
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<https://books.google.com>





4135.aa.50.

A Simple, Plain Reply

TO

“A SECOND FAMILIAR” BUT CALUMNIOUS
“CONVERSATION

ABOUT THE

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

BY W. T. HENDERSON.”

“*Blessed are ye, when men shall REVILE YOU, and PERSECUTE YOU, and shall say ALL MANNER OF EVIL against you FALSELY, for my sake.*”—*Matt. v. 11.*”

A. Well, my friend *B.*, what do you think of this second attack of the Baptist Minister on Brethren? The first seemed filled with puerile, untruthful slander, and this with virulent, untruthful abuse.

B. I am amazed how any one calling himself a preacher or minister of the Gospel could lend himself to the propagation of such utter and baseless tirades against the people of God. It is to be feared that judicial blindness, and a seared conscience, have seized hold of our friend the Baptist minister.

A. Mr. H. need have no fears about the anger of Brethren for being called a sect, for except for the truth's sake, Brethren do not care a straw what they are called; but remark, while the Baptist minister uses the most silly epithets against Brethren, on this point, he does not even once combat a single truth in the tracts he is opposing, which plainly prove from Scripture that Brethren are not a sect, having not even one of the elements that constitute a sect, while they equally prove that the Baptist Society is palpably and undeniably a sect.

B. It is natural to all to impute to others whatever is true



of themselves is equally true of others, we therefore only wish him as little anger as we have ourselves, and that is none at all. If we have effected no other good towards the Baptist minister, I trust we have at least improved his morals. The false prophet used to wear a rough garment to deceive, and our friend has worn a Wesleyan cloak to deceive, but now he has put it off.

A. As in the first tract, so in this; contradictions of the most remarkable kind abound. Mr. H. says our object to break up the churches "is *plainly avowed*," while he quotes Dr. Winslow, as saying that our object is "a deeply laid scheme;" and, yet, only two lines lower down the Dr. says, "the design is palpable and apparent." How can a thing be deeply laid, and at the same time be palpable and apparent? Men, that alas! have no truth before their eyes, but mere calumny and abuse, are always sure to fall into the most childish contradictions, for they really know not what they are saying; to heap slander upon slander is all they seem to care about; truth and the fear of God seem to have vanished from their minds.

B. But are you aware that Dr. Winslow's pamphlet was written eighteen years ago, and that a lady, one of those whom the Baptist minister calls silly women, answered it, and so ashamed was the Dr. of the grossness and misstatements he had been betrayed into that he set aside seventeen pages of his first pamphlet, and from the very part that he was ashamed of, and set aside, persons of the Baptist minister's spirit continue to quote against Brethren; and, as far as I am informed (for I could not procure the book, it being long ago out of print), the Baptist minister himself has quoted from the same that, as I have said, the writer himself was ashamed of. How remarkable and sorrowful it is that the man who so shamefully abused Brethren should himself leave his own flock, as they are called, to be scattered and rent as they were, and are, and go to a place of greater respectability, as it is called, and emolument, the moment such baits were offered. To me the calumny and abuse of men with little conscience, and great desire for office, *place* and *gain*, are an honour to Brethren instead of anything else. It is also remarkable that at Leamington, where the Dr. had written against Brethren, they have had many added to them, and gone on happily and unitedly to this day.

A. And is not Rust's case even worse? Think of a

man who professed to be an intelligent Baptist minister, becoming a clergyman and holding baptismal regeneration, with all the other Popish things in the Prayer Book; and these are the men that our Baptist minister quoted from. One would think he ought to be ashamed to quote their foolish abusive language about Brethren.

B. We are next introduced to J. Cox, Baptist minister: what do you think is the worth of this man's abuse of Brethren, when he himself can quote such language as this from "Goodwin," and say, "it is substantially in agreement with the pure word of God." J. Cox quotes from Goodwin, these words, "The curse seized upon Christ, when he was made flesh, and began to break out upon him, in the spots of *human infirmities* in making him all over *like* sinful flesh." The Baptist minister who quoted and agrees with language such as this, I, for one, am glad to be abused by. Mr. H. speaks of the *wickedness* and error of Brethren, but offers no proof whatever; but, here, none will deny, we have the fullest and most open *proof* of both wickedness and error against the Lord Jesus himself, quoted by a Baptist minister. (Letter to the Rev. J. Cox. London: Morrish.)

A. In the next individual brought forward for rancour against Brethren, we see the Baptist minister's errors, but I will not say wickedness. We have Mr. H. giving an attorney's or lawyer's-clerk the title of Dr., no doubt to give him some importance: this man was put away, a few years ago, from Brethren, and since then, anything like his violence, evil speaking, and shocking conduct, it would be difficult to find a parallel to. The untruthfulness of the story he quotes about the party whom his informant says was seized by the throat, is palpable. The person spoken of served as a soldier in India, and by a spent ball was struck on the head and became all but deranged; this man wanted to force himself into the offices of a Brother, where Christians were in the habit of meeting to talk over business matters, and was not allowed to do so. The Baptist minister in quoting, tells us that, "several sisters rushed out in great alarm, &c." What do you think of the amount of untruthfulness in the whole of this wretched story when I tell you *there never was a Sister at any one of those meetings*, which, as I have said before, were only held for business matters in the private offices of a Brother in the Lord. A further instance of the entire

untruthfulness of these quotations is found in the statement that "they pretend to be wholly led by the Spirit, whereas all things are arranged beforehand—who shall lecture, who shall pray, and who shall give out hymns." Every word of this is unmixed falsehood.

B. What do you think of the spirit of Dr. Carson's attack? It seems to me that the most superficial observer can see through it: popularity and notoriety, together with setting off his book on "the horse" seem to be his great aim; the advertisement of his horse forms a part of his tract, for you have it with *six commendations* as a finishing up to his senseless calumnies of Brethren in the last page of his pamphlet. This man has "wit in his anger;" but it is not difficult to discern what he is at, to finish up his vituperations with puffing off his book, and, of course, his profession, is worthy the writer of such scurrilous and untruthful abuse as he has indulged in, and from which one would have thought the Baptist minister would have shrunk from quoting. Any one who will only mark the language and spirit of Messrs. Culverhouse, Carson, and Henderson, will soon see *where they are, and what they are at and after.*

A. None will deny that evil may get in amongst God's children, both of a doctrinal and moral character. Brethren (as well as the various societies or sects of the day) are subject to these unhappy circumstances; and whenever this has been the case, they have dealt with the evil and put it out; in fact, the very rigid discipline of Brethren, more than anything else, has called out very much of this misrepresentation and untruthfulness; but these people who take up the gross statements of *excommunicated* and *interested* individuals have been answered again and again. Interested Baptist ministers who contend for pay, office, and place, have been answered, and some of them, as we have already said, eighteen years ago, and yet this ridiculous rubbish is taken up again in the most unchristian and dishonourable manner. How comes it, my good friend *B.*, that all this slander is brought up again by the Baptist minister just now, for Brethren have been meeting in this place for nearly nine years?

B. Oh! the reason is plain enough; a few of the Baptist minister's members, as he calls them, having left him, and taken their place with Brethren, he thinks nothing too bad or too gross to say and write against

them ; but we shall see, and perhaps, shortly, where all this will end.

A. Does it not strike you that Mr. H. repeatedly accuses Brethren, but without the least proof, of doing that which he himself is doing every week? He dreams about our using "unfair means" to attract persons to us ; the very thing he is constantly doing himself. Look at the worldly and fantastic subjects he selects and placards as Sunday Evening Lectures. Look at his "*Penny lectures*," placarded all over the town, for the purpose of catching the young. Think of a man, according to his own belief, called to and paid for preaching the Gospel, lecturing every week, on silly tales, out of story books and novels, and charging his hearers a penny each for listening to such trash : some who have heard him have told me that they were quite ashamed. Look at the placarding of "tea meetings," of anniversaries, and of noted personages for preaching, and say if all this is not to draw a congregation, and to get by all sorts of means an increase of members. The Baptist minister speaks of Brethren giving tracts, as if that were a crime ; but look at his unceasing weekly mode of circulating tracts ; he gets a label printed (and pastes it on the cover of every tract) in large letters, "Bridge Street Chapel," "Times of Service at the above Chapel," "Meetings, lectures, &c.," and at the bottom, in large letters, "William T. Henderson, minister." If this be not pressing, and pushing for a congregation, I know not what is.

B. The thing is plain enough ; we have all heard the saying, "You measure another man's corn by your own bushel." The man who can quote and copy such language towards God's children as "*Ecclesiastical vermin*," one would think could and would both write, say, and imagine anything, however abominable and vile against them ; and, indeed, this tract, as well as the former, fully proves it.

A. How true it is that when men will be learned, who are not, they are sure to fall into great errors and blunders, and even prove the very thing they are trying to disprove or set aside. Mr. Henderson tells us that *αγγελος* means a messenger, and having told us this he says, "Then there is not the *slightest idea* of travelling in the Word," and makes his friend George to reply, "Not the slightest." Is this the way a man calling himself a

minister of the Gospel tries to blind and deceive simple people? If this be not a most untruthful statement I know not what is. Who ever before heard that a messenger "*did not travel*;" or, that in the word messenger, "There is not the slightest idea of travelling," and even repeats, "not the slightest." Ah! unhappy man! is this the way you try to support your most unscriptural stationary one-man ministry? Did the first messengers not travel when from their Master's lips they received the command and the commission, "*Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature*? Did Paul, a messenger of the Gospel, not travel? Did Philip, the *εὐαγγελιστῆς* not travel? Is it not truly awful to see the plain Word of God so shamelessly set aside, and even common sense itself outraged? Who ever heard before that *a messenger did not travel!* See, now, how a gift, a wrong position, and an unscriptural office blind the mind. If this man were not what is called a minister, would he or could he have made such a statement? The very thing he tries to disprove, he proves, himself being his own judge. If you told a child that a messenger did not travel, and that there was not the least idea of travelling in the word messenger, "not the slightest," he would only smile in your face, and perhaps, say, you must go to school again.

B. I perfectly agree with you, *A.*, in what you have said; judicial blindness is evidently taking hold of many in these days, but we know how difficult it is to show man anything contrary to what is called his interest. In bringing forward again the two Greek words, double honour *διπλῆς τιμῆς* the Baptist minister cites Dr. Doddridge, but though this is an interested witness, all he attempts to say is "*Double honour seems only to express a plentiful maintenance according to what they needed, and the society could afford.*" This man is evidently in doubt of his own rendering, and well he may; and, therefore, he only uses the words, "*it seems to express,*" and then to show how little he knows of the subject he is writing about, he tells us that double honour means "*as much as the minister needed, and as the society could afford!*" Howson and Conybere are also cited, but in the same doubtful and modest manner, they only tell us that "*τιμῆς seems to imply the notion of reward;*" but mark the hardihood and boldness of the Baptist minister in his first tract, we have

no "*seems to express*," no "*seems to imply*," when he who is not a Greek scholar attempts to give the meaning of these Greek words, but at once he says "double honour" means "the most liberal support." Now, I suppose, all persons will admit that the true way to get at the meaning of a passage of Scripture, is to trace it out, and see where, and how often it occurs, comparing the text and context together; in a word, comparing Scripture with Scripture. This I have done in my former tract, to which I refer my reader. I quoted the word double in the only five instances in which it occurs, *and in not one of them* is there the slightest hint as to the support of a so called minister. The word honour occurs forty-three times in the New Testament, four of which instances we have in this 1st Epistle to Tim., but in none of the forty-three cases have we anything that *in the least* refers to paying a minister. Why did not Mr. Henderson go to the Word of God, instead of to the doubtful comments of Doddridge, Howson, Conybere, &c.? The reason is quite plain, because the Word of God condemns him. "Double honour, not pay, is the rendering of the Syriac, Aethiopic, Arabic, Latin, &c." But, alas! how the Baptist minister fulfils the very Scriptures, he tries to torture and twist, when his pay or his worldly interests are at stake. "A gift blinds the eyes of the wise."

A. Have you noticed how the charges brought against Brethren repel and contradict each other, proving plainly enough of what value or weight they are? Brethren are condemned for giving money by Rust as "*giving it with questionable intention*," while Carson condemns them for not giving money, and hints that they are misers," and calls them "narrow-hearted creatures" for not giving;—so that if they give money they are wrong, and if they do not give it they are wrong. And these are the kind of men that the Baptist minister must go to, to learn the *truth* about Brethren; and mark his plea for this, he wants to prove, he says, his assertions in his former tract, and what does he do but go to the interested bitter enemies of the Brethren, some of whom they had put away from amongst them, and quotes their openly false assertions, and thus by such false assertions, he thinks and says, he has proved his own openly false assertions too. This is, certainly, a novel way to prove his foolish statements. If assertion is not proof, what is *false assertion* worth?

B. Mr. W. T. Henderson tries to prove his ministerial position by quoting five cases, none of which, as I think, we shall see sanction in the least the unscriptural office he is placed in, as a Baptist minister. The first case he quotes is that of the appointment, by lot, of an apostle, Acts, i. Is he (Mr. H.) appointed by lot? Is he an apostle? If not, then, he has no warrant for his ordination here. Matthias, we all know, was appointed as and for an apostle, and he was chosen in a Jewish, not in a properly Christian manner of ordaining, for the day of Pentecost had not yet come; and the church had not really or formally been formed. Mr. H. has not then a single shred of warrant for his ordination here. It was not a one-man ministry over one society (which thing is never found in Scripture) that you see here, but an apostle to fill up the twelve in the room of Judas.

2. It seems singular that the Baptist minister should name this ordination of deacons as proving his own, for the opposite is exactly what it proves. The Baptist Society ordains Mr. H., or "calls," if you please, the minister to be their minister. I do not here speak of the equally unscriptural act of ministers' ordaining a minister. But in the appointing the deacons the church was not allowed to appoint them, but were told by the apostles to look them out, as it was a matter among themselves of money for the poor; and the apostles, *and not the church*, appointed them.

3. A man must be very hard run for proofs of his ministerial position when he cites the case of a messenger who was chosen by various assemblies of God's people, to take some money to those who were in distress. Just think of the state of ignorance this man must be in, as to Scripture, when he tries to make out that a man sent by the churches with a gift, is in principle the same as a "society choosing him to be their minister.

4. I really know not what to say or think of this Baptist minister. It is really awful to see him handling the Word of God as he does. In Acts, xiv. 6, 14, we see the apostles Barnabas and Paul in Licaonia, and when *they had ordained them elders* in every church, verse 23, they commended them to the Lord, &c. Now, here is precisely in every way the opposite of that which our friend Mr. H. quotes it for. It is *they*, the apostles, and *not* the church, that ordain elders, and in every church

too. Why did they not tell the churches to do this if it were right for the church to do it; and mark, it is a church, and not a society, we have here; and they are *elders* (many), and not one man called a minister, who are ordained.

5. The same ignorance is again manifested in the last quotation, "The apostles, and elders, with the whole church send two men to Antioch;" ergo, or therefore Mr. W. T. Henderson is scripturally educated, called, chosen, and ordained, over a Baptist society. Is this the way the Baptist minister explains and applies the Holy Scriptures of God?

Ah! my friend *A!* this is melancholy work; a man gets into a wrong anti-scriptural office, and then goes to work to try and make black white, and white black, in order to support his pretensions. I now put the following twenty-five facts before Mr. Henderson, taken from my tract, entitled, "Is the office or ministry of the Dissenting Minister to be found in the Scriptures?" And I ask him in no unkind spirit, but in faithfulness, to peruse them, and see, in the sight of God, if they are not true. I address him on his own ground, as a Baptist Preacher or Evangelist:—

1. The Baptist preacher receives a human preparation, or schooling for his office.

2. The Baptist preacher receives a human call.

3. The Baptist preacher goes through a human test or trial.

4. The Baptist preacher is received by a public vote.

5. The Baptist preacher is ordained by ministers.

6. The Baptist minister has his pulpit.

7. The Baptist minister confined to a particular sphere.

8. The Baptist preacher located in a particular town.

9. The Baptist preacher set over one particular so-called church.

10. The Baptist preacher has pew rents.

11. The Baptist preacher receives public collections.

1. The preacher of the New Testament was taught only by God the Holy Ghost.

2. The preacher of the New Testament was called of God only.

3. The preacher of the New Testament did not.

4. The preacher of the New Testament was not.

5. The preacher of the New Testament was not.

6. The preacher of the New Testament had not.

7. The preacher of the New Testament was not.

8. The preacher of the New Testament was not.

9. The preacher of the New Testament placed over no church.

10. The preacher of the New Testament had none.

11. The preacher of the New Testament received none.

12. The Baptist preacher receives weekly offerings.

13. The Baptist preacher receives funds even from the unconverted.

14. The Baptist preacher receives a settled or stated salary.

15. The Baptist preacher interferes with, and hinders the various gifts of the Spirit in the church, by what is called the one-man ministry.

16. The Baptist preacher presides at the Lord's-table, and no one but himself can "dispense the elements."

17. The Baptist preacher takes the place of head of the "members" who are under him.

18. The Baptist preacher has what are called *his* deacons with and under him.

19. The Baptist preacher claims by his position, almost exclusive right over the baptistry.

20. The Baptist preacher, only, baptises.

21. The Baptist preacher is led and guided by the human rules of the creature.

22. The Baptist preacher has a stated monthly "ordinance."

23. The Baptist preacher has such power over his pulpit and the chapel, that he can exclude another from preaching there.

24. The Baptist preacher frequently speaking or lecturing publicly on other than sacred subjects; as amusing tales or stories of various kinds.

25. The Baptist preacher, in a public manner, interfering and occupying himself with worldly politics.

12. The preacher of the New Testament did not.

13. The preacher of the New Testament, never.

14. The preacher of the New Testament had no salary.

15. The preacher of the New Testament preaches Christ, and interferes with none of the gifts of the Spirit in the assembly.

16. The preacher of the New Testament took no such place at the Lord's-table.

17. The preacher of the New Testament took no place of headship amongst believers.

18. The preacher of the New Testament had no deacons in connection with or under him.

19. The preacher of the New Testament claimed no such power.

20. The preachers of the New Testament and even the apostles exercised no such exclusive right.

21. The preacher of the New Testament had no human rules either to lead or guide him.

22. The preacher of the New Testament, when in the way of it, attended the Lord's Supper weekly and not monthly.

23. The preacher of the New Testament had no such power.

24. The preacher of the New Testament unceasing in preaching the truth and Gospel of God, concerning His Son, Jesus Christ.

25. The preacher of the New Testament never meddling with such things, but occupying himself solely with the truth as it is in Jesus.

4. I hope the Baptist minister may study the Scriptures more, and foolish tales, amusing stories, and untruthful slanderous attacks on Christians less; and, above

all, that he may study his own state and temper, and see whether he has only taken up a mere profession, without having undergone a real change or new birth. I am quite sure that any impartial, real Christian, who will carefully read his two tracts against Brethren, will and must feel that the writer shows himself much more like an unconverted than a converted man. Could a converted man compare Christians to pigs and vermin? I think not; and when a searching word was put to his conscience in my former tract, he took no notice of it, nor indeed has he answered anything in the tract; his best weapons, he thinks, are the lowest calumny and abuse, such as even what is called a poor fish woman ought not to use, neither the lowest grade in society. He tries and wants to appear learned, but if we are to judge of his learning or training, from his tracts, we have certainly a sad display of it.

B. In the face of what you have so plainly proved from Scripture, shall we say it is ignorance, or wilfulness, or untruthfulness, for this Baptist minister to tell us that the assemblies of God, spoken of in the New Testament, "Had officers, and possessed the power to elect them themselves;" that "no one was allowed to fill any office, save on the vote of the church;" just think of this statement, when neither apostle, prophet, pastor, teacher, evangelist, elder nor deacon, were in any instance ordained by the church. The lot spoken of in the 1st of the Acts, was before the church was formed, as we have already seen?

A. It would be well if Mr. H. would observe that being in his ministerial position, as a preacher, entirely opposed to the preacher of the New Testament, as you have so fully shown, his ministerial position is even yet more opposed to the ministry of the apostles, the prophet of the New Testament, the teachers, the pastors, the elders, and the deacons. In no instance in Scripture have we a preacher, or evangelist, as such, ordained by any man, be he an apostle or any other. The elders and deacons of Scripture were ordained *only* by apostles or their delegates, and never in one instance by a church or assembly of believers. The five other ministries, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, received no human ordination whatever, but received their commission, office, appointment or ordination, from the ascended Saviour:

as it is written, "When He ascended up on high * * He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." You observe we have neither elders nor deacons here, for they were ordained either by an apostle, or his delegate, but never, I repeat, by the church. The other five just named, were ordained by no one but the Lord Himself. Here, then, are the seven great ministries of the New Testament, but the Baptist minister's office is not found among them, for he has received his office from other so-called ministers, and his Baptist society; but none of the above were ordained, or called by a Baptist society, or any other society or sect. Mr. W. T. Henderson's ministry is, therefore, entirely unscriptural, for all know, or ought to know, that the day of Pentecost was the real commencement of the church; the lot was, therefore, never resorted to after the church was formed. Mr. Henderson, therefore, has not a single Scripture to support his office, his one-man ministry, his ordination, his pay, nor indeed anything else relating to his position as a so-called minister, or preacher. Is it any wonder that Christians are crying out that they are half-starved under the ministry of those that know almost nothing of Scripture?

B. Another untruthful assertion of the Baptist minister is that Brethren are of the opinion that "all such offices" as deacon, elder, &c., "have ceased." As usual, he does not even attempt to give any proof, and I would here remind Mr. H., that quoting our enemies' untruthful slanderous assertions, as he does, proves nothing except his taste for slander and abuse. Brethren *are not* of opinion that the offices of elder, deacon, or evangelist, have ceased; but they are not only of opinion, but are certain from the Word of God that the Baptist society has none of those offices or officers according to the Scriptures; but as has been abundantly proved already, the Baptist minister is no where seen or found in the New Testament, and the apostles ordained the deacons, and did not allow the assembly to do so.

A. The next statement of our Baptist minister is another proof of his sad ignorance of the Word of God: he says, "The alleged presidency of the Holy Ghost is a great delusion. Now I demand of the Plymouths one text of Scripture in which it is plainly stated that the Holy Ghost presides at the meetings of the Church." To preside is

“to be set over, to have authority over.” A president then, we may truly say, is one who rules, guides, and instructs an assembly. Now is not this precisely what the Holy Spirit does in God’s assembly, the Church. But as this man demands a plain Scripture, (and I commend him for demanding it, the only thing indeed in his tract I can commend him for,) let us give him not only a plain, but many plain scriptures for the presidency, guidance, and instruction of the Holy Ghost in God’s assembly, the Church.

1st.—The Holy Spirit was promised, not as an influence, but as individually to come and take the place of the absent Saviour, “It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send him unto you.” Here then we have “another comforter” sent in the place, and in the absence of the Lord—a real person—“Him,” and “when He the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth, and He will show you things to come.” Here then we have the guidance and the instruction of the One who was to come in the Lord’s absence, to abide or preside with and in the Lord’s children. But look at His position and definite presidency in Acts xiii. 2. Here were a number of God’s children gathered, and “as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the HOLY GHOST said, separate *me* Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I have called them.*” “So they, being *sent forth by the Holy Ghost*, departed unto Seleucia.” If the Holy Spirit does not take the president’s position here of governing, ruling, guiding, and instructing, there is no meaning in plain words, or far better, in plain Scripture language; in truth it is the Holy Spirit’s government you get in the Acts and the Epistles, and not the government of man; and this is the reason why our dispensation is commonly called the dispensation of the Spirit. Why do we see such marvellous effects on the day of Pentecost, but because the Holy Spirit had come in power and authority. And why are Ananias and Sapphira said to have lied to the Holy Ghost, but because He was in and among the assembly of God as president, governing and ruling? Look again at the rule or presidency of the Spirit in Paul’s work. Paul and Timothy “were *forbidden of the Holy Ghost* to preach the word in Asia.”—Acts xvi. 6. The government or presidency is nowhere more fully established than in 1 Cor.

xii. Here we have the Spirit giving "to one the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another faith," and various other extraordinary gifts . . . "*dividing to every man severally as He will.*" Thus, then, is the Holy Spirit the ruler or president of the Church, which He Himself has "baptised into *one body*," but while forming it into one body divides gifts to "every one," just as *He* will. Nothing can be plainer than the sovereign presidency of the Spirit; but alas, the Baptist society sets up man, or the minister, as president amongst them, and denies the presidency of the Holy Spirit, and thus the *office* of the minister is "Satan's substitute for the power and presidency of the Holy Ghost."

B. The untruthfulness of the Baptist minister, as to the world getting worse, is very palpable. In his first attack on Brethren he says, "They teach that the world '*religiously*,' is getting worse and worse, and that God has ordained that it shall get worse and worse every day." The question, therefore, raised by Mr. Henderson was whether the world, as affirmed by Brethren, would get '*religiously*' worse and worse. Brethren never stated that the world morally, commercially, and scientifically would get worse, but quite the opposite. Instead, therefore, of the Baptist minister honestly and uprightly sticking to his former assertion, that Brethren affirmed the world would get "*religiously*" worse and worse, he leaves out, in this second attack, the word "*religiously*," and says, "I see they do believe that the world will get worse and worse." Now this is doubly false, for they do not believe that the world, *except religiously* will get worse and worse, and they have never said so; and to leave out the word in dispute (*religiously*) gives a second false idea of the matter; but more than this, G. is made to state two other falsehoods about this matter: he says, Brethren "first deny, and then fully admit that the world will get worse and worse." Let the reader remember that Mr. Henderson's accusation was, that Brethren said the world would get *religiously* worse and worse. In my tract I fully proved from Scripture that the world would get religiously worse and worse, and Mr. H. does not attempt to combat, or controvert this, but most untruthfully states that I "first denied, and then fully admitted" that the world would get worse and worse. The conscience of this man almost makes me tremble. He seems as if he

would stick at nothing to pervert and distort the plainest truths. Might I ask Mr. H. to ask himself this question, Am I a converted man? A whole heap of false accusations, such as we find in his two tracts, look very unlike the new birth.

A. The Baptist minister's quotation of R. Hall's light, trifling, profane allusion to prophecy is very awful. I would quote for him the apostle Peter's solemn, beautiful words, and hope he may ponder *them* more than the irreverent remarks he quotes for us. Peter says, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto *ye do well that ye take heed*, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, *until the day dawn*, and the day star arise in your hearts."

B.—How strange it is to see a so called minister quote untruths from the slanderers of Brethren, as if they would have any weight with an upright man. "*A writer in the Record*," Mr. H. tells us, declares that he never recollects in one instance "confession of sin" being made by Brethren. But what will this writer in the Record say, and what will the Baptist minister say when I inform them both that Brethren have meetings expressly and purposely for confession of sin. If Mr. H. will look again at my reply to his former attack, he will see on this point that my last quotation but one, from Scripture, is "*If we*" Christians "confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." The Baptist minister asks, "But is the daily confession of sins made on the earth?" A curious and ignorant question for a man calling himself a minister to ask. Of course the daily confession of sin is made on the earth, where else? and let me add, is made not only by Brethren individually and collectively, but by every real Christian man and woman on the earth.

A. As to the subject of the law, quoted from what he calls a Plymouth tract, *but gives us neither title nor publisher*, and also from the Editor of the "Record," we have only to refer the reader to J. N. Darby's pamphlet in reply to the "Record," "A Letter on the righteousness of God," in answer to the "Record." (G. Morrish, London.)

B. We have now in the last place only to look at one of the "seven." It seems to me that if the Baptist minister goes on a little longer in his present strain, all

sense of shame, of truth, and of conscience will have fled from him. One of the "seven," instead of anything else, was by a Baptist minister near this town received even as a preacher, and his name put in print as one of the preachers of the Baptist Society in the village, and without the knowledge of this one of the "seven." The first tract made many ashamed of the Baptist minister, but this last one has outraged every feeling of truth, uprightness, or even decency. Think of his comparing Christians to pigs and vermin, and of using such language as "hellish" towards the Children of God.

Let us now say one word to the converted, and the unconverted reader. Should the reader be a child of God, we would earnestly beg of him to watch well against the flesh, and to be much and constantly in prayer, that in nothing he may be found taking part with the evil one, who God says is "the accuser of the brethren," but in faithfulness to the Lord, coming out from everything not in accordance with the plain Word of God. It is a terrible thing when the conscience gets seared, and the light in a man becomes darkness: and those who know the truth, and from interested motives will not follow it, are sure to get their eyes and minds blinded. "If the light that is in thee be darkness, *how great is that darkness.* You who may be only a moralist, or mere professor, let us say to you, take care that even your *outward* religiousness, amiability, and correctness be not your ruin. Are you trusting in any of these things, in whole, or in part for salvation? If so, then no one can possibly be in a more dangerous state than you, for you are making a kind of Saviour of your morality; and by this means the real and only Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, is hidden from you. Look then to the "Lamb of God" only, and remember those few but precious words, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." "All that believe *are* justified from all things."

PRICE ONE PENNY.

17 0065

LONDON:

W. H. BROOM, 47, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD;

WOLVERHAMPTON: R. TUNLEY; AND MAY BE HAD OF ALL BOOKSELLERS.

