation with a brother came down and we're pretty sure that Greenwich was doing this deliberately to foment some trouble because they figured Bexhill would take this action. Bexhill refused the letter of communication, of commendation and wrote back to Greenwich that they could not be in fellowship with them any longer as they were sheltering Mr. Raven. So they would call me a Bexhillite, because I praise God for Bexhill. It doesn't matter how big and powerful Greenwich was, it was wickedness, that's what it was. The scripture tells us, “If any man who is XXXXX, and abides not in the doctrine of Christ, greet him not, for he that greets him is a partaker of his wicked works.” Bexhill determined they were not about to become forced. These brethren walked with Mr. Raven for nearly two years until they finally came to their heads. When it was confirmed... Finally the Lord...See, and the brethren were waiting... Mr. Darby spoke about having patience in the midst of evil. All of us... You know what they talk about in the secular language? Something called the critical mass? I don't know if you've ever heard that. A bunch of things come together. All of a sudden there's, like, a critical mass. Or, like in chemistry, all of a sudden you're pouring things in and a precipitation starts, and then all of a sudden, Whoom! all of this white stuff starts coming out, and building up at the bottom. All of a sudden! You've reached that point. And waiting on God... We had that experience in 1985 and 86 in Shrewsbury. The term was used, I wonder why Dorothy hasn't applied the “ax” to us yet. At one time we were held up for two or more weeks. And that question came up and I said to some, “Because brother so-and-so has to be manifested yet.” Sure enough, in those two weeks, all of a sudden, this fence-straddler suddenly came out in support of what they were trying to do. Now, I'm going to pass on something to you about some of those things. This is not known, because it's known to me privately. Our dear brother John Gorgas, who is now with the Lord, he moved, you know, he went to Chatham, and then he tried to put

pressure on us to leave; to rescind the action, to rescind this action, and so forth. We believed we had acted in the name of the Lord Jesus, and he did too at that same time. We didn't feel that we could go back on what the Lord showed us to do at that time. He wrote a letter down to a brother in Dorothy, and the brother showed me, not showed me, he sent me a copy of the letter. Brother Gorgas wrote to this brother who was in Dorothy and says, "It's obvious to me, that the Dorothy brethren are trying to bring the Shrewsbury assembly to its knees." Then he hollers at all of us to rescind the action, when he perceived all along what their leaders down there were trying to do. They were going to force Shrewsbury to bow to their will. And this is another reason all of these kinds of troubles amongst the Lord's people; human will has gotten into divine things, and there is a state that comes about, and God addresses that state. That doesn't appear, necessarily, all at once on the surface, what it was about, but when some of the heat and fire subsides and the smoke subsides, and it's looked at carefully, you can see what the hand of the Lord was in that particular thing, and what He was doing. Then a brother, a young man who got off the path, but he was gathered to the Lord's name at the time, in Gasport, NY, he wrote to the brethren out at Illinois XXXXX to the principle brethren there, I have a copy of the letter, and asked them some questions, and they came to a point where they said that in 1903, Tumbridge Wells acted in independency - very convenient. So desperate were they all to fix blame on us, that they were ready to go to that, and then they could get off the hook. Once they did that, they said in 1909, a letter went out from Tumbridge Wells, and they corrected their independency of 1903. Well we have the letters from Mr. Sibthorp and signed by the other brethren that are there - they never changed their mind about one step with the Lord that they took except that maybe they should have been more firm yet. And that was an untruth, gotten up, to the embarrassment that at bottom and in principle what happened in 1986 was a replay of what happened with Tumbridge Wells. It began to get around - everybody started looking at that and - yep, same principles involved. That's the way it goes with these terrible divisions. The Lord is spanking us as gathered to His name, because we have not walked in uprightness and holiness before Him - collectively, as individuals and in our family - and a state comes in. Mr. Blant wrote a paper after the Raven division lamenting the state (he stood against Raven too and thanked God for Bexhill), but he lamented the state of the saints in general that God found it necessary to address that state. And he owned that state before God - that this was the hand of God upon His people. That's what brings division about. What? All we have to do, actually, to get light on it from God's word is to read about the division under Rehoboam and Jeroboam and study that a little bit and see what was involved in there, and why did God do that? And then you know what Rehoboam wanted to do? He wanted to get the army of Judah up and go and take them and reunite the kingdom. And the profit came to him in the name of the Lord and said, "This thing is from me." And he wasn't permitted to go and do that. Why? Because God's hand had come upon Israel because of the sins starting with Solomon that he had allowed, and it kept getting worse and worse and worse. Now let me tell you something that comes to mind about something Rehoboam said, and I don't personally think it was quite justified for Rehoboam to open his mouth this way considering his own conduct in the whole thing. Yet, what he said was true. He wrote to them and said, "We have the pure table." And people don't want to hear that. "We have the pure table." I didn't think it was well for such a man to have said it, but God has recorded these things in His word, and this came

out of his mouth, and the fact was true. Where was the pure table? It was not in Dan, it was not in Bethel, it was down there at Jerusalem, where God had put it, even though Reaboam had not conducted himself rightly and well. You see, and every time these things happen, of course, we want to start climbing on brethren and say, “You know, if you hadn’t done this,” or, “if you brethren over there had done that,” and this and that and the other thing, “why then this wouldn’t have happened.” How about if all that went on in Reaboam’s day? In Jeroboam’s day? What did the profit say? “This thing is from me.” This is not to excuse things that have been done wrong by anyone. That isn’t my point. But the first and principle thing that we have to see in all these kinds of difficulties is the hand of God – “This thing is from me.” That God is speaking to a state, and He’s addressing it. And He doesn’t want us to go on united that way in evil if His presence is there. If his presence is not there in the Catholic church it can get as big as it wants! And you know, if separation from evil is a false principle, we have just denounced the whole reformation. What grounds did Luther have for leaving the Catholic church if there’s to be no such thing as separation from evil? Why should he have left the Catholic church? You see? The minute that principle, which is supported by the word of God, is denounced, we might as well all be back in Rome. You see? The protestant reformation would never be justified. But that is a principle in God’s dealings with His people.

SH: I don’t know if you have another direction that you want to go, but I think you’ve kind of brought things to a point where a question now is established, and that is, there are various companies of Christians that appear to meet in the same manner – physically it looks like we are meeting in the same manner, but yet those companies of Christians are not in communion with each other. And what you’ve established thus far is that it is not possible for both of those companies of Christians to have the Lord’s table and to be taking the Lord’s supper. It’s not possible. So I’m a guy coming in, and I see these various companies – Where do I go for direction on finding out where the Lord’s table is?

Yeah – you know I went through that question for about eight months. Madelin and I were praying about when were in the KLC’s – just about that thing. I tell you, I was really studying history. I amassed a lot of things and I was really boning up on that stuff and I was even taking – when I had to go on business somewhere – I was taking that along and looking at it, studying it. One day I had such a headache noon time when I was in my car and I was studying these things. All of a sudden it hit me – ha! – I don’t have to be a historian to know where my feet belong. Boy that was a revelation too – you don’t have to be a historian to know where my feet belong. I’m not downgrading knowing something about history, of our history. Just like a Jew ought to know about Jewish history. If God has done things in church history – His testimony, it’s good to know something about it, and especially holding our past connections. So I thought, well, I need the principles of God’s word, and who is teaching these principles? And at that time it was a little easier because I found that the Tumbridge Wells brethren were teaching these things. I had seen that in some of these papers on the Tumbridge Wells division, that that was a great issue at that time - and in 1940, the man who wrote that nice paper, “The Grace and Love of God to His Failing People”...my, that’s almost enough to flow tears out of my eyes. Brother Brown...I was with the KLC’s, you see, that’s what he wanted to do with that paper – get me in the KLC’s. I was there and I wanted to get out

because something was drastically wrong where I was in the KLC's. I don't want to go into the things that were there. They're a lot worse now! Evil things tolerated. "Wicked"...what scripture would call it. So I left that meeting, and we started attending Chatham, and we went there for a little while and we made known to the brethren that we saw that that was not the Lord's table there and I wanted to be gathered to the Lord's name. As soon as I said that wasn't the Lord's table there, then no one had any further difficulty. They were a little concerned about me, and that cleared up any difficulty they had. But I wanted to know - where is the truth that there is one body - taught and practiced, that there is one Lord's table. Where was it taught? And where is it practiced? I want to be there, because I want to carry out these kind of things. Of course through some historical researches, I found out that these brethren were maintaining that truth and that there too, in 1940 there, that they had gone through Tumbridge Wells itself. Some of the offspring of the brethren there were trying to rescind what they did - I read those paper too, but I found that I was in the wrong place. Ultimately, it has to be founded on God's Word and His principles, just a few of which we were speaking of together this afternoon. I'm an advocate of knowing a little something about our history, because we're always going to be challenged about it. As far as the Grace and Love of God to His Failing People - look, I don't want to be in a position to run down the paper. God has a lot of grace and love for His failing people. I agree with that, and that is why He has a lot of love and grace for me. See, because I'm one of His failing people. But to use that, to defy these scriptures is not right! Right? And in 1926 in Nole's history about the reunion, it says there that the brethren said, "We did not seek to apportion the blame." That sounds so generous! But it is an abhorrence...

SH - Who is that speaking of?

Nole, in his history of the brethren, regarding the 1926 reunion of the Kelly and the Low-Continental groups. They said, "We did not seek to apportion the blame." That sounds so nice, and it's generous. But scripture says, "It is required in a steward that he be found faithful." And we have to get at the root of things, and things have to be judged. The way of restoration, is by reception, not by reunion of divided companies, because two opposing companies are not gathered to the Lord's name! Two loaves broken in separation, which they all were, do not profess that we are one loaf. That can't profess it, no matter what the people say about it, and say, "Oh yeah, well these loaves are confessing that we are one loaf." The practice of it doesn't. It doesn't matter what a person says. The deeds are what God is looking at. If there are two divided companies, they are breaking bread in separation, so those are different loaves. Those are different tables. Neither one of which would be the Lord's table. And I believe that the Lord restored communion at His table in 1827, and it has continued to this day. We have been tested repeatedly as to the truth of the one body, and even fundamental evil in connection with Mr. Stewart and Mr. Raven, but that God has maintained this truth all the way through. And it's my desire, at least, that I'm going to practice that which God restored last century. If brethren want to give it up, why don't they have the integrity to say, "I have given up that truth," instead as Mr. Campbell says, whom I...(I was telling him)...I knew him quite personally, met him many many times, and listened to much of his ministry, to say that, "We practice the original principles of the brethren." No way does

that practice... And talk about “high claims” and all that. What is that but language meant to put down saints who just want to humbly go on with the Lord’s truth? But a brother like that, using language like that, “Pharasaism”, and “high claims” and all of this kind of language. That’s not fitting to charge saints with that. It just isn’t. It’s not a “high claim”.

Third Meeting

...yesterday, So, I see it as features of our own history as gathered to the Lord’s name. And there are two scriptures that speak about leaven leavening the lump. The first one that we read, is in 1 Cor. 5, and it has to do with what we might classify as moral evil, as there’s a little more in Galatians which has to do with doctrinal evil. The same principle applies. Perhaps somebody could read for us the chapter five – the entire chapter. 1 Cor. 5. Actually to go through a chapter like this, you could spend a couple of hours. It’s not the purpose, but just to go into several principles from it that are important in connection with the consideration of Christian fellowship and what is proper to it. And when I say, “Christian fellowship”, you will recall that yesterday we were considering that a table expresses fellowship. This book is talking a lot about that. In chapter one and verse nine we saw that we’ve been brought into the fellowship of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. That fellowship, if that’s true of us that we’re in that fellowship – and all Christians are – then we have to give that expression in our practice. That expression of it is, in many ways, of course as to fellowship, but the highest aspect of it has to do with the Lord’s table and the remembrance of the Lord Jesus in His death. That act also shows our participation as members of one body. Now there are things that interfere and debar persons from showing fellowship. In an extreme case like this, this man is guilty of a sin, what we call “incest”, and we can see that the apostle Paul is [implying] that they are to have a meeting of the assembly. It says in verse four, “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” You see, some action was to be carried out in the name of the Lord Jesus. Is it in the name of the Lord Jesus... In the name of Jesus Christ you do this, “when ye are gathered together in my Spirit with you. Now he expects them to be gathered together, and he expects them to do this in the name of the Lord Jesus, and he expects that he is, in Spirit, he is coupling himself with them. You see, because they are going to deliver this one to Satan. You can’t do that today, because the apostle Paul is gone, and he can not couple his Spirit with our action, and that takes apostolic power to deliver a person to Satan. I just want to say that in passing. This is a thing up in the beginning and it’s part of scripture and it’s for our lesson. The apostle Paul has addressed himself to this awful case of them. Their state was bad. They were carnal, according to chapter three. But he calls on them now that this has to be done. So, you do it in the name of the Lord Jesus, and you’re gathered together, and I’m there in my spirit with you, and the power of the Lord Jesus Christ is there in doing this thing. Because although there was leaven in their midst, they were still an assembly gathered to the Lord’s name. They didn’t know what to do. He charged them in verse two, “you could have mourned!” We have no excuse today, because we have this. Now the fact that evil arises in an assembly, and it happens all the time, does not at that point leaven that assembly. But once that evil is brought out, and in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established – there’s a scripture that’s often violated, though it’s repeated in many contexts – the case is proved. There

might be Godly brethren that look into it and the proof is brought forward of the thing. And it doesn't mean that everybody gets involved necessarily in the nitty gritty of these kinds of matters. The case is proved, and then it's brought before the assembly, because we find it says when the man was repented and was to be restored he does say to them in the second epistle, "You have approved yourselves clear in the matter." How were they clear in the matter? Because they acted on his word and put the evil out. Thus they were not a leavened assembly, because the leaven was put out. The fact that leaven arises in the meeting does not ipso facto make that a leavened assembly. If it's demonstrated that it's so, and the saints say, "Well no...well...oh no...well we don't believe that," or "oh no...we're...well he's such a nice man otherwise, we're going to go on with him," at that point the assembly becomes leavened and is no longer an assembly gathered to the name of the Lord Jesus. So the mere arising of evil in the midst, does not in itself leaven the assembly. But at any rate, the power of the Lord is there with those – these were saints gathered to the Lord's name and the object of discipline was for the person's good. Now he says, "Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" Now what does that mean? I'll tell you what Open Brethren, first of all, tell you it means, because they want to get around the word of God. I said yesterday that they have said that if I'm breaking bread with an adulterer, that doesn't defile me. The more Godly say, "Well a person like that **ought** to be put out." But they will not say what we say, and therefore they called us "exclusives", because we exclude the evil, and we exclude people who will persist in making themselves one with the evil, even if they're not doing the same thing. And Mr. Bellet, whose writings we all love so much and how touching they all are, he says, "Well, they've called us "exclusives". While that word is not found in the scripture, the truth that's meant by that word is, and therefore we will have to accept that designation." That's what they want to call us is "exclusives". So, we were talking before that in the KLC magazine that has about a circulation of 14,000 around the world, there was just an article last July and it says, "Exclusivism is wrong." And there was a period after the word "wrong". No, exclusivism is right. Persons who write like that, ought to go to Open Brethren. And I'm going to tell you very frankly, that's where they belong, because they say that leaven leavening the lump – the lump can not be leavened until every last person in the meeting is doing that sin. This sin is of such a nature, that I would be positive that there would be some people in that meeting that were not able to do this particular sin of incest. That's a myth to say that.

SJ – Don't...I know that some Open Brethren look at that term "exclusive" as the fact that they would be excluded from breaking bread with that group.

Well however they may look at it...

SJ – Yeah...

...the thing is, is that these Open Brethren, well maybe next Sunday, they want to go to a meeting where they allow people like that in fellowship. Well they're leavened by that, you see. We won't have persons come who will not give a guarantee of holiness. This was the point, see. And that's how Bethesda began. Present Truth Publishers has printed the volume II of the books on Darby, and that whole book goes into how this division

came about, exactly what those principles are, who espoused those principles, who withstood those principles, and that has characterized the two ever since, except there is always a drift towards the looseness on the part of the exclusives, or extremism to Ravenism on the other side. But to maintain that balance of the truth which the brethren had in Bellet's day, in Darby's day, in Wigram's day – they all refused this wicked principle, because what happened? Well, in Plymouth, there arose this teacher who said that the Lord Jesus was at a circumstantial distance from God, and He was under God's displeasure and He had to work His way up to a point where God could meet him, and on and on and on with these ravings. A brilliant man – B. W. Newton – tremendous scholar – wrote volume after volume of learned works. That doesn't make any difference. Well finally Mr. Darby and six others withdrew from that meeting, and then, (he thought six others, it was sixty came) and so forth, and not long after he withdrew because of clericalism. That's when this doctrine came out. Then after some time, persons supporting Mr. Newton who both believed his doctrine, and some who didn't but supported him, were received at the assembly at Bethesda. "Wait!" said some brethren, "No no no!" A Mr. G. Alexander, a faithful brother in that meeting said, "No, this isn't right." He said, "These men are supporting this wicked Mr. Newton! And a little leaven leavens the whole lump. And they are responsible for any connection in support of him, and he's not to be received in this meeting." And they wrote up the thing called "The Letter of the Ten" where they said that a person coming from under a teaching like that, we examine him and if he's personally sound, we'll receive him. No. Even if he's personally sound, if they identify themselves with that wickedness, if they support that wicked teacher, if they have fellowship with that wicked teacher – a little leaven leavens the whole lump. "Not so!" say the Open Brethren – everybody has to be doing it in that assembly beforehand. "No, no," say the exclusives, a little leaven leavens the whole lump in this context means the toleration of the leaven down this end of the lump here makes the character of the lump change. See leaven works in two ways. In Matthew 13 we find that the woman puts leaven in the three measures of meal until the whole was leavened. That's talking about how leaven works its way through the whole thing and assimilates the whole thing to its own character. This is talking about the changing of the character of the lump by the toleration of leaven any place in it. How far it works is another question. And it will tend to work like the other one. But Matthew 13 is a different subject than this one and here a little leaven leavens the whole lump, and I think we'll show it now as we go down. It means that the character of the lump has changed from a leavened lump...an unleavened lump to a leavened lump. Now supposing you have a glass of water and somebody comes and takes a nice fat drop of arsenic and he just very carefully...he gets it over here on this edge and puts it in there so it's sort-of like hanging there. Like to take a drink from it? You say, "Now wait a minute! That's a poisoned glass of water!" "Oh no no no no. No, no. That's not...no. A poisoned glass of water is one where the poison has worked itself all the way through and mixed itself thoroughly in. Do you like that idea? As long as it hasn't gone that far you'll drink it? No! You see? With our own bodies we'll not do that. But with Christ's body, we will do it! You see? You see how these things work? We have the facility within us to make doctrines that takes away what's due to Christ, but we wouldn't allow it in our own personal case. We wouldn't drink from a glass like that. Why? Because that glass has changed its character from an unpoisoned glass of water to a poisoned glass of water by allowing that drop in there. Now that's not

quite analogous, you see, because in this case you can remove the leaven, of course. I'm just...but I'm trying to draw an analogy and to explain what I mean by, when I say that the character of something changes. So, you have to keep the lump in a purged character. And we're going to see that now as we just go along a little further. But he's saying here, that a little leaven leavens the whole lump. That's a statement of a characteristic of the lump – it would become a leavened lump. "Purge out the old leaven." Now here's a command to them to do it. And what is the old leaven? What's found in that man that's being tolerated. And they needed the power of the Lord Jesus in the midst, and being gathered together, to purge it out. You want to couple that with the previous verses. So, that's how they'll purge it out. They'll have an assembly meeting where it comes before the saints for judgment. And the saints act in the name of the Lord Jesus, and there's their power there. And you know what? The power of the Lord Jesus is here today, however feeble we may be. There's a minimum amount of power...and of Philadelphia it says, "Thou hast a **little** power." And you know how small it can be? Just enough to keep the evil out of the assembly. It doesn't have to be the great things that were going on like on the day of Pentecost, or in apostolic times. No. There's...there's the Lord will give us that...at least that much power – to keep the assembly clean of leaven. He'll guarantee to us that amount of power. And that stays, you see. That's not one of those things that can be ruined. There are many things in connection with the church that are ruined, but this is a moral thing and a spiritual thing, and He is spiritually present and His power is still there to purge out evil through His saints that the assembly might remain clear. "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump." Not that ye...notice what it says...it doesn't say that ye may "become" a new lump...they hadn't lost their new lump character yet. And what does it mean to be a "new lump"? Don't forget that the saints are seen as in Christ. And in Christ, that's a perfect place – a perfect sphere before God and we're a new lump before God, as to His divine purpose. As to how He sees us in Christ, we're a new lump. And if we're a new lump in that way, what does that mean? That means that I have to put into practice, you have to put into practice, the assembly has to put into practice, the truth about being a new lump. We have to answer to it. Whatever God has made of us as to His work in Christ has to be practiced. And so we have to practice this truth – the maintenance of the character that God has endowed us with as being seen in Christ. We have to answer to that in this world. So that the assembly has to maintain the new lump character. How do you do it? By purging out the leaven. That's what it says, "Purge out the leaven that ye may be a new lump...As ye are unleavened." See? We are unleavened. In Christ we are unleavened. Paul says, "Don't you see that? That's your position, in Christ you are untouchable. You're unleavened." But in practice you might not be unleavened. You have to answer to your unleavened character in Christ. What God has constituted you demands a corresponding conduct here on below...down below when the church is seen in responsibility. And it's our responsibility to give expression in our practice to the unleavened character that we have as being in Christ. So if we're unleavened in Christ then we must be unleavened in our conduct to answer to that, because everything that's true of us in Christ requires a corresponding practice down here. So he's saying that you've...you must purge out that leaven that ye may be a new lump. That is, to maintain that new lump character as they are unleavened that's what you have to do. Now what if you don't do it? Well then the opposite happens. If they had refused to put this man out... You know, if you put the Open Brethren against the wall

and say, “Yeah, what would’ve happened?” They don’t answer. And if they had to answer, they’d say, “Well no, the assembly wouldn’t be leavened until they all did it.” That’s not what the text says. If they had refused what the apostle Paul had said here and they said, “No. We’re going to go on with this man,” that very attitude is a leavened attitude. That attitude is not an attitude of separation of evil unto the Lord. That’s really a wicked attitude to say, “No, we’re going to go on with this man. We’re going to keep him in fellowship.” And if the assembly had acted that way, then that assembly would become leavened by fellowship with this leaven. Leaven gives character to the assembly.

“For even Christ our passover has been sacrificed for us.” See how he brings in now the death of Christ. Christ has given Himself for us, not that we might be leavened. And he says, “Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven.” Now, when you first read this, you’re going to think he’s talking about the Lord’s supper when he says, “Let us keep the feast.” He’s not talking... He’s talking about a Jewish feast just as in chapter 10 when he said, “Behold Israel after the flesh. Are not they that eat of the sacrifice...”

...the day after the passover. Christ our passover is sacrificed for us, on the fourteenth day of the month. On the fifteenth day of the month, began a seven day feast and it was called the “feast of unleavened bread”. Christ our passover...He died for us...that’s 1900 years ago, and as far as God is concerned, there’s no time between when He died and when we begin our walk. See? The feast is the next day, connected right with the passover. And it takes it’s character from the passover. Christ died for sin! Died for leaven! Put it away as charged against us by God! Christ our passover died for us. What starts then? The feast of unleavened bread for the Jew, when all leaven had to be out of the house. Right? No leaven – couldn’t eat it, couldn’t have it in the house... And that seven day feast speaks of our walk – our complete walk, because it’s a seven day feast. And that’s the walk of the believer. And where does the walk of the believer get its character? From the passover. See the connection here? Christ our passover died for...is sac...Christ is our sac...passover. He’s been sacrificed for us. “Therefore,” or so that, “let us keep the feast, not with old leaven,” like this man, “neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness,” those are added to this, “but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.” These are figures of speech, but they’re talking about the character of the believer’s walk that derives from the fact that Christ his passover has been sacrificed for him. And what he’s putting before the Corinthians is that they were not answering to this in the assembly. It doesn’t mean every last one of them.

MW – I’m not sure I understand the difference between the old leaven and the leaven of malice and wickedness. Are they two separate distinct things? Or...

Uh, I couldn’t say, actually. I wouldn’t...I...maybe somebody knows some...uh...there must be a distinction or they wouldn’t be there, right? That isn’t clear to my mind exactly what the uh...uh...it... See there’s a...I don’t know...but there’s a ...it’s a possibility it might have to do with their old walk which this man fell into. The Corinthians were notorious for this kind of conduct. And later we’ll...or...yeah, next chapter we’ll read about a pile of sins and it says, “Such were some of you.” You see? It might...I couldn’t say that I felt that sure on it, but it might be that it refers to that kind of conduct. And

what could continue, however, or be present now in their midst is malicious thoughts about one another, and insincerity and other kinds of wickedness like that.

So the important point here is you have to purge the leaven out that ye may be a new lump. So that needs to be clear to us that it's the **allowance** of leaven. The fact that there is leaven there is not in itself sufficient because the saints may not have had it really directed to their attention, you see. And it has to be real leaven. You know – not ever saint that looks at me cross-eyed is a bad person. And maybe they said something to me in a tone that they could have said it better. I'm sure I've offended that way time to time. You know, not every thing is leaven. There are certain things that are leaven. You see the seriousness of these things here, "Fornicators, a covetous (or an avaricious man), an idolater, a railer..." A lot of...I've found over the years, there's a lot of brethren bandy about the word "railer". They charge a person that they don't like, or has withstood their flesh, and they say, "He's a railer!" It really is needed is a good publication on what railing really is. It's so easy to strike at another person with words, you know, when you really don't know yourself what they mean. And idolaters, extortioners, and so forth – it's this kind of thing. You notice murders aren't here. You wouldn't keep a murderer in the meeting. A man commits a murder, I mean a deliberate murder, and you keep him in the meeting because it's not written here? No. This is not a list. It's some samples of the kind of things for which a person is put out.

Is there any thoughts to be expressed, or questions on this thus far?

SJ: I have a thought. There's something in nature, right, something that's leavened – like I think of a bread or like, uh...beer, or wine. Is there any way that can be unleavened in nature? It's was just a thought on... Or is it, once... is it sort of like... What I was thinking is, does it have to... would it have to be like a work of God to change that from being leavened? I mean, can you separate leaven from dough once it's been in dough, or from wine once the wine's been fermented? Can you change it?

With bread if you knew it was only in one end, I mean, you could cut it out, but you see...

SJ: Right.

This is just an analogy here, that it's using it this way. And the force of it really is, is not how far it has spread yet, but whether it's tolerated there so as to change the character of the lump from an unleavened lump to a leavened lump. And it's not looked at as if the presence that...the fact that some, what we call leaven, sin of leaven has arisen amongst the saints. It's that which leavens the lump, but it's really the toleration of it. "Purge it out, that ye may be a new lump." In other words, to maintain your new lump character. Not to **become** one. It doesn't say "become"...that ye may become a new lump. If it had said that, that would have [implied] that they had been already leavened, right? If it said, "Purge it out that ye may **become** a new lump," that would have implied that the fact that this occurred... And you know, there's hardly an assembly that can be free of that. We'd be... Everybody would have to say, "I wonder if their leavened, and this leaven..." No,

no, that isn't it. But the fact that it rises up is the fact of the indifference to it, because if it said, "No, well, he's such a nice brother..." See? And this B.W. Newton said, "Oh no. Oh, he's such a nice man." Or these people that want to come under from him – Oh, they're such sweet people. That really has nothing to do with it in God's sight. The question is – Is it leaven or not? And if it's leaven, that's it. So purge it out that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened in Christ – answer to what ye are in Christ. Now let's suppose now that they hadn't put him out. Now what? If they had said, "No Paul, we're not going to do it." You think Paul would say, "Oh, that's alright." No. If they had to purge it out in order to be a new lump, the failure to purge it out would mean they would no longer be a new lump. We need to have that clear in our minds. There's a consequence of disobedience to this apostolic order to purge it out. If they had to purge it out to **be** a new lump, then the non-purging of it would mean they would not be a new lump any longer. They wouldn't maintain that new lump character. They wouldn't answer to their unleavened position in Christ. See? That wouldn't affect ones position in Christ. Even this man, it turns out he was a believer, because he was restored. So this raises a question, because it says, "If any man called a brother." It doesn't say, "If a brother do it..." It says, "If any man **called** a brother..." See now, 'cause it raises a question right away – is that one really the Lord's? It turns out he was the Lord's. Did that change his standing in Christ then what he did? No. But he wasn't answering to it. He was leavened and therefore had to be put out of the assembly that the assembly might not be leavened. This is that awful exclusive doctrine about leaven leavening the lump! And that's what's meant when it says in a magazine, "Exclusivism is wrong." No. Exclusivism is right. It's taught in the Word of God. And this is far from the only place where this is taught. It's taught on an individual level too, and... Take Second John, for example. "If any man goes forward and abides not in the doctrine of Christ..." (That's talking about therefore about a professed Christian.) "...greet him not, for he that greets him is made a partaker of his wicked works. Many years ago I wrote to an O.B. leader, Edwin Fresh, and I said...quoted that verse to him, said, "What do you say?" "Well," he says, "he's made a partial partaker of his wicked works." Do you see what he did? He threw the word "partial" partaker. It doesn't say "partial"! He was forced by the verse to admit there was something to it, but he was still wanted to play it down, he threw the word "partial"...he's a "partial" partaker. That doesn't say he's a partial partaker. "If any man goes forward and abides not in the doctrine of Christ, greet him not, for he that greets him is a **partaker** of his wicked works. Doesn't say he's a partial partaker. And it doesn't say that the person that did this agreed with him. It's not a question of the person imbibing the doctrine. It's the showing of fellowship in some form with this wickedness. God says, "You are therefore constituted a partaker of the wicked works." This is that awful exclusive doctrine! That association with leaven leavens a person. And it's taught in the Word of God. We don't have time to go into this. We could spend a couple of hours going over the scriptures. And we've been carrying a series in the past on that in Precepts too about association with evil defiling. It's taught right from Genesis through Revelation. This teaching is warp and woof because it's consistent with God's own nature as light. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness" at all. And we're not to have fellowship, it says, "with the unfruitful works of darkness." And this man was committing a work of darkness – his sin. That's looking at the work from a different standpoint. Here it's leaven, but it is also one of those works of darkness. And we're not

to have fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. It's clear in the scripture. Well, what's about the attitude that says, "Well, I can break bread with one who's committing works of darkness. That doesn't leaven me. That doesn't defile me." Such a person has no concept of what fellowship really is, according to the Word of God. He's got some...it's like a buddy-buddy thing that's been substituted for genuine Christian fellowship. It's a fake kind of a fellowship. It's impure. And it's not according to God's nature as light at all to treat those things in that way. But you see, that makes for a nice wide path. And I can move in and out where I want. And there's numbers of persons who have a gift from the Lord too, and they're abusing their gift that way. But they make a bigger audience for their gift. See? And they move in and out of all sorts of things, and don't pay any attention to their responsibility as to what they're linking themselves with when they do that.

Now. "Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they that eat of the sacrifice in communion with the altar?" So here's the adulterer, he's partaking. He's in communion with the altar. Is that the same altar I'm in communion with? And we're not having communion together in this? I'm a partaker, and therefore in communion with the altar. He does it, and he's in communion with the altar. You see, in Israel, those things did happen. And that has it's own place, but the principle of it is wrong. And when we bring this to the spiritual level, as it is in the new testament, that's not tolerated(? 30:42) at the Lord's table. So yes, we are having fellowship together with the others that are doing this likewise and we make ourselves one with them. And isn't it so that we saw that by partaking of the loaf, we're declaring that we're one body with the others that do it? I'm declaring I'm one body with this person that the apostle Paul said, "He's wicked! Put him out! He's not to partake any more. Put him out away from among yourselves." And as Mr. Kelly has well shown, that means from the Lord's table, and our table at home too. So this teaching is connected with the Lord's table.

SH – I just wanted to say, Scott, earlier you were looking for a parallel between the working of yeast in nature and the way that it's referenced here, and I think the parallel is this: It's not that in a loaf of bread, in dough that you have put leaven, it's not that you cut it out, it's that you apply fire. And that stops the working of that leaven. It's when you put it in the oven, the leaven is killed. And the fire speaks of righteousness and judgment. And so, it's not an actual physical cutting that is the parallel, it's that righteous judgment is applied here by the assembly, even as in a loaf of bread you stop the working of that leaven by putting it in the fire.

Yeah, and that would be judgment.

SH – Right.

And that's what it says at the end of the chapter. "Do ye not judge them that are within..." "Oh," they say, "No wait a minute now. The Lord said, 'Judge not that ye be not judged'." Oh, there's just so much dust and fog and storm and fume and fury that's brought against this so-called exclusive's teaching. But it says it here in black and white, "Do ye not judge them that are within?" In that sphere? "God judges them that are

without.” So...and that’s another subject as to how that applies in the day of ruin, but we’re looking at this principle of the thing that that which is within the assembly, the assembly is responsible to judge. Yeah, and fire is a good analogy as dealing with it. So here this person would have to be put out.

“I wrote unto you in an epistle...” just to tie this up just a little more, then on to something... “I wrote to you in an epistle, not to company with fornicators.” That means at home, at your own table too. “Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world.” He’s not talking about a worldlump fornicator. We might have to work with them. We might have one who’s working for us. We might have one who’s working next to us. You see. He’s talking...Paul said, “I’m talking about Christians here. I’m not talking about fornicators of the world, because,” he says, “because then you’d have to go out of the world!” Yeah. If it meant every fornicator, we’d have to leave the world to escape it. He’s not talking about that. He’s talking about our sphere of responsibility, which is for our associations, assembly-wise – what we are having fellowship with. And that’s what we have to do.

Alright. Now to come back to the question – What about if Corinth had refused to put the person out? I would say they would no longer be a new lump. It says, “A little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump.” That means that if 99 persons...if there were 100 people in that meeting and this one man remained in there, and they said, “No Paul, we’re not going to do that,” there are now 100 people leavened. They’re leaven is not that they did the same wickedness; their leaven is an indifference to what the holy demands of having Christ in the midst requires. The Lord and leaven can not go together. Now every little thing that disturbs us in the meeting is not leaven. You know those bean trees that have those long beans on them and those big leaves? Now I...maybe...I don’t want to offend anybody if you love those trees...I don’t particularly like them, but those trees have a right to exist. They’re part of God’s creation. I wouldn’t go and plant one on my property, but I don’t go around cutting everybody’s bean tree down. They have a right to exist! You see? And that’s like personalities. We all have different personalities, you know? And sometimes these personalities rub, and we might not like a particular personality so much, just like I don’t like a bean tree. Does that mean that that person’s evil?! Of course it doesn’t! A bean tree isn’t evil, it’s different. Alright? So we’re going to have different personalities in the meeting. There was a brother out in Enola (sp? 35:33), he was telling me how he has a little lapidary (?) machine, and he has a motor that spins this. He puts oil in there. You know oil is a type of the Holy Spirit. And he goes and take all of these jagged stones, and he puts them in there. He says, “Oh, I let them down there and tumble for two months.” Oh, you want to see them when they come out. They’re all so nice and smooth. But see in the assembly you’ll have to knock off some of our sharp edges, you know, because we have to live with one another. It’s nice to make a little adjustment for other people too, because I know our personalities are all different. And I know my personality rubs numbers of people the wrong way. I’m aware of that, and I make some effort, even though you don’t think so. It’s very hard to change our own personality, it really is. Right? And so why does the scripture say that we are to forebear with one another, if there is nothing to bear with? Oh! to have that perfect assembly so I could go over there and spoil it. And I’d be the one just to spoil it, you see, because I

wouldn't fit in with all those perfect ones there. And perfect, of course, is that everyone has the same personality that I do. And everybody looks at every last little detail or thing, exactly the way I do. And then we're going to have peace and prosperity in the assembly, right? No, I don't believe that either. But the assembly is God's school, and we never get out of God's school all our life to learn. You want to make a difference between leaven, and a lot of other things that there might be in the assembly that... and it may call for some forbearance on our part. And there's nothing wrong with us having to learn forbearance. And in fact I think God delights that we should learn some forbearance. And he's given through his apostles injunction to bear with one another. And He puts us together, that we can do some bearing with one another. And so that the graces of Christ might come out of us, by coming into exercise that way – to bear, and to forebear. And we can pray for one another, right? But not everything that comes up is leaven, or somebody looks at me cross-eyed, and it's leaven. Or I happened to get jammed in my ribs as I walked out – that doesn't mean that brother is...he did that deliberately. Why would I suppose that? You know? There's a lot of things where we can take a humble attitude about ourselves and about our brethren and learn to swallow some things, as they say, you know? Children in a family – they have to get used to each other too, right? Sometimes there's some little things that go on that aren't wickedness. So it's...I wanted to emphasize – it's just important. And you know, I know you brethren here have been charged with leaven. You know how I know that? You've been charged with being leavened here numbers of times, and maybe more times, and you don't even know about it. And I'll tell you how I know about it. I know about it from Frank Marotta, because he knows about it, because he's tried to be of some help to someone who makes all those kind of charges repeatedly over nothing. And demanded proof. And there was no proof forthcoming! And gave maybe some light, at different occasions, but now Frank says, after all that labor for three years, "I have to say that, in the end, I was not a help." And that's the way it is. And meanwhile, while we are subjected to those things, it may be that the Lord has allowed this, because something can be learned. And that's the way we grow, through these pressures. And what did the Psalmist say about pressure? There's a very good verse, and it's so hard to learn. He says, "In pressure, thou hast enlarged me." Now I think there's a law in gases, called Boil's law, that has to do with decreased volume as things are brought under pressure. And in the spiritual realm, things don't necessarily work the way they do in the natural realm. And with pressure, it doesn't follow Boil's law, because the Psalmist says, "In pressure thou has **enlarged** me." And in nature, pressure **diminishes**. But the sad thing is, is that there are Christians get diminished under pressure, and that's very sad. And the reason is, is that they're not in the secret of the Psalmist, because if we maintain communion with the Lord, and feels things as the Lord feels them, (and we have the support of His sympathy in situations in which we are), then we take it to the Lord, because there isn't anything that He hasn't gone through in some way, and far worse. And what He went through for us in atonement for us, we may never follow Him there, but He's called us to walk in His path. And He's felt things. And because of His holy soul, He has felt things as none other could. Just as a by-thing, I just want to mention: Somebody in the meeting that was just come into fellowship, he said to me, "I don't understand why the Lord would pray, 'Not My will, but Thine'? Why did he say, 'Father'..." about this thing...about the cup...How did that get put...about the drinking of the cup, and that He shrank from it. "How could that be,

being who He was?" Do you know what the answer to that is? Part of the perfection of His person. He wouldn't have been the Holy, Perfect One, if He had not shrunk from being made sin. Can you imagine the Holy One having before Him to be made sin, and not shrinking in absolute horror from it? In infinite horror, because He was infinite in His being. And He could feel that in an infinite way. We don't feel things like the Lord did. That was a horror to be made sin! It was completely contrary to His holy nature as God. And in manhood, He shrunk from it. And he imparted all the value of His divine being to that act that...those words, words that came out of His human mouth, "Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." And I said to this brother, "If the Lord had not shrunk from it, it would have shown that He was not the Holy Perfect One, that he was," because it was absolutely in accordance with His holy character to be shrunk from...to shrink from sin, and give expression to the horror of it before His father. He, "Well, thank you," that made clear sense to him. See? He's the Holy One. So the Lord Jesus, you know, He feels things in a way much more than we can feel them. And He's passed through this awful scene that we pass through, but he passed through as the Holy One, and therefore He felt everything in a way that we couldn't possibly approach to. But we can go to Him with everything. And He's there in the glory. And He has sympathy with our infirmities – not our sinful tendencies. The apostle Paul says, "I will glory in my infirmities." Infirmities are weaknesses. We may be tired and oppressed by the enemy. Was the Lord oppressed by the enemy? Oh, indeed He was. What a horrible thought – the suggestion of Satan to Him, that He should depart from the will of God. See, He felt these things, as we don't feel them. So we can go to Him with all of those things. And we can bear and forbear with one another, you know, as to many things. And certainly there are many many things like that, that don't raise any question of leaven, whatsoever. But on leaven? When it's determined to be a leaven, then there has to be an uncompromising stand on the part of all the saints with respect to it. "You have approved yourselves clear in the matter."

Alright, now...we have enough time to finish this – what I have before me. Now supposing that Corinth did not put the man out – they would not be a new lump, and therefore they would all be leavened. Not because they did the act, but because of that unholy indifference to the honor of the Lord Jesus who is in the midst. That's a leavened attitude. They're all leavened. And now, Corinth, just ignoring the apostle Paul, writes some brother a letter of commendation, and he comes on up to...comes up to Ephesus. Now what is Ephesus supposed to do? Well Ephesus might say, "Oh well we believe in local autonomy! We believe in independency of assemblies!" Oh, well, then they have a different loaf, you see, then the other assemblies, because two loaves (or more) broken in separation do not confess that we are one loaf. So now, what are they going to do? "Oh," they say, because they are Open Brethren they say, "No, each independ...each meeting is independent and judges for itself and do you?...you didn't do that incest anyway, did you? No. Well then we can receive you, as long as you didn't do it." Well what about the fact that he's coming from a leavened lump? A little leaven, leavens the whole lump. The **whole** lump. And Mr. A was part of the lump, and Mr. A is leavened. He comes up to the next assembly now with some letter, or maybe their so loose, they don't even want a letter. He's leavened. And when they receive him, what are they receiving? That's that awful exclusive doctrine! You see? And it's found in the scripture. It's the truth of the

one body! The saints at Ephesus and Colossi are one body in Christ, but... They're in a particular locality, but they're each giving expression to the truth that they are one body. They're at the same table. There's only one Lord's table. They're on the same ground of gathering. It's the same Lord Jesus.

Now suppose a different case. A man is put out at Corinth, and so he's complaining about he was unjustly dealt with. And he goes up to Ephesus. Now we're not talking about Mr. A, we're talking about the one who was guilty of the thing. He goes now...he's been put out, and he goes up there, and he wants to be received. And now what? What should they do there? "Oh," they say, "well, we're an independent assembly here and we don't feel so strict about that sort of thing, so we receive you." Now at Corinth they said, "Well, you know, the Lord Jesus is in our midst, and we have the apostolic direction and the power of the Lord Jesus is here so we put the man out." And up at Ephesus, they're going to receive this man and they say, "Yeah, the Lord Jesus is in our midst too." And you know what? It's a different Lord Jesus. And you know why he's a different Lord Jesus up there? Because the Lord Jesus up there would act the same as the Lord Jesus down here in Corinth. There must be two Jesus's...or more. I tell you brethren, this looseness in divine things has a lot of ramifications that most people don't seem to sit down and think through because they're not interested in their responsibility. They want to enjoy certain Christian privileges unrestrained by their responsibilities that they have, because every Christian truth that is true of us in Christ demands a practice down here in our responsibility. But the tendency of our selfish hearts is to want to take some blessing, or even an imagined blessing, and get the good of it, and participate in it, without it being guided by the truth of our responsibility that flows from what we are in Christ. And so if the Lord Jesus directed that this man be put out here, and they acted on it, how **dare** any other assembly receive that man and say that they're receiving him in the name of the Lord Jesus. That borders on blasphemy! That's making a different Lord Jesus than the one that's down there in Corinth. I wonder if that's clear to us all. We have to...if we're gathered to the Lord's name we have to act on these things. These were the truths of being gathered to the Lord's name that were recovered last century. That's what the brethren acted on. That's what the Open Brethren division was all about! We neither receive that wicked man, Mr. Newton, nor do we receive anyone coming from his ministry who holds the same things, or similar things, or some of it, nor do we receive anybody who doesn't imbibe his doctrine but says, "Oh he's a fine man, and I'm free to have fellowship with him when I want to." And they might say, "Well I won't on an assembly basis, but I'll just do it as an individual." No. Second John blocks the individual. There it's a lady – the elect lady who's in her house. His sister is told, "If any man goes forward and abides not in the doctrine of Christ, greet him not, for he that greets him is made a **partaker** of his **wicked works**." And of course there, it's doctrine. Now if we went over to Galatians, we won't...we find there, not an elaboration like here – we have the principle here, sufficient for it. Over there, it says it in connection with doctrine, because doctrine is the issue. Galatia was a province. There were many assemblies in Galatia, and Paul wrote to the Galatians. That included many assemblies, and he told them there, in connection with doctrine, "a little leaven leavens the whole lump." Now I'm going to make a statement. Leavenous doctrine is worse than this. And even the world would reject that idea, and most Christians would reject that idea. And

why do I say that doctrine is worse – leavenous doctrine? Because the scripture says, “If the foundations be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?” Do Christians, in general, claim that this incestuous person got light from God to do this? No. He doesn’t even claim that. What do they say about their blasphemous doctrines? What did the brethren say who supported Mr. Raven? “Oh! This is new light! This is new light from God!” And this is the thing about blasphemous doctrine – it makes God the author of it! It says that God is the author of this teaching! That’s why wicked teaching is worse than moral evil, because, in general, moral evil does not say, “Well God is the source of it.” But these teachers say, “Oh this is light I have gotten from God.” And they make God the author of these blasphemies against His Son! And that’s why it’s more wicked, because it has that character and it shakes the foundations of our faith! Now that Christ of Mr. Raven was not the Christ I find in the Bible – that he’s not the Eternal Son? That he’s not the Eternal Word? That he’s not essentially the Eternal Life from all eternity in his own divine person? That he brought was of the essence of humanity from heaven with him down here?! And that he didn’t have a human soul and human spirit? What kind of a Christ is this? This is not the Christ of God at all. This is not the confession of Jesus Christ come in the flesh. And these men all said, “Well this is new light.” You see what they were doing? They were making God the author of those blasphemies against the Son. And the scripture says, “If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?” And that is foundation truths that he was attacking. The fundamental truths of the person of Christ and of the incarnation and of His... not a denial of the tri-une beings but of His relationship eternally in the Godhead. It’s just all wiped out by this man. AND for...he died in 1905. He was teaching this in 1890, when the Bexhill assembly wrote to Greenwich that was sheltering him and said, “We’re not having fellowship with Mr. Raven, and YOU for sheltering him, any longer.” And the division took place. And these certain men that were...they went in, (and of course there were additional ones), and they left in 1908 over an ecclesiastical matter, not the repudiation of Mr. Raven and they pretended that they were gathered to the Lord’s name all along and they called themselves exclusives. And all the while they were a leavened lump, because they were in fellowship with Mr. Raven and his supporters and his teachers. And they don’t want to hear this, I can tell you. They don’t want to hear this. They don’t want to hear this today in England, many of these Glantons. And they were called Glantons because the problem took place at a town named that. And that’s where...it was an ecclesiastical matter. They never repudiated Mr. Raven. They don’t like to hear it that Mr. Raven taught these things. They want to say, “No, James Taylor developed them **after** 1908. After we left.” So for 18 years they were in fellowship with Mr. Raven and they were not leavened? Of course they were leavened! The Raven fellowship is to this day – every one of them – they’re leavened by this blasphemous teachings against the person of Christ. And personally, I don’t want anything to do with that sort of thing. I want no fellowship with it, and...at the Lord’s table. And so, and what happened in 1974? I was gathered to the Lord’s name in 1963. What happened in 1974? The Glanton group, who had united with Booths over in this country – the Glanton group and the Kelly Lowe Continental group united on the ground that both groups were all the time gathered to the Lord’s name. I don’t believe that for a moment. And I didn’t have that benefit when I was gathered. And Tom Knapp, when we left, that night he came and he wanted to see me and he arranged a secret meeting up in Connecticut by a brother who wouldn’t tell on him. And we sat for four

hours and discussed this. And he said to me, “Roy if you’re right...” (this was before the Glanton reunion), “Roy, if you’re right, how come the Lord showed you that, and the Lord didn’t show it to me.” Now how am I supposed to answer a question like that? I can’t answer a question like that XXX(54:13) What? What am I going to say? I thought of only one thing to say to the dear brother. I loved him so much. He had been so often in my home. He was in the Lord’s work, you know? And I said, “Tom, maybe if you tell me why it took forty years for the children of Israel to get from Egypt to Canaan when it’s only an 11 days journey, we might have the answer to that.” And I left it at that. But 1974 came, and dear Tom, he couldn’t swallow that one. He knew that the Glantons were in a wicked association. He did not believe at that time that there was one expression of the one body. He believed that all these various companies were gathered to the Lord’s name. But **that** he could not swallow and he **left** the Lord’s work and became a painter. Now Tom, my brother Tom is a **very** capable man, I can tell you. He’s a very very bright man and he has a lot of instruction in the Word of God. He could be of great help on principles, and giving the Lord’s word forth. So ultimately Tom was gathered XXX (55:32) too, see. He sees things differently now. But I thank God that when it came to that, he saw clearly, no matter what he felt about unions and everything – **that** one was absolutely not acceptable because no way can it be consented to that the Raven remained on divine ground as gathered to the Lord’s name. When Bexhill separated from Greenwich...you say, “How do you know that? How do you have the nerve to say where the Lord is or isn’t.” By the divine principles. I know that the Lord is not where leavened is tolerated in the midst. With the power of our Lord Jesus Christ. No Lord Jesus Christ with His power is going to remain in assembly like Corinth if they refused to obey the apostle, who was appointed by Christ to tell them this – to direct them to put that leaven out. They would have been a leavened lump. And the assembly at Greenwich in 1890, a large meeting, influential men, F.E. Raven’s home meeting. They were no longer gathered to the Lord’s name. “**Where** two or three are gathered together unto My name,” is conditional. And we find out that the condition is, you’ve got to be met on the ground of the one body. “When ye are gathered together and my spirit with you, **with** the power of our Lord Jesus Christ,” is implying His presence in the midst of Corinth, that He acts through the gathered saints to purge the leaven and put it on the outside of the assembly to maintain the cleanliness of God’s house, because God’s order has to be carried out there. And Bexhill acted for the Lord. They had the power of the Lord Jesus in their midst to separate from this evil. And all assemblies that remained on divine ground acknowledged that Bexhill acted for the Lord and complied with it, and bowed to it, because the Lord Jesus up in the next town is not going to act different than the Lord Jesus did in Bexhill. And two loaves and ten, broken in separation don’t confess that we’re one loaf. And those that remained on the divine ground of gathering, they continued to partake of that one loaf. There’s only one loaf. That’s where the Lord’s table was. You can’t tell me that the Lord’s table was at Greenwich any more, where the wickedness was in the midst and they were sheltering this blasphemer against Christ. He was setting up a false Christ, and a false worship really. It’s really such wickedness! He’s one of the worst offenders against the person of Christ that has arisen in church history. I don’t know a lot about...exhaustively about church history, but I know some of those doctrines... and he took from this one, and from that one, and from that one, and combined all these blasphemies together into this system. Mr. Kelly said, “He had a

mission from an unclean spirit.” You know Mr. Kelly was not...was in the Kelly group. That took place in 1881. There were even some amongst the gathered saints that contacted him and said, “Give some help on the subject!” And he wrote a masterpiece. And you’ll find it in his book, “F.E.R. Heteradox” on the person of Christ and the union of the two natures in Him. And he said “Apolonairus,” who taught this, this ancient heretic, he “was justly branded an antichrist and a heretic.” And he was meaning that...he didn’t put it right to Raven, but he was meaning that. If Apolonairus was justly branded an antichrist and a heretic, so was Mr. Raven. And these brethren – they’re all in fellowship with this man for 18 years and then they form the Glanton company, and then they reunited with the KLC’s in 1974. Oh, I’m happy I was out even before that happened. Oh, what an awful time that would have been, to go through all of that. Poor Tom went through that. I know a Baptist man, I couldn’t say positively, I love that dear brother, he had come in amongst the Grants before 1953 and he got into all of this. He went into a nervous breakdown at that time. He wasn’t the only one. And I do have some letters that I know he was withstanding it. He didn’t want any part of it! He knew that they were blasphemers! I don’t mean the Glantons, although they’ve had it arise. That teaching keeps popping up. And Joe Pascoe left the Glantons because they were harboring some people in the meeting who were denying the eternal Sonship. We have to be very careful the reasons why we leave an assembly. We’d better have God’s mind for it, because you know what? We could end up right back there again. That’s where he is today. Things haven’t changed. You know, dear brethren, only God can preserve us. We can’t preserve ourself. And it isn’t the truth that just preserves us but God uses the truth. But we have to have that personal affection for the Lord Jesus and value God’s Christ above everything else. Numbers don’t matter. If you want numbers, go to the church of Rome, they’ve got so many. Right? What did that brother say?...Smith...not Jimmy Smith...the other one...Eric Smith... They told him down in South America, “Why don’t you come with us?” He says, right? “We have thousands in the United States,” you know, and he says, “Do you have more of Christ than we do?” Christ is where two or three are gathered together unto His name. And that is the most valuable thing, no matter how much the weakness, no matter how much we get mocked. And we don’t have to hold our heads up, you know. We have nothing to hold our heads up. But we can thank God for His grace for His preservation thus far. See these...we’re done now...these subjects are all...we haven’t exhausted them. These subjects are all inter-related, you see. There’s a whole scope of truth and there’s a lot more to this subject yet. There’s a whole scope of truth connected with these...these things. And leaven leavens the lump. And I hope we understand it doesn’t mean that the leaven has to go through the whole thing so that everybody’s doing it, but if it’s tolerated there, once it’s known to be tolerated, the lump is leavened. And the Lord Jesus is not in the midst where the lump is leavened. He departs. Just like in Israel when the glory cloud, (Ezehiel saw it in vision), it lifted up and it left. And they said...one said once in connection with the ark, “The glory is departed.” And we go on with the form and it all seems so nice and we’re looking perhaps like the real thing and we have a feast that’s devised in our own heart like the feast at Jerusalem, like Jeroboam did, you see. You say, “Wow, that’s hard talk! You know? Who do you think you are?” I’ll tell you who I think I am. I’m nobody. But Christ is everything. And if we don’t value a **true** Christ, what are we valuing?