

---

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 26







4135.aa.26.

A  
REFUTATION  
OF  
CERTAIN CHARGES  
MADE BY  
THE BRETHREN.

---

"HOW LONG WILL YE JUDGE UNJUSTLY?"  
"JUDGE RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT."

---

LONDON:  
HOULSTON & WRIGHT, 65, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1867.

*Price Sixpence.*



A

# REFUTATION

OF

CERTAIN CHARGES MADE BY THE BRETHREN.

---

WHEN a Christian holding the position of a public instructor in the Word of God, is charged with teaching heretical doctrines, it is the duty of those who attend his ministry or read his writings, to investigate the charges, and to endeavour to vindicate him should the accusations prove to be unfounded.

For nearly twenty years Mr. B. W. Newton has been accused by the Brethren of holding heretical doctrines respecting the Person and Work of the Lord Jesus; and their grievous charges have been reiterated in several pamphlets recently published.

Having carefully examined the accusations, and attentively read all Mr. Newton's writings, as well as attended his ministry for more than six years, I have fully satisfied myself of the falseness of the charges, and of the entire disregard to truth, justice, and righteousness, manifested by many of those who have made them.

Deeply pained by the prejudice which has been thus created in the minds of Christians against Mr. Newton and his writings, and feeling strongly that the interests of truth require that every effort should be made to efface the "brand-mark of heresy" which





has been impressed upon them, I desire to call attention to the following observations.

For many years previously to 1847, Mr. Newton was associated, as one of their leaders, with a large gathering of Christians at Plymouth, who soon became known as "Plymouth Brethren;" but at the close of that year, he entirely disconnected himself from them. He has not had, since that time, any connexion with the Brethren.

About the year 1845, the *novel* views on doctrine and prophecy, which now characterize their teaching, together with their principles and practice as to ministry and church order, were introduced at Plymouth; but they were from the first vigorously opposed by Mr. Newton. On these points Dr. Tregelles, who is well acquainted with the whole of the circumstances, observes:—

"It had been the endeavour of Mr. Newton to prevent the Brethren at Plymouth from adopting the practices and opinions as to ministry and absence of order, into which those in other places, professing to hold the same principles, were running. In this endeavour he was for some years successful; so that there was at Plymouth the definite recognition of ministry, such as was not unsuitably termed 'modified Presbyterianism.' When, in order to uphold certain prophetic and dispensational theories, the Brethren, at first covertly and afterwards openly, were setting aside covenant, priesthood, and mediation, as if they could not relate to the church; and when they were teaching that the church does not include the Old Testament Saints, these erroneous doctrines were distinctly opposed by Mr. Newton. This led to the course of action carried on against him by Mr. Darby and his associates, at first privately, and from the year 1845 and onwards, publicly."\*

"The opposition to Mr. Newton arose entirely from his prophetic views being disliked by Mr. Darby. . . Out of this

---

\* See p. 16 of "Five Letters to the Editor of the *Record*, on Recent Denials of our Lord's Vicarious Life." 2nd Edition. By S. P. Tregelles, LL.D. Houlston & Wright, 65, Paternoster Row. Price 2d.

sprang all the charges against Mr. Newton, and the endeavour to condemn him on *every possible* ground. Had he accorded with Mr. Darby on prophecy, we should never have heard *his* voice raised against him as to ministry or church order; his writings would not then have been scrutinized with severity, in order to glean matter of accusation.\*

The character of Mr. Darby's accusations might be gathered from the following passage in his tract entitled, "A Plain Statement on the Sufferings of the Lord." He says:—

"I have not the least doubt from circumstances I have heard lately, of the authenticity of which I have not the smallest doubt, that Mr. Newton received his prophetic system by direct inspiration of Satan, analogous to the Irvingite delusion."

The "Narrative of Facts," &c., published by Mr. Darby, also evinces a spirit of bitterness and malice towards Mr. Newton, which it is difficult to conceive could have been shown by any Christian. Concerning this "Narrative of Facts," which has been well designated a "perversion of facts," the author of the "Retrospect of Events that have taken place amongst the Brethren," who is not personally acquainted with Mr. Newton, thus writes:—

"The religious world has rarely seen such a publication as this, for it would indeed be difficult to find condensed within the compass of eighty pages, so many and such heavy accusations, interspersed with so many galling remarks. The language, as is usual with that writer, is obscure, elliptical, and uncouth; the sentences brief and hurried, and the general style so careless that sometimes the grammatical construction is disregarded. But the object was to heap together accusations, and certainly the writer has presented a mass of criminations bearing hard upon many individuals, and especially on Mr. Newton, whose character he assails without measure,

---

\* See p. 32 of "Three Letters to the Author of 'A Retrospect of Events which have taken place amongst the Brethren.'" By S. P. Tregelles, LL.D. G. Hunt, 32, Duke Street, Manchester Square, London. Price 6d.

and without mercy. Mr. Darby does not scruple to charge his antagonist with deliberate falsehood, and that repeatedly. 'Mr. Newton's personal veracity,' he says, 'is openly and fairly impeached; Mr. Newton's veracity has been impeached, I impeached it.'"

The various parties among the Brethren, though bitterly opposed to each other, generally concur in misrepresenting Mr. Newton. I regret to say that cowardice, falsehood, equivocation, meanness, and malice, together with claims to superior sanctity, and a professed desire to defend the honor of truth, are some of the characteristics which mark many of their attacks.

But notwithstanding the great provocation, and bitter persecution, to which he has been so long subjected, Mr. Newton has altogether abstained from any personal attack upon his accusers; having sought simply to place before them the unscripturalness of their *novel* views; and at the same time to maintain the truths embodied in the Creeds and first eighteen articles of the Church of England, to which he has always adhered; but with which the Brethren are altogether at variance on many important points.

As regards the true divinity, sinless humanity, vicarious work, and imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus, Mr. Newton, while acknowledging the Holy Scriptures as the alone standard of truth, is substantially in accord with Augustine, Calvin, Bengel, Witsius, Turrentini, Zanchius, Bishop Pearson, Bishop Horsley, Dean Nowell, Dr. Owen, Dr. Thomas Goodwin, and many other English and Continental divines, and also with the creeds and confessions of Evangelical Protestant Churches. It cannot, however, be denied that the *novel* doctrines of the Brethren, on the person and work of Christ, as taught in the writings of Messrs. J. N. Darby, C. H. Mackintosh, C. Stanley, and others, are,

to a great extent, opposed to the orthodox views maintained by the above mentioned divines, and by the various creeds and confessions.

Dr. Bonar, a well-known champion of truth, and a friend of Mr. Newton, thus writes in the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy":—

"We have no wish to bind any one to human standards. But it is something to find ourselves standing side by side with the worthies of the olden time. . . . Deviations from the *old theology* ought to be carefully scrutinized. *Old creeds and old divines are certainly not law to us.* THE DIVINE WORD IS THE ONE STANDARD. Yet one begins to be suspicious when some doctrine is zealously proclaimed which our Reformers threw aside, which our Confessions protest against, and which our soundest theologians have *condemned.*"

The "Record" of the 6th June, 1866, in a review of Mr. Newton's Tract "Christ our Suffering Surety," remarks:—

"The Darbyite section of the Plymouth Brethren are more famed for their zeal as proselytizers than as missionaries. It is pre-eminently on the flock of Christ that they make their inroads, trying to infect them with those doctrinal peculiarities which are sometimes dangerous and always mischievous. It is one of the favourite efforts of the Darbyites to assail the doctrine of our Lord's passive righteousness, and to make the Atonement only to consist in His sufferings on the cross. Like all error, it is one prolific of other errors concerning the Deity and humanity of our Lord, and tending to obscure the glory of the Gospel. Mr. Newton has published this tract in order to set forth the truth as contained in the teaching of the Scripture and of our orthodox divines, both Continental and British. . . . Mr. Newton argues against the error which he combats, chiefly by setting forth its opposing truth, but he also shows that the error arises from the dangerously false notion that the Son of God's relation to the Father was on the cross changed, and that then for the first time He was treated as a sinner subject to the curse of a broken law. But the answer is clear that neither in His life nor on the cross was the relation of Jesus to His Father one of personal guilt. 'Into such a relation,' says Mr. Newton, 'Jesus never did and never could come.

Personally, Jesus was ever the object of the Father's delight and love—holy as God is holy, perfect as God is perfect. If He had not been this, He could not, whilst bearing wrath on the cross, have been what He was—'an offering and sacrifice to God of a sweet-smelling savour.' His personal excellency made Him this. He never stood, therefore, in 'the actual relation' of men to God. God did not feel towards the Son of His bosom, when He took the place of a vicarious sufferer, as He feels towards those who are personally sinners. Jesus was *always* the object of the Father's complacency, delight, and love.' The subject is one much agitated amongst the followers of Darby, and it is one on which they frequently puzzle and bewilder simple souls. Mr. Newton's tract, which is cautiously written, without a particle of acrimony, is calculated to be very useful."

My beloved father, who has for many years defended the *old truths*; and opposed the *novelties* of the Brethren, as well as earnestly protested against the course of action they have pursued towards his friend Mr. Newton, says:—

"On almost every point of doctrine the Brethren differ in some degree from other Christians, and in some doctrines their teachings present a contrast. If they are right, then they have made wonderful discoveries, and all others have hitherto been in error. If they are wrong, then they are certainly innovators, and require to be most carefully watched. The points of difference between themselves and others refer to "the Person of the Saviour," "his holy life," "the solemn scene in Gethsemane," and "the nature of his sufferings on the cross," "the present dispensation," "the mission and ministry of the Holy Spirit," "justification," "regeneration," "repentance," "sanctification," "the second coming of Christ," "the resurrection and rapture of the saints," "the law of God," "the Lord's day," and "conscience." On these and several other points relating to things religious, social, and political, their views are somewhat peculiar. For the last thirty years they have been finding fault with almost every one and every thing."\*

By faithfully exposing their errors, and defending

---

\* See p. 3 of "Test before you Trust; or, the Innovations of the Brethren." By Rev. John Cox. Houlston & Wright, 65, Paternoster Row, London. Price 4d.

truth, Mr. Newton has incurred the hostility of his opponents; who by their multitudinous pamphlets, and by other means, continually reiterate their false charges. In one of these pamphlets his name is associated with the names of Arius, Socinus, and Irving, and he is referred to as the greatest heretic of all.

The accusers of Mr. Newton invariably do one of three things; either

*Firstly.* They strongly denounce him solely on the ground of the false statements they have heard from others; or

*Secondly.* If evidence be required they only produce certain isolated passages, from two tracts published in 1847; these passages have been speciously selected, and so cunningly presented, as to give a semblance of truth to their unrighteous charges. Taken in their connexion, these very quotations teach views altogether different from those which have been so wrongly attributed to them. These two tracts, moreover, were withdrawn by Mr. Newton, a few months after they were issued, not because they contained the erroneous doctrines imputed to them, but "*for reconsideration,*" and in the hope of terminating a painful controversy. Other tracts which have been subsequently published, and now take the place of those which have been for nearly twenty years withdrawn and out of print, are not referred to; nor do his accusers quote from any works which he has written during the past eighteen years—now numbering eighteen volumes;\* or

*Thirdly.* They stigmatize, as dreadful errors, doctrines which Mr. Newton holds, in common with other orthodox Christians; but which do not accord with their *novel* and unscriptural views.

---

\* See list appended at the end.

The larger number of those who condemn Mr. Newton, there is good reason to conclude, have never read any of his works or attended his ministry, having been taught to shun, as defiling, every thing connected with him. They implicitly believe and simply repeat what they have been told by their leaders. They are unable intelligibly to state wherein they consider Mr. Newton is at fault; all they can do is to denounce him as a blasphemer, and his writings as heretical; and the more ignorant they are of the subject, the louder are their denunciations. Others, however, prepared with evidence endeavour to substantiate some of their charges; but when examined they turn out to be false witnesses, and their evidence only condemns themselves.

In a pamphlet, published last year, entitled, "The Close of Twenty-eight Years' Association with J. N. D., and of Fellowship and Ministry amongst those who adopt his Doctrines concerning the Sufferings of Christ, by W. H. D.," it is assumed throughout that Mr. Newton is a convicted heretic. This being in the view of the author, Mr. Dorman, an established fact, he has endeavoured to shew that, judged by this standard, Mr. Darby is almost as heterodox as Mr. Newton. It appears too that Mr. Dorman had for many years approved and recommended the works of his late colleague, without detecting that they contained the views which he at the same time denounced. Thus with one hand he sanctioned that which with the other he condemned. He explains this inconsistency by saying that, until recently, he had read Mr. Darby's "Papers on the Sufferings of Christ under a perfect illusion of mind," and that there "reigned in his mind a kind of absolute confidence that it was next to impossible that he should

really *hold* anything that was wrong." This kind of confidence, together with, what Mr. Dorman calls "the fascinations of Mr. Darby's intellect and character, and service in the Gospel," has, I believe, led many to accept his conclusions regarding Mr. Newton's doctrines. Mr. Dorman says, "Mr. Darby has long ago settled for himself and for others, I imagine, what character he thinks attaches to *them*."

The new division which has thus taken place amongst the Darbyites, affords another illustration of retributive justice. Mr. Darby, who was once a friend and colleague of Mr. Newton, separated from him on the alleged ground that he held and taught heretical and blasphemous doctrines. Eighteen years ago he issued a decree which, says Mr. Dorman, excluded from fellowship and communion "Christians, in other respects upright and blameless, not because they held Mr. Newton's doctrine, or have the least leaning towards it, but because they cannot abjure all association with those who, at some time or other, have received into fellowship persons who, in some way or other, have been connected with Mr. Newton's doctrine."

The words, "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again," contain a principle illustrated by the present case. Those who for twenty-eight years have been in close fellowship and communion with Mr. Darby, have now separated from him on the ground that he holds similar doctrines to those which he has falsely attributed to Mr. Newton. Mr. Darby's charges, as has been already stated, had no foundation in Mr. Newton's writings; but how far all the charges brought against Mr. Darby by his late followers, can be substantiated from his works, I will not venture to say. I am inclined to think that in some things his accusers



may have misrepresented his meaning, but this will not altogether surprise any one who has tried to understand his writings.

The unchristian spirit and intense bitterness, which characterize those who have endeavoured to carry out the "exclusive principles" of their leader, cannot be described, nor the sad results over estimated. Mr. Darby and his followers have created divisions and dissensions in Churches, and brought discord and disunion into families where previously Christian love and concord reigned. And many minds after being fascinated with the novelties and lofty claims of the system, have become miserably distressed and almost driven to despair by the bondage into which they have been led. This system is forcibly described by Mr. Dorman :—

"As an immense ecclesiastical ramification, which is everywhere subject, and in all things, as to its order, doctrine, and discipline, to Mr. D.'s decrees, enforced by a ubiquitous unseen spiritual supervision, from which as there is no escape, so is there no appeal . . . narrow and sectarian, and as hard also, as the domination of man can desire it."

Mr. Dorman confesses that for eighteen years he was engaged in "schooling Christians, young and old, ignorant and well informed, in the mysteries" of Mr. Darby's decree; that his heart has been withered by this cruel work, and that he cannot any longer pursue it. He does not, however, acknowledge the unrighteousness of the course pursued against Mr. Newton, but still condemns him without referring to any of his writings, except to one of the withdrawn tracts, which he does not state has been withdrawn. It is quite clear that Mr. Dorman has been reading Mr. Newton's writings also "under a perfect illusion of mind."\*

---

\* For further particulars as to the way in which Mr. Newton has

In a subsequent publication by Mr. Dorman, entitled "A Solemn Appeal to the Brethren," &c., he says:—

"It is not a little striking—and it speaks much for the spiritual judgment and foresight of the writer, that in the 'Notes on the 6th Psalm,' in which Mr. Newton's doctrine was *first* brought to light, the following passage (p. 47) occurs:—'I am greatly alarmed at this mysticism—how easy would be the next step that atonement was in the inward experience of Jesus, and not really in His actual death on the cross.' Now whether Mr. N. or his followers ever advanced this step I am unable to say; but I believe they did not. One thing, however, is certain, that it is precisely and absolutely the step which Mr. Darby and his followers have taken."

If Mr. Dorman had read, with an unprejudiced mind, Mr. Newton's writings, he *would* have been able to say that all the charges contained in the "Notes on the Sixth Psalm," to which he refers, are base calumnies.

These "Notes" were written by Mr. J. L. Harris, who had been previously to Mr. Newton's separation from the Brethren, his friend and co-adjutor. He therein charges Mr. Newton with making statements in the lecture upon which he comments, "subversive of the doctrine of the cross." He also says, "I believe the doctrine taught to undermine the glory of the cross of Christ, and to subvert souls." His accusations are grounded solely upon some manuscript notes of a lecture delivered by Mr. Newton on Psalm vi., concerning which Mr. Newton says in the preface to his "Observations," &c.:—

---

been treated in this Pamphlet, and in another which was published about the same time, entitled, "Grief upon Grief," by F. P. H., see letters in "The Rainbow," for January, 1867; and in the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy," for July, 1867. The Editors of both these journals, misled by the above pamphlets, had inserted statements prejudicial to Mr. Newton. When this was pointed out to them they kindly published my letters, which have been useful in removing prejudices from the minds of many Christians. The letter in "The Rainbow," was accompanied by one I had sent some months previously to Mr. Dorman, which was not even acknowledged by him.

“About eighteen months ago, I was giving lectures on some of the Psalms. Notes of one of these being taken, not in shorthand, by one of those present, were afterwards copied and lent by the possessor to some of her friends. I never saw one line of these notes, nor indeed knew of their existence (though aware that such notes were often taken), until I heard that they were read and severely censured in a meeting convened in Exeter for the purpose. Shortly afterwards they were published, accompanied by the strictures on which I now comment. This was done without any communication having been made to me, and therefore no opportunity was afforded me of avowing or disavowing any of the sentiments, or of rendering any explanation, or even giving any judgment as to the accuracy of the notes.”

The charges were repudiated by Mr. Newton. It has been truly said, that “in their anxiety to bring Mr. Newton into condemnation, they disregarded the courtesies and proprieties which are usually respected in society.” This *first* charge, made so far back as 1847, is a fair specimen of the numerous subsequent accusations. Mr. Harris’s foundation and Mr. Dorman’s superstructure correspond.

Another pamphlet has also recently appeared, entitled, “A second Word of Warning to the Recent Converts in Ireland on the peculiar doctrines of Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton, &c., by T. Ryan.” This is a second edition, considerably enlarged, of a pamphlet, which was published in 1866, in which the author has sought to prove a great similarity between the views of Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton on the sufferings of Christ; his object being to condemn both. He has given a list of Mr. Darby’s writings on that subject, and made direct quotations therefrom; he does not, however, refer directly to one of Mr. Newton’s works, but simply quotes from a pamphlet published in 1863, entitled, “Brethren, and their Traducers, by W. Kelly.”

This pamphlet, which has been widely circulated by the

Brethren, contains a sample of the calumnious charges against Mr. Newton, and of the unfair use made of the withdrawn tracts. Mr. Kelly has therein denounced Mr. Newton's doctrines as "deep, damnable, fundamental denial of Christ,"—"strange and poisonous doctrine about our Lord,"—"blasphemous and heretical statements;" and he is stigmatised as "the heretic,"—"teacher of blasphemy,"—"the false teacher,"—"the evil doer." These are only specimens of, for they do not by any means exhaust, Mr. Kelly's vocabulary of abusive epithets. He also says in the same pamphlet, in reply to the question,—“If a child of God comes to you from Mr. Newton's congregation, would you receive him at your table?”—"I answer, Certainly not, because we are satisfied that such an one, if a child of God, is *not* walking as such, and is therefore inadmissible at the Lord's Table. How could one be suffered to break bread whom we believe to be a partaker of the evil deeds of a blasphemer against the Lord?"

Mr. Kelly also makes the following specific charge of heresy, which Mr. Ryan has retailed verbatim in his "Word of Warning," &c. :—He says, "Mr. Newton's doctrine, to which I have alluded thus strongly, is, that *apart from vicarious sufferings* (Remarks on the Sufferings of the Lord Jesus, pp. 2, 3; note, p. 9), Christ came by birth as a man and an Israelite, into a condition of distance and inflictions from God," &c. To this is added eleven extracts, speciously selected from the two withdrawn tracts. These extracts are incorrectly quoted, and the meaning is also entirely perverted by their being isolated from their connexion, and thus introduced. The impression intended to be conveyed to the reader is, that Mr. Newton held that Christ was in

moral distance from God, and that He suffered under the hand of God on account of some *personal* necessity, and altogether apart from His being the surety for others. This wrong impression would be caused by Mr. Kelly having used the word "vicarious" in his charge, without referring to the *strict* and *specific* sense in which Mr. Newton employed that word, as clearly defined in the tracts from which the extracts have been so unjustly taken. See page 29 for further explanation on this point.

After reading the first edition of Mr. Ryan's pamphlet, I wrote to him, pointing out the injustice of accusing and condemning Mr. Newton, *solely* on the *false* testimony of an enemy and without reference to any of his writings now in circulation. This letter was the commencement of a long but fruitless correspondence, the principal part of which is appended hereto. (See p. 25.)

I indulged the hope that Mr. Ryan would have been led to reconsider and withdraw his untruthful statements; or, at least, that he would have abstained from adding to them. It is evident, however, from the correspondence, and from the second edition of the pamphlet recently published, that, in these expectations, I had given him credit for more Christian integrity and manly straightforwardness than he deserved.

In this edition Mr. Ryan has not only retained the quotation from Mr. Kelly's tract, but has added some extracts, which he has grossly perverted, from "A Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord's Humanity," published by Mr. Newton in 1848, which has been out of print for many years. He does not, however, refer to "Ancient Truths respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus," and "Christ our Suf-

fering Surety," subsequently published in the place of that letter.

These extracts have been placed side by side with some passages from Mr. Darby's writings, in order to confirm the view previously taken by Mr. Ryan, as to the similarity which he *imagines* exists between the views of Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton, and to brand them both as holding the same "peculiar doctrines." To endeavour to prove that their views, are substantially the same, would be as difficult a task, as to undertake to shew that darkness and light are identical. It cannot be wondered at therefore, that Mr. Ryan should have signally failed. In order that there might be the least semblance of similarity, the views of one of them must be grossly mis-stated. The extent to which this has been done as regards the quotations from Mr. Newton's writings, in this last production from the pen of Mr. Ryan, has startled me.

The first extract he has given from the "Letter" is as follows:—

"Few things can be more *dangerously unscriptural* than to assert that Christ never suffered anything *under the hand of God* until the Cross. It is entirely a novel doctrine, for there is scarcely a writer (who is really Christian) from the Apostles' days to the present hour who does not regard Him as so suffering from the cradle to the grave. One of the necessary consequences of such a doctrine, must be to deny that any part of Scripture which speaks of suffering received under the *hand of God during life* can pertain to the Lord Jesus. Many of the Psalms which plainly do belong to him, would thus be authoritatively set aside as not pertaining to him. It would also be necessary to deny that the Lord Jesus was under any of the governmental arrangements of God, which were bearing afflictively on man and on Israel, for those arrangements were God's, and if the Lord Jesus were not *above* them all, *he must have suffered under them, and therefore under the hand of God, thus governing.*"

In the original of the above quotation, only five words are in *italics*. Mr. Ryan has, however, taken the liberty of italicising twenty-two additional words without mentioning it in the usual way. He has, also, contrary to rule, omitted from the passage some important words, without in any way indicating that he had done so. The letter from which Mr. Ryan has quoted having been out of print for many years, but few persons would have an opportunity of comparing the extracts with it; I therefore quote the complete sentence, with the omitted words printed in *italics*.

“Many of the Psalms which plainly do belong to him, and some even of those which are quoted and applied to him in the New Testament (such for example as the 102nd) would thus be authoritatively set aside as not pertaining to him.”

Had Mr. Ryan given the whole sentence he could not then have asked for proof from the New Testament for that which he condemns as “very bad and fatal doctrine.” He does not attempt to shew that it is unscriptural; nor does he deny that the view, which he also designates as a “peculiar doctrine,” is held not only by Mr. Newton, but by all orthodox Christians. It is a common practice with some of the Brethren to denounce as unsound that which does not accord with their *novel* views.

The second extract from the “Letter” given by Mr. Ryan is as follows:—

“*The remnant of Israel which is to pass through the fires of the day of the Lord’s appearing, have, before they are received and acknowledged by the Lord, as His, before therefore, they ‘convert and are healed,’ certain apprehensions of the circumstances in which they are. . . . They will recognize the deserved ruin of their nation, the outstretched arm of God in judgment. They will say, ‘The Gentiles have come into their inheritance,’ &c. Their*

*apprehensions*, as I have elsewhere shown, will be mingled with much ignorance and self-righteousness, but still their consciences will have been struck, and they will begin to recognize the reality of *the chastisements that have fallen upon their people*. . . . But if there be one single grain of truth brought before the *apprehension of their consciences* by the external testimony of God, that one grain must have been included in *the perfect apprehensions of the Lord*."

The same remark should be made as to the *italics* in this passage as was made in reference to them in the previous extract.

No statement can be more plain and easy to be understood, and one wonders how it is possible to make any objection to the obvious truth contained in it. But Mr. Ryan first perverts and then condemns. Surely every Christian who believes that all *truth* was apprehended by Him who is "*the truth*," would concur in the statement to which Mr. Ryan so objects. But in order to object to it, he has to represent Mr. Newton as stating that Christ had the "*apprehensions*," "*experiences*," and "*exercises*" of "*the remnant of Israel*" in their unconverted state, whereas, Mr. Newton clearly states that—

"If there be one single grain of truth brought before the apprehensions of their consciences by the external testimony of God, that one grain must have been included in the perfect apprehensions of the Lord."

Mr. Ryan says:—

"Now we do not demur to the fact of the Jewish Remnant and their experiences, but to the experiences of the Lord in reference to their unconverted state, before they 'convert and are healed,' as Mr. N. says, this is what we demur to. Messrs. Newton and Darby bring our Lord into like exercises and experiences in this respect! What one styles 'fearing wrath,' the other styles, 'the outstretched arm of God in judgment.' The ideas are exactly similar," &c.

Mr. Ryan also gives the following extract from Mr. Newton's Letter:—



“I have been sometimes asked for an explanation of a passage in p. 26 of ‘The Observations,’ which has been represented as saying that Christ had *the experiences proper to the unconverted*, a thought that never entered into my mind at any moment of my life, and which would be blasphemy. The tracts certainly never teach it, for almost every page teems with assertions to the contrary.”

Mr. Ryan meets this clear explanation by saying, that Mr. Newton disclaims the charge that he attributes “to the Lord in his life, the exercises of the soul of a sinner, or, as Mr. Newton expresses it, the ‘experiences proper to the unconverted.’ We can only account for this by the fact that when men become instruments of the angel of light to propagate false doctrine, they are often startled when brought face to face with their own conclusions.”

I will not further remark on these unblushingly dishonest and degrading practices, except to add that Mr. Ryan and others who act in a similar way, appear to believe that the condemnation of Mr. Newton is of supreme importance, and that the end will justify for its attainment the use of any and every possible means. I am also inclined to believe that the view which many of the Brethren hold, that they have nothing whatever to do with the Law as a rule of conduct, is also held by Mr. Ryan; and that if he does recognize the command “thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour,” as in any way binding upon him, he quite loses sight of it when he has to do with Mr. Newton. “Prejudice (says an old proverb) has neither eyes nor ears.” Perhaps the most charitable view to take of Mr. Ryan’s conduct would be, to consider that, in this case at least, he has not now the power of discriminating between truth and error.

It would be more easy than pleasant to refer to many other pamphlets of the same character as those already noticed, and to multiply instances of this kind of treatment which Mr. Newton and his writings have

received from the hands of some of the Brethren. It is only by suppressing truth and withholding facts; by misrepresentation and untrue statement, that they maintain their false charges, by which so many are deceived.

When Mr. Newton saw that the real object of his adversaries was not to defend the honour of truth, but to crush himself, and blacken his character, by holding him up to the world as a blasphemer and a heretic, he retired from any further controversy with such opponents, and has not since defiled himself with any attempt to refute their despicable calumnies. But while he has not for many years defended himself by replying to their reiterated charges, he has nevertheless definitely and steadily maintained, in his voluminous and Scriptural writings, the very opposite doctrines to those which they have so falsely imputed to him. It is the endeavour of his accusers to prevent Christians from reading these clear expositions of Scriptural truth; and they, therefore, do not refer to any of his works except those which are out of print, and which cannot be obtained by any one desirous of comparing the works themselves with the false doctrines which they have *deduced* from them.

I have already quoted (see p. 12) from the preface of one of Mr. Newton's tracts, in which he *first* defended himself against certain charges based only on imperfect notes of one of his lectures. The *last* attempt he made to vindicate himself is in "A Letter to a Friend concerning a Tract published at Cork,"\* 1850, in which he says:—

"My dear Friend,—You need not make any apology for sending me the Tract entitled 'Remarks on Mr. Newton's

---

\* Houlston & Wright, 65, Paternoster Row, London. Price 4d.

Doctrines,' &c. It is of course painful to be the subject of unjust accusation; but I have now been so long accustomed to have my sentiments misrepresented and my words perverted, that I have almost ceased to expect anything else from certain quarters. Time will show, whether I do or do not hold the wicked doctrines so industriously charged upon me by some, who seem to find their chief pleasure in attacking me. I am not accustomed to notice their statements; nor should I now say a word in reply, if it were not in the hope that it might be useful to yourself, and others similarly circumstanced, to have something, recently written by myself, to show to those who are personally unacquainted with me, and with my doctrines.

"In commenting on the writings of another, (especially if our object be accusation,) the full context of every passage we quote, as well as the Author's explanation of his own words, (in case of his having furnished explanation,) should be given with scrupulous exactness. Suppose we were to separate texts of Scripture from their context, and were to refuse to limit and explain Scripture by Scripture, what perversions of truth might be plausibly founded, even on the word of God itself! The co-equality, for example, of the Divine Persons might be denied, because the Lord has said, 'My Father is greater than I:' or the Godhead of the Lord Jesus might be questioned, because it is said, 'That hour knoweth not the Son.' In the Tract before us, the quotations are partial and imperfect; and the explanations I have given of my own words, are suppressed.

"One of the many incomplete quotations, which, taken apart from its context, may well startle the reader, is the following: '*Christ had in His nature not only a possibility and aptitude, but also a necessity of dying.*' These words looked at by themselves, may of course be taken in a sense that would involve deadly heresy; and so, Mr. C.— wishes them to be understood. He makes the quotation, too, as if the words were mine, whereas he knows that they are not mine—yet not a hint is given as to whence they come. They come from a writer of whom the Church of England justly boasts as the most careful and most accurate of all her theological writers. They come from Bishop Pearson on the Creed."

The concluding words of this letter are:—

"It would be useless indeed to deceive ourselves with the false hope that the clearest explanations would produce any beneficial change on Mr. C.— in his present temper of mind. It is too evident that he does not desire to be convinced; and

is anxious that others should not be convinced. Otherwise he would not have quenched, as he has done, every explanation which I have given in my last Tract on the Humanity; and commented on my doctrines as if the explanations of that Tract had never been given.

“Any, however, who are of candid mind, may be directed to those explanations. They will soon discover, if they are patient, in the investigation, first, that many of Mr. C.—’s own doctrines are erroneous—secondly, that he has misrepresented my statements—and lastly, that he has drawn false inferences from them, even when he has not misrepresented them.

“I am thankful to be able to say, that I hold (and so does Bishop Pearson) that Christ, though He did assume a mortal body, was under no necessity of death *as we*—that He was ever in moral nearness to God, not less so on earth, than when He was in Heaven—that He was ever the object of the Father’s complacency, delight, and love—that whether in the cradle, or in life, or on the Cross, He was alike morally perfect, as perfect as He now is in Heaven—perfect in all His inward experiences—perfect in all His outward ways, and therefore in both, unlike other men—that He never was *as* those for whom and with whom He suffered—that all his sufferings were as the Redeemer—all on behalf of others, and for their salvation. The doctrines of the Apostles’ Creed—the Nicene Creed—and the Athanasian Creed, I gladly accept, as well as the first seventeen Articles of the Church of England, as containing the truths for which I would desire to live and die.

“This confession one might suppose to be sufficiently full to satisfy the most rigorous mind. But some are never satisfied. We must not therefore be discouraged. We are living in the latter days—days in which ‘truth is fallen in the streets, and equity cannot enter’—days in which, though mercy is most needed, yet it is less than ever shown. But the truths of the Scripture remain: and the hour of their triumph will come at last.  
(Signed) B. W. NEWTON.”

My spirit has been for a long time deeply grieved at the cruel treatment so unsparingly inflicted upon my beloved friend and pastor; and I have been all the more moved by the knowledge of the patient endurance which he has exercised “under the unusual trials that have come upon him.” I feel, too, that

the false statements respecting him, which have been retailed in a number of pamphlets recently published in consequence of the disruption among the Darbyites, ought not still to go forth unchallenged. After reading Mr. Ryan's last pamphlet, I cannot any longer restrain myself from sending forth my protest; and have done so without the knowledge of Mr. Newton, being desirous of avoiding any reference to a subject necessarily painful to him. I am glad to know that he is in ignorance of much that has been recently published against him.

I do not expect that what I have written will in any way beneficially influence those who appear to possess the same kind of feelings as the Jews had, who were "banded together and bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul." I do not charge all the Brethren with these feelings of hatred towards Mr. Newton, but I regret to say that even where there is no direct opposition, there is the Jehoshaphat-like indifference which silently countenances the Ahab-like denunciations of the true servant of the Lord. I do, however, trust that many who have been misled by the false statements of others may be induced to read and examine Mr. Newton's writings, a list of which is appended; and should opportunity offer, that they will attend his Chapel in the Queen's Road, Bayswater, London, where he ministers twice every Lord's Day, and there listen to his clear and Scriptural exposition of the Word of God. By these means they will be able to "judge righteous judgment."

Some who have taken this course have not only proved how greatly Mr. Newton has been misrepresented, but have also discovered a mine of scriptural

wealth in his teaching, for which they have been for ever afterwards truly thankful.

Those who seek to be established in the truths of the Word of God, and to be fortified against the errors of the day, would do well to read attentively Mr. Newton's works. He has evidently a great love and reverence for the Scriptures, and has made them the study of his life. His true piety, his great natural abilities, his intimate knowledge of the languages in which the Bible was originally written, his deep research, and his comprehensive view of Scriptural subjects, together with the power he possesses of communicating thoughts to others in a style as clear as it is graceful—all these and other valuable qualifications pre-eminently fit him for the position which he has, for more than thirty-five years, honorably sustained as a Christian teacher. Through all his writings, there is too, a tone of deep spiritual thought and feeling becoming the solemn and important subjects of which he treats.

The *character* of the persecution which has been directed against him, is, in itself, apart from other evidence, a mark of the importance of his position; and of the value of the truth he holds. The artillery of calumny, falsehood, and misrepresentation would not, I believe, have been hurled against him so long and unremittingly, if he were seeking to defend any other citadel than the fortress of truth.

Referring to the persecutors of Mr. Newton, one who is not connected with him, has forcibly said:—

“As surely as all the words of God are truth, and that none of them shall fall to the ground, so surely will they who acting in a spirit wholly foreign to that of God, yet presume to think they *glorify the Lord thereby*, find the words of Isaiah lxvi. 5, apply to themselves, and will sooner or later have effect in their own confusion—‘Hear the Word

of the Lord, ye that tremble at His word; your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified: but He shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed.' ”

There was ONE of whom it was said by the High Priest of Israel, in the presence of the assembled “chief priests and elders and all the council who sought *false witness* against Jesus to put Him to death”—“He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death.”

HE who was thus unjustly condemned, and afterwards crucified by His own people, hath said, “The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough that the disciple be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?”

“Blessed are ye when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of Man's sake.

“Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.”

JOHN COX, JUN.

17, Palace Gardens Villas, Kensington,  
London.

August, 1867.

## Judge Righteous Judgment.

---

### CORRESPONDENCE

Referred to in page 14.

---

“ 17, Palace Gardens Villas, Kensington, W.  
“ 18th April, 1866.

“ Dear Sir,—I have just read ‘A Word of Warning to Recent Converts in Ireland, on the Peculiar Doctrines of Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton,’ by Amicus; which is, I believe, from your pen, and I cannot forbear to express my feelings concerning the false and unfounded statements which are therein made relating to Mr. Newton.

“ I have carefully read Mr. Newton’s writings, and have for several years attended his ministry, and I do not hesitate to affirm that those ‘peculiar doctrines,’ which you have attributed him, cannot be found in any of his writings, and are not taught in his pulpit ministrations.

“ The unjust treatment which Mr. Newton and his writings have received from those who have invented these wicked charges, is, I believe, without parallel in the history of modern Christianity.

“ A bitterness of spirit, and a lack of straightforwardness and honesty, have characterized all the various pamphlets written against him, which have come under my notice.

“ Passages have been isolated from their immediate connection, and ‘peculiar doctrines’ have been deduced therefrom, altogether contrary to Mr. Newton’s invariable teaching; and he has been thus represented as denying truths for which he has always most earnestly contended.

“ In the paper now before me, you warn converts against Mr. Newton’s peculiar doctrines, and your accusation is supported *only* by quotations from Mr. Kelly’s pamphlet, containing



extracts from two tracts which have been long out of print, and were publicly withdrawn by Mr. Newton nearly twenty years ago for reconsideration; the result being the publication of 'Ancient Truths Respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus,' and 'Christ our Suffering Surety,' neither of which you have referred to.

"Abundant evidence is, however, afforded in the tracts from which Mr. Kelly quotes, to show that Mr. Newton did not teach in them the 'peculiar doctrines' attributed to him.

"But even were it otherwise, it would have been no less unjustifiable and unfair to produce those tracts as evidence against him, after they had been thus publicly withdrawn. Had you given the two subsequently written tracts, together with 'Propositions for the Solemn Consideration of Christians,' published in 1864, a careful perusal before you wrote your 'Word of Warning,' &c., I do not think that you would have been guilty of repeating these unjust charges, the effect of which will, I fear, be to stumble and hinder those you desire to help.

"In several instances I have found that those who have repeated these charges, have not read any of Mr. Newton's writings, but have simply retailed the false statements of others.

\* \* \* \*

"Yours faithfully,  
"JOHN COX, JUN."

The following is Mr. Ryan's answer :—

"34, Leeson Park, Dublin,  
"May 3, 1866.

"Dear Sir,—I have your favour of the 18th April, in reference to a tract of mine, 'A Word of Warning,' &c. You say as follows :—

"In the paper now before me, you warn converts against Mr. Newton's 'peculiar doctrines,' and your accusation is supported *only* by quotations from Mr. Kelly's pamphlet, containing extracts from two tracts which have been long out of print, and were publicly withdrawn by Mr. Newton nearly twenty years ago for reconsideration, the result being, the publication of 'Ancient Truths Respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus,' and 'Christ our Suffering Surety,' neither of which you have referred to.

"To this I make two replies. Firstly. I was speaking of Mr. Newton's sentiments whilst with the 'Brethren,' so called,

and those views which caused divisions amongst them. I may not have been sufficiently explicit, but still any can on reading the tract perceive that I refer to his sentiments whilst with that body and not since, and in the first page I state it very decidedly. Secondly. It does not appear that Mr. N. withdrew those publications on the ground of being really in error, but only for *reconsideration*, as you say. Had they been withdrawn as error, and confession of them made according to grace (as the term *withdrawn* in itself might imply), then you might blame me for not stating this, or for not becoming acquainted with it. But it was no such thing, quite the contrary, for the life-sufferings of our Lord are the same in the latter as in the former, rather stronger of the two, so that there is no withdrawal in this case, and the only thing in which Mr. N. differs from his former self is, that whilst the Lord's sufferings on the cross were then said to be those alone which atoned for our sins; now he says, that all His life long *hunger, thirst, weariness*, were like the cross (the same in kind but not in degree), an atonement for our sins. The latter then is the one point on which Mr. N.'s present views are not the same, for in the former tract he said, that the above were in the general sense 'on behalf of us or for us,' but not atoning. The main point, however, remains the same, and the latter view is no improvement on the former in my humble judgment.

"Yours faithfully,

" T. RYAN."

To this letter I sent the following reply, dated 14th May, 1866:—

"Dear Sir,—I have received your letter of the 3rd inst., which I regret to say is most unsatisfactory.

"In the first place you state, that though you may not have been sufficiently explicit, 'yet your warning was against Mr. Newton's sentiments whilst with the Brethren, and not since.' Now assuming this to be so, you warn 'recent converts' against certain heretical doctrines which nearly twenty years ago were attributed to Mr. Newton, and in support of this most grievous charge, you refer them *only* to some extracts, selected by the hand of an enemy from two tracts, several years after they had been publicly withdrawn for reconsideration; and you make no mention whatever of the withdrawal, nor of the tracts subsequently written in their place.

“In the second place, you excuse yourself from blame in regard to this unrighteous act, because, as you say, ‘the tracts had not been withdrawn as error and confession made according to grace.’ The tracts had been publicly withdrawn, and a sense of right and common justice ought to have hindered any one from using them against Mr. Newton. This attempted justification is to my mind self-condemnation.

“With reference, however, to your first point I would further observe, that I do not think that any one, after reading your paper, would conclude otherwise than that in it you warn ‘recent converts’ against the *present* views of Mr. Newton.

“In the opening paragraph you ‘introduce young converts (now urged to join a party) to the peculiar doctrines of Mr. Newton and Mr. Darby.’ You then allude to the position Mr. Newton held at Plymouth twenty years ago, and to certain statements then attributed to him which caused ‘division amongst Brethren.’ You next mention the work on the ‘sufferings of Christ,’ published by Mr. Darby ten or twelve years afterwards, as controverting the statements attributed to Mr. Newton, but propounding the same errors.

“With great apparent candour you then say, ‘Lest any should think we misrepresent Mr. Darby or Mr. Newton, the following are extracts by which from their writings, the reader can judge for himself.’\* Then follow in parallel columns the extracts to which I shall presently refer. On page 8, you say with reference to Mr. Newton and Mr. Darby, ‘they agree that the Lord experienced a sense of sins, that the full letting loose of the power of Satan was upon Him in His life, without the knowledge of God’s favour resting upon Him,’† and without being vicarious or substitutional! Again, on page 9 you write, ‘This is the theology of Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton upon the present subject, as any one can see from the above extracts.’ You refer, then, to those extracts (and those *alone*, isolated as they have been from their connexion and wrested from their true meaning), as being the exponents of Mr. Newton’s present views, and have professedly given them in order that the reader may judge for himself; but should the reader desire to see the tracts, from which those extracts have been taken, he will

\* This has been omitted by Mr. Ryan in the Second Edition, but the garbled extracts remain.

† This is an extract from “The Word of God and the Priesthood of Christ.” By J. N. Darby, 1863. Page 7.

find that they have been publicly withdrawn, and out of print for nearly twenty years. You have not dealt thus unfairly with Mr. Darby. All your quotations have been made direct from his writings now in circulation, and a list of his works has also been given by you; so that any person has an opportunity of fully and fairly judging the question so far as he is concerned. But in the case of Mr. Newton, you have not mentioned one of his works now in circulation, which have been expressly written by him in the place of the withdrawn tracts, but you have referred only to a calumnious pamphlet, published by Mr. Kelly in 1863, which altogether misrepresents Mr. Newton's views. I have read that pamphlet, and am as much astonished and disgusted at the arrogant, bitter, and unchristian tone in which it is written; as at the untruthful statements and unfair deductions it contains.

“ I think I have written enough to show—1. That your warning to ‘ recent converts,’ can only be regarded as directed against the *present* views of Mr. Newton. 2. That the evidence you have brought before them in support of your serious charge, is such as cannot be admitted, having regard to common honesty and fair dealing between man and man. But even if there were no bar to its admission, I do not hesitate to affirm that it would fail to support your charge as set forth in the passage I have already quoted from page 8 of your paper. In that passage you have not only entirely misrepresented the views of Mr. Newton, but most unjustifiably made him subscribe to the words of Mr. Darby, and to sentiments against which he has protested in the clearest and strongest manner. If those views can be found in any of Mr. Newton's writings, he would be justly charged with serious heresy. For to teach that Christ ‘ experienced a sense of sins,’ and bore wrath and suffering except on behalf others, would, of course, be tantamount to teaching that Christ was personally a sinner.

“ In order to show that Mr. Newton taught that which was directly opposed to this view, I give the following extracts from the two withdrawn tracts. In those tracts Mr. Newton has used the words ‘ vicarious’ and ‘ substitutional,’ in their strict and specific sense, applying them only to those sufferings which Christ endured on the cross, the like to which His people can never experience, but not applying them to sufferings such as hunger, thirst, weariness, the like to which His people also experience. At the same time, as you will

see from the extracts, Mr. Newton clearly held and taught that all the sufferings of Christ were sacrificial, and exclusively on behalf of others. Upon reconsideration, however, he now maintains, and has done so for many years, that all the sufferings of Christ in life and in death were alike substitutional and vicarious; and in his subsequently written tract, 'Christ Our Suffering Surety,' (pp. 31, 32), he has fully discussed the point; and after having stated the reasons for using those words in their strict sense, he adds:—

"These reasons so far weighed with me formerly, that (whilst strongly maintaining that all the sufferings of Christ were sacrificial and exclusively on behalf of others) I thought it best to appropriate the words 'instead of,' and 'vicarious,' in the strict sense of 'instead of,' to the cross, and say that He obeyed and suffered hunger, thirst, and the like, 'for us,' or on our behalf, but this I should no longer do." p. 32.

"Mr. Newton then enters fully into the reasons for his change of opinion on this point.

"In the concluding sentence of your letter, you say that the 'latter view is no improvement on the former;' and in doing so you deny that the life sufferings of Christ formed part of His atoning or satisfactory sufferings; and you thus restrict the work of redemption to the cross. This *novel* view unscripturally *divides* the work of Christ which is spoken of in Rom. v. as 'one obedience,' and 'one righteousness,' and is contrary to the teaching of the saints of all ages. Is there any Scripture warrant for saying that Christ suffered in any way except as the Redeemer, the Lamb, and the Surety of His people? The work of atonement though completed on the cross (where alone He suffered the full, unmitigated outpouring of damnable wrath) comprised all His sufferings in life as well as in death.

"Having thus shewn in what sense Mr. Newton used the words 'vicarious,' and 'substitutional,' I now proceed to give the extracts from the withdrawn tracts. The concluding words of the tract entitled, 'Remarks on the Sufferings of the Lord Jesus,' 1847, are:—

"But let it be remembered that not one sorrow, not one stroke, came on Him at any one period of His life, except because of others. His *relative* position was the reason; *personally* He had a title to all joy, all blessing." p. 49.

"The same views are taught in the other tract, called 'Observations on a Tract entitled—The Sufferings of Christ, as set forth in a Lecture on Psalm vi., Considered' 1847:—

"In the sense of the writer of the tract, I have never said that

Christ suffered the wrath of God, and that not vicariously before He came to the Cross. I repudiate the thought quite as much as the author of the tract," p. 15.

"Whether the Lord Jesus were living in Paradise, or whether in the midst of a fallen and groaning earth, personally He would be the same. He would have the same character, the same dispositions, the same love to the Father, the same delight in Him. As regards these things, the darkness and the light are both alike to Him. Whether near or whether far off, He could not be other than that which He essentially was, the Son, that is ( $\delta\delta\nu$ ) in the bosom of the Father. And the personal relation of the Father to Him was equally unchangeable. He never could be in His sight other than the Son, one in whom He always rested with joy unchangeable." p. 28.

"There is no one I trust that will read these pages, to whom it need be said that Jesus was sinless in body, soul, and spirit, as much so after He had become flesh, as when He was in the bosom of the Father, before the world was. p. 33.

"It is indeed true that all that the Lord Jesus did and suffered was for our sakes, and all His elect will reap the results thereof, in glory for ever and ever. The 'obedience' in which His believing people are 'constituted righteous,' depends on His living actions quite as much as on His death. All the results of His living service are imputed to those who believe. But would it be right to apply the word 'vicarious' to this relation of the Lord to His people? I think not, in the sense in which we apply the word to the substitutional sufferings on the cross.

"His place on the cross was one in which He suffered not only *on behalf of* others, but in the strictest possible sense, *instead of* others." p. 45.

"All that Christ did as the righteous servant of Jehovah went to make up that one righteousness in which His people are accepted. This must be fully borne in mind; and thus, in one sense, we might almost use the word 'vicarious' when speaking of the whole of His obedience in life as well in death for us." p. 47.

"I will now give you a few extracts from works written subsequently to those which were withdrawn.

"But surely, if the great leading principles be sound, any writer has a right to the free expression of his thoughts and to protection from the charge of heresy. I ask this in respect to the tracts in question. There are certain great leading principles which pervade them throughout. The great orthodox truths touching the person and atoning work of the Lord Jesus are preserved inviolate. The statement again and again repeated, that if His own individual relation, whether dispensational or personal, had been regarded, He would have received only blessing,—that He never suffered anything except for the sake of others,—in other words, that all His sufferings were vicarious in the sense in which that word is ordinarily used,—the perpetual allusion to the meat offering scorched

as giving to all His living sufferings a sacrificial character, the careful application of the word *sinless* to all His experiences and all His sufferings, and therefore the making all His experiences and all His sufferings as peculiar as His person,—the distinctions drawn between things necessary because of the appointment of God and things necessary on essential and irreversible principles of holiness;—all these and similar statements do render it impossible that He who is represented as having suffered in such a way and on such principles as these, should have been represented as unfit for atonement; for if unfit for atonement, He must have been equally unfit *so* and on such principles to suffer during life, and thereby to work out a righteousness for His people." *A Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord's Humanity*, 1848, p. 16.

"I can assure Mr. C. that although I do draw a distinction between the living sufferings of Christ, and His sufferings under damnatory wrath upon the Cross, yet that I believe all these sufferings to have come on Him *as the Redeemer*—to have been all '*vicarious*' in the sense in which Christians commonly use that word—all sacrificial—all necessary, by the appointment of God, to the accomplishment of the work of salvation."—*A Letter to a Friend concerning a Tract recently published at Cork*, 1850, p. 13.

"In considering those sufferings, it is needful to bear in mind, first, that He came into the world for the one purpose of glorifying God, *in carrying out the purposes of God for the redemption of His people*. Consequently, all His sufferings were to that end, and none ever came on Him, from the cradle to the grave, but as the Redeemer. Secondly, all His sufferings were voluntary; voluntarily undertaken, voluntarily continued. Lastly, at every moment of His earthly service, even when bearing the whole weight of divine wrath upon the cross, He was unvaryingly the object of the Father's love, complacency, and delight. The Father could ever say of Him, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' In like manner the delight of the Son was ever in the Father. He could ever say, 'My meat and my drink is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work.' He was ever acting as the surety of God's people, and therefore, whatever sufferings He might endure under the righteous government of God, they came on Him as one who was suffering all that He did suffer for the sake of others, as their appointed Redeemer and Sacrifice. His own personal holiness and excellency were not affected thereby. Indeed, if all perfectness had not essentially and unvaryingly pertained unto Him, He could not have been the Redeemer. He must be as a Lamb 'without blemish'; therefore, however stricken because of others' sins, He was always the object of the Father's perfect love." *Ancient Truths respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus*, 1857, pp. 5, 6.

"But Christ as our Surety had not only to obey on our behalf; He had also to suffer on account of our sins. By bearing whatever was appointed Him to bear of suffering in life, as well as the

*unmitigated* stroke of damnatory wrath in death, He vindicated the righteousness of the Divine government, and maintained its holiness both in respect of its dealing with sin here, and in respect of its dealing with sin hereafter, that thus God might be fully glorified, and full satisfaction be made for the sin of His people. . . . Although, therefore, Jesus as the Surety was always bearing something that was due to the sins of His people, and was therefore always the *sin-bearer*, yet there is a marked distinction between His sufferings in life and His sufferings on the cross. The bruising and scorching of the first-fruits (see Lev. ii.) was distinguished from its being burnt on the altar: yet they were parts of one sacrificial appointment, and both the scorching and burning were marked types of suffering—suffering appointed by God." *Christ our Suffering Surety*, 1857, pp. 13, 25.

"These extracts prove that Mr. Newton did not teach, either in the withdrawn tracts or subsequently, the peculiar doctrines which you and others have attributed to him; but even if there could be found in the withdrawn tracts every conceivable form of error, no one would have any right to produce them in evidence against him, as they have been publicly withdrawn, and other works issued in their stead. In those works Mr. Newton has taken great pains to state clearly and unmistakably the doctrines he holds; and he has also repudiated again and again the sentiments imputed to him, but the false charges are nevertheless continually retailed in the most shameful manner.

"The way in which you have associated the name of Mr. Newton with that of Mr. Darby, in your paper, is most unwarrantable; their views, as contained in their published writings, are as strongly contrasted as light and darkness.

"I do not think that a similar case of systematic and prolonged perversion of a writer's statements, and unjust use of his writings, could be found in the annals of controversy; and I verily believe that an analogous proceeding, in any of the literary or political societies, would bring down upon the perpetrator a condemnation which he would justly deserve. For twenty years Mr. Newton has borne this unique and relentless persecution, but with such Christian and gentlemanly demeanour, as to call forth even the admiration of his enemies, while it has increased the righteous indignation of his friends.

"I now appeal to you, Sir, as to a brother Christian, and one who professes to maintain the truth, to reconsider your statements affecting Mr. Newton, and should you require any further evidence in support of anything I have advanced in this letter, I shall be glad to have an opportunity of supply-



ing you with all that is in my power to render. Should you desire it, I am prepared to shew that, in all the extracts you have given from that libellous pamphlet of Mr. Kelly's, the views of Mr. Newton have been misrepresented and grossly perverted,—to crown the calumny, Mr. Newton is therein stigmatized as a blasphemmer and a heretic!

I am thankful to know that but very few papers of this kind come under the notice of Mr. Newton, so that he is spared the annoyance and pain which it would seem to be the desire of the writers personally to inflict upon him. To feel that the reception of truth is hindered, and that the minds of believers are prejudiced by these false statements, must cause pain to all right-minded Christians, but especially to one who, assuming in the early period of the controversy that there was a real desire for the truth on the part of his opponents, fully met every charge, and readily and patiently afforded every explanation that was required of him; the result being, so far as his opponents were concerned, only an increase of mis-statement and false charges, and not, as Mr. Newton had vainly hoped, concord and union.

I may add, that I have written to you without Mr. Newton's knowledge, and from a sincere desire to serve the cause of truth.

“ Yours faithfully,  
JOHN COX, JUN.”

In Mr. Ryan's answer, dated '26th May, 1866, he reiterates the charges contained in his pamphlet; and also accuses Mr. Newton of making contradictory statements in his tract, entitled “Christ our Suffering Surety.” But Mr. Ryan has not observed that in one part of the passage on which he comments, Mr. Newton is stating *what others say*, and in the other part what he himself holds. Hence the supposed contradiction. Mr. Ryan also says:—

“ Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 13th of this month, I just pen a few lines. The reason of my not doing so before was not wishing to say hard things, as it is so hard to avoid speaking of people in controversies. You will therefore forgive anything of this kind, as I am sure that you intend well, however mistaken or under illusion in the matter. You will then forgive me for saying that the wonderful indignation expressed in your letter because of my quotations from two old tracts instead of two new tracts

written by Mr. Newton, is wholly misspent upon me for the following reasons.

“You complain of my quoting from tracts that have been publicly withdrawn. I did not before hear this, and, now that I do hear it, I don’t believe it can be. When or where or how have they been ‘publicly withdrawn’? You say they are out of print. That may be, but that does not prove that they were ‘publicly withdrawn.’ Bishop O’Brian’s Sermons were for many years out of print (the Sermons on Justification), but they were not on that account ‘publicly withdrawn.’ So that one would be glad to know how Mr. N.’s tracts referred to were ‘publicly withdrawn.’ If I, as a public teacher, say that I publicly withdraw certain tracts, no honest minded person supposes me to mean otherwise than that I retract or repudiate the doctrines contained in them; they would never suppose me to mean that I hold and teach the same doctrines whilst I change the letter-press—this would be justly regarded as quibbling and equivocal on my part. . . . Is it honest then to say that the tracts have been publicly withdrawn in the common ordinary unequivocal sense of that expression? So far, therefore, as the first statement goes, where is the public withdrawing of the tracts in question? None whatever. We are not to use terms and mislead people, and more especially when the doctrines of God are concerned . . . Therefore until some better proof be given that the tracts referred to have been ‘publicly withdrawn,’ I am reluctantly compelled to look at the use of those terms in such a connection, and as respects the truth of God, both as a snare and an illusion, and remain,

“Yours faithfully,

“ T. RYAN.

In my reply, dated 30th May, 1866, I requested that the imputation Mr. Ryan had cast on my veracity might be withdrawn; reminded him that I had mentioned the withdrawal of the tracts in my first letter, and also said:—

“It ought, I think, to be patent to everybody that an author is at perfect liberty to withdraw any of his writings for reconsideration, or even without stating any reason whatever; and that when works have been publicly withdrawn it is not right to quote them as the present views of the writer.

“The withdrawal of a work is one thing, and the manner, reason, and object of withdrawal altogether different things.

If you withdraw the unjust imputation you have made against me, whether it be done graciously or ungraciously, it will not affect the *fact* of withdrawal, and you would, I am sure, consider it very unrighteous on my part if I were to treat you as though you had made no withdrawal. The principle involved in not considering a paper as withdrawn, because the manner or motives are not deemed satisfactory, if sought to be carried out in the ordinary affairs of life, would soon be detected as a species of Jesuitry too absurd to be seriously entertained.

“For instance, what would you think of any person to whom you had paid money in discharge of an account, saying to you some time after, that you cannot be regarded as having discharged the debt, because you had not done so gracefully?”

“I now add to the statements made in my previous letter the following extract from a paper written by Mr. Newton in 1847, in which he has publicly withdrawn the tracts, viz., ‘With regard to the two tracts recently published by myself on ‘The Sufferings of Christ,’ I also request that they may be withdrawn for reconsideration.’ With this evidence before you I trust you will be satisfied that your charge of heresy is grounded solely upon tracts which have been ‘publicly withdrawn,’ in the common ordinary unequivocal sense of that expression.

“This, however, is not the *least* part of the injustice you have done Mr. Newton in your papers. The unfair use you have made of the extracts by mis-representing the views of Mr. Newton, is of far greater moment; but upon this, and the wrong construction you have also put upon the quotations given in your last letter from ‘Christ our Suffering Surety,’ I will not now make any further remarks.

“Yours faithfully,  
“JOHN COX, JUN.”

Mr. Ryan answered on the 1st June, 1866:—

“Dear Sir,—In reply to yours of May 30. I did not mean to state that you intended to say what you did not fully believe to be the case;—not at all.

“But I referred to the case itself—that I did not believe it could be called a ‘public withdrawal.’ Such is my estimate of the matter in hand; yours may be different, for partizanship blinds.”

Mr. Ryan also asked whether the paper containing

the withdrawal of the tracts was on sale or out of print; to which I replied on the 2nd June, 1866, that it is now out of print; but I sent him copies of the published letters of Dr. Tregelles, referred to on pages 2, 3, in which the withdrawal of the tracts is mentioned, and I added:—

“The public withdrawal of these two tracts is a matter of fact, and cannot be affected by any question of partizanship.”

Mr. Ryan’s answer is dated 11th June, 1866:—

“Dear Sir,—In reply to yours of June 2, which should have been answered sooner, I have only to say that it is curious that the document which speaks of the ‘public withdrawal’ of those tracts should be ‘out of print.’ You remember that ‘out of print’ was one of the proofs given for the tracts in question having been withdrawn. But instead of this document, you send me Dr. Tregelles’ Letters. Well, in those letters—which show how Dr. T. understood the matter—he does not say one word of the ‘public withdrawal’ of the tracts, but only of certain statements contained in the tracts; whilst the tracts, as a whole, are, in the judgment of Dr. T. and Mr. N. unobjectionable, and contain no wrong doctrine at all. This then is not what plain ordinary people would call a ‘public withdrawal’ of the tracts. But in an extract given from Mr. N. in one of those letters, we are informed that the corrected statements of Mr. N. (corrected for the sake of others) are to be found in a ‘Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord’s Humanity.’

“Now why did you not send me this letter, to which Mr. N. refers, and not Dr. T.’s letters? It would have been more to the point as an important document, and I don’t find that you make any mention of it. But as it happens, I have that letter of Mr. N. in my possession; and you must be well aware that there is not a sentence in my tract that is not confirmed and established by that letter of Mr. N. If sentiments or statements were found in my tract, which are not found in that letter, I might be justly blamed, but where are they, or which ones are they?

“Therefore, the line of defence adopted won’t bear the light of day, and the wonderful indignation displayed is a mere catch on terms. However, to cut matters short, if it pleases you and Mr. N., I will add a few pages to the remaining copies of my tract which are unsold, to the following effect:—

“1. That Mr. N. has withdrawn certain statements made in former tracts.

“2. That those tracts are now out of print, and Mr. N. has no desire to reprint them. But that as regards the doctrines at stake, Mr. N. still holds and teaches that our Lord in his life was all along under the damnatory wrath of Almighty God. That those life sufferings were expiatory and atoning alike to the sufferings on the cross.

“3. That with a contradiction common to error in general, Mr. N. also holds and teaches that the cross stands out ‘alone,’ and consequently unlike His other sufferings.

“But how it is that the cross stands out ‘alone,’ and yet all His other sufferings ‘*alike unto it,*’ and expiatory, and atoning, it is not for me to explain, nor can I at this moment tell which of them Mr. N. really does hold.

“If then Mr. N. or you wish me to add a P.S. of this kind it shall be done; but I cannot see how it would mend matters for him, and in saying this much, I expect that my part of the correspondence ends.

“Yours faithfully,

“T. RYAN.

My answer is dated 13th June, 1866:—

“Dear Sir,—I received your letter of the 11th instant, and regret that I am under the necessity of pointing out many incongruities and mis-statements contained therein.

“1. In compliance with the request made in your previous letters, I supplied the most conclusive evidence that the two tracts had been publicly withdrawn. You now reply, ‘I have only to say that it is curious that the document which speaks of the ‘public withdrawal’ of the tracts should be out of print. You will remember that ‘out of print’ was one of the proofs given of the tracts in question having been withdrawn.’

“To my mind there is nothing ‘curious’ about a document which was published nearly twenty years ago, being out of print. On the contrary, it is a most ordinary circumstance; and as to your statement that I mentioned this circumstance as one of the proofs that the tracts have been withdrawn, I will only say that it is not according to fact. I have already shewn in a previous letter the fallacy of your statement—again repeated, that because the withdrawn tracts are asserted to be free from the heretical doctrines imputed to them, therefore they cannot be considered as having been publicly withdrawn.

“2. Your statement that in the ‘letters’ I sent you, by Dr. Tregelles, not one word is said of the withdrawal of the tracts, is also not according to fact. See ‘Three Letters’ p. 20. In the concluding extract the *tracts* (not ‘certain statements’) are clearly referred to as having been withdrawn, and Dr. Tregelles has added in parenthesis the reason why, viz., ‘for re-consideration.’

“3. Your statement that I have not made any mention of ‘A Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord’s Humanity,’ is also not according to fact. If you refer to my letter of the 14th May, you will not only find it referred to, but also a long extract from it. In my last letter also, I specially referred you to the paragraph on page 20 of Dr. Tregelles’ ‘Three Letters,’ &c., in which that letter is mentioned. In my previous letters I have given prominence to ‘Ancient Truths,’ &c., and ‘Christ our Suffering Surety,’ as containing Mr. Newton’s views, because these works are still in circulation and take the place of the ‘Letter’ which is now out of print.

“4. Your statement that there is not a sentence in your tract that is not confirmed and established by that letter, is also not according to fact. On the contrary, there is nothing in common between them. The doctrines in that letter are as strongly contrasted with those which you so unjustly accuse Mr. Newton of holding, as truth and falsehood.

“5. That which you propose to add by way of postscript to your tract is also full of other mis-statements. You propose to add, ‘that Mr. Newton has withdrawn certain statements made in former tracts.’ Truth requires that you should acknowledge that you have charged Mr. Newton with holding grievous doctrinal errors, and have adduced in support of this serious charge only some extracts selected by the hand of an enemy, from two tracts which have been long out of print, and were publicly withdrawn by Mr. Newton, nearly twenty years ago, for reconsideration; and further, that the erroneous doctrines which have been deduced therefrom are not and never were, held or taught by Mr. Newton.

“You propose also to state in your postscript, that Mr. Newton holds and teaches contradictory views as to the sufferings of Christ—this also is not according to fact. In none of his works can I find that he says, ‘that our Lord in His life was all along suffering under the damnatory wrath of Almighty God.’ The statements to which you referred in your previous letter, ‘that all His sufferings in

life and in death were alike expiatory, atoning, and vicarious,' certainly does not involve the thought of all being damnatory sufferings. Neither are you justified by the conclusion you have come to from the passage on p. 19, of 'Christ our Suffering Surety,' to which you have referred in your previous letter, as shewing that Mr. Newton held any such idea as 'mitigated damnatory wrath.'

"In the former part of that passage, Mr. Newton is speaking of what others say and not stating what he himself holds, but in the latter part of the same passage he teaches most distinctly the opposite view, where he says, 'Even in Gethsemane where the agony of His soul and of His body was so great, He was not as yet left in His own solitary strength to bear alone the intensity of unmitigated wrath.' The supposed contradiction exists only in your imagination.

"I do not think it possible for Mr. Newton to state more clearly than he has done in that tract the views he holds on this subject.

"So far as the additions you propose to make to your paper, being any reparation for the great injustice you have done to Mr. Newton, by the unfair use you have made of his writings, it would be only adding calumny to calumny.

"It is with much regret that I say that I can scarcely find in your letter a true statement. Writing thus is by no means a pleasant task, and in pointing out these many mis-statements, I do not desire to impute wilful falsehood to you, remembering that mis-statements often arise from ignorance, carelessness, and other like causes.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN COX JUN."

Mr. Ryan, in his answer dated 17th June, 1866, says:—

"I showed you in my last letter that what you and Mr. Newton are pleased to call a public withdrawal of certain tracts, was no 'public withdrawal.'

"One of the proofs I gave of this was that in the 'Letter on Subjects connected with the Lord's Humanity,' . . . I said were confirmed and established all the statements of Mr. N. which my tract presents."

Mr. Ryan then appends certain extracts from the two tracts placed side by side with certain extracts from the Letter and observes:—

“ If any man on reading over those extracts can say that there is nothing in ‘common between them,’ all I can say in reply is that, he must have some other interest to serve than the Gospel—or else that plain English words fail to convey to him their ordinary meaning.”

I will not burden this paper (which is much longer than I intended it to be) with these extracts, as I never questioned the identity of the views contained in them. I only questioned the correctness of Mr. Ryan’s statements respecting them.

This is the last communication I received from Mr. Ryan on this subject; the following letter dated the 20th June, 1866, closed the correspondence.

“ Dear Sir,—I do not find either in your letter received yesterday, or in your previous communications, anything to shake the evidence, by which I have clearly proved the public withdrawal of the tracts you have so unfairly used against Mr. Newton in your ‘Word of Warning,’ &c.

“ To bring serious charges of unsound doctrine against a writer, supported *only* by evidence from writings which he has publicly withdrawn, is contrary to the rules of controversy, and if done knowingly, must be regarded as a very unchristian and ungentlemanly act. The misrepresentation of the writer’s statements would, of course, be a sevenfold act of injustice.

“ In my correspondence with you I desire to assume that you have been misled by Mr. Kelly’s libellous pamphlet, and that you have taken all your evidence against Mr. Newton from it, being in ignorance of the facts of the case.

“ In my previous letters, I have given an extract from the paper containing the withdrawal of the tracts, and have proved beyond a doubt that they were withdrawn *publicly*.

“ You do not attempt to question the genuineness of that paper, of which you have, I believe, a copy; nor have you disproved its publicity; neither do you plead that there is any ambiguity in the passage containing the withdrawal.

“ In fact you do not in any way traverse the evidence I have produced; but you simply deny that the tracts have been publicly withdrawn, and in doing so endeavour to shew that the doctrines contained in the tracts are also found in a subsequently written letter. This I never denied—on the contrary, in my letter of the 14th May, I have given extracts from them *all*, in order to shew that Mr. Newton’s views, as



contained in them, are entirely opposed to the heretical doctrines which you have deduced from the tracts, and which you now attribute to the letter.

“If you refer again to my last letter, you will see that you have quite misunderstood what I have therein written. I have not said that there is nothing in common between the tracts and the letter, but have drawn the contrast between the doctrines imputed to Mr. Newton in your paper and the letter.

“These, however, are distinct points, and do not in the remotest degree affect the question as to whether the tracts have, or have not, been publicly withdrawn.

“I must, therefore, ask you to confine yourself to the evidence upon this point, which it is desirable should be kept distinct from extraneous matters, and be settled before other questions are further considered.

“Yours faithfully,

“JOHN COX, JUN.”

In his *recent* pamphlet, Mr. Ryan has, at last, admitted the withdrawal of the tracts. He says, “as Mr. Newton has withdrawn those tracts from circulation there is no necessity of my going into proofs in his case.” But notwithstanding this admission, Mr. Ryan has still retained the extract from Mr. Kelly’s pamphlet, which contains incorrect and perverted quotations from those very tracts. (See p. 13) Had Mr. Ryan made no further statements prejudicial to my beloved friend and pastor, I should not have taken any further notice of him; but after reading his “Second Word of Warning to recent converts in Ireland on the peculiar doctrines of Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton,” I feel it to be a painful duty which I owe to him, and to the “recent converts” addressed by him, as well as to Mr. Newton, to make this protest and remonstrance.

I am almost driven to the conclusion that Mr. Ryan has made up his mind to do all in his power to injure the character of Mr. Newton and destroy his influence as a Christian teacher. He professes in his pamphlet a tender solicitude for “recent converts,” and under the guise of guarding them from dangerous error, seeks to fasten upon Mr. Newton doctrines which he

has always repudiated. To be thus misrepresented, and accused of holding that which he would rather lay down his life than promulgate, is no small trial to a sensitively Christian heart. Mr. Newton has been, however, graciously strengthened to bear this deep sorrow for many years; and while his accusers have been railing against him, and spending their time, money, and energies, in fulminating charges, he has been quietly and steadily employed in teaching the very truths which they have persistently accused him of denying. To unprejudiced minds this has been abundantly evident both in his numerous works and public ministrations; and this faithful, unostentatious service has been greatly owned and blessed by the Lord, who has used his gospel statements and tracts in the conversion of many souls; and made him the honoured instrument of bringing many to realize peace and acceptance with God through the finished work of Christ; and of establishing others in the faith and hope of the gospel.

He has been thus building up the fabric of truth, which his opponents have been assiduously engaged in pulling down. For, although they are *professedly* employed in defending the truth, any thoughtful mind will easily discover, that they are *really* assailing the Creeds and Confessions of Protestant Evangelical Churches, and are destroying the great land marks of Christianity. While manifestly carrying on a crusade against *one* of the servants of the truth, they are really opposing and resisting *all* true Evangelical Christians. The extent to which they have succeeded in introducing their own novel and peculiar system, and the sad results which have followed, are but little estimated by those who do not know their devices.

No one is better acquainted than Mr. Newton with the dangerously unscriptural character of their system; and no one has more thoroughly and ably opposed their peculiar doctrinal and ministerial views; and yet, strange to say, it is generally supposed that Mr. Newton belongs to the Brethren. His official description,—

“Minister of a Congregation of Protestants holding the Creeds and first eighteen Articles of the Church of England, but rejecting her order and ritual,”—is, of itself, quite sufficient to show that he does not belong to a body who ignores all Creeds and Articles, and who hold loose democratic views of Ministry and do not recognize “pastors and teachers as the definite ordinance of Christ.”

In conclusion, I would appeal to all Christians who desire to maintain those foundation truths of Scripture for which our Reformers laid down their lives, and would earnestly ask them to inquire whether these things, which I have written, are or are not true; and to “judge righteous judgment” respecting them.

Appended is a list of Mr. Newton’s works; and I challenge his accusers to produce from them fair and honest proof that he holds any of the heretical doctrines which they have unrighteously imputed to him. And in any further statements which they may make on this subject, I would beseech of them to have reference to the following exhortations by the Apostle Paul.

“Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you with all malice.”

“And above all these things put on charity which is the bond of perfectness.”

“Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” Amen.

24 AU 67

**LIST OF WORKS**  
BY  
**BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON,**

*(Formerly Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.)*

**OCCASIONAL PAPERS on Scriptural Subjects.**

Vol. I. Royal 8vo., cloth, with Map of the Ten Kingdoms, colored, mounted, and in cloth case. Price 10s. 6d.

Containing Nos. 1, 2, and 3, each of which may be had separately, in wrapper. No. 1, price 2s.; No. 2, price 2s. 6d.; No. 3, price 3s. 6d.

Including Papers on Justification;—Sanctification;—the Song of Solomon;—the Histories of Abraham, Lot, and Jacob;—European Prospects;—Remarks on "Mosaic Cosmogony" being the fifth of "Essays and Reviews";—Note on the Locality of Hades;—Notes on the Greek of several portions of Scripture, &c., &c.

Vol. II. No. 4. Royal 8vo., in wrapper. Price 4s.

Including Remarks on Judgments on "Essays and Reviews";—a Paper on Salvation by Substitution;—Note on "Ecce Homo," &c.

**THE JUDGMENTS OF THE COURT OF ARCHES,**

and of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D., one of the writers in "Essays and Reviews," *considered.*

(Extracted from Occasional Papers, No. 4.)

Demy 8vo., Price in wrapper, 1s. 6d. Cloth 2s.

Including Remarks on the two Judgments; Note on Mr. Wilson's rejection of the Doctrine of Eternal Punishment;—Doctrine of the English Reformers on Baptism;—Dr. Pusey and his "Eirenicon";—The Future of Israel ignored by the Modern Maintainers of Catholicity;—Note on "Ecce Homo."

**DAVID, KING OF ISRAEL.** 12mo., cloth. Price 2s.

**DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE Respecting Baptism.**

12mo., cloth. Price 1s. 6d.

**THOUGHTS ON PARTS OF LEVITICUS.**

Vol. I. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo., cloth. Price 3s. 6d.

*Contents*:—The Burnt Offering. The Meat Offering. The Peace Sacrifice. The Sin Offering. The Trespass Offering.

Vol. II. 12mo., cloth. Price 2s.

*Contents*:—The Consecration of the Priests. Things Clean and Unclean. The Leprosy.

**NOTES EXPOSITORY OF THE GREEK of the First Chapter of the Romans.** With remarks on the force of certain Synonyms, &c. Crown 8vo., cloth, 2s. 6d.

[OVER.]

WORKS by B. W. NEWTON—*Continued.*

**THOUGHTS ON PARTS OF THE EPISTLE TO  
the Romans.** 12mo., cloth. Price 3s.

*Containing the following Tracts, which may still be had separately, viz.:*—

1. The First and Second Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans Considered, &c. Price 1s. 6d.
2. Justification. Romans v. *Third Edition.* Price 2d.
3. Eternal Reconciliation. Romans v. *Third Edition.* Price 2d.
4. Romans vii. Considered. Price 1s., cloth 1s. 6d.
5. No Condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus. Romans viii. *Second Edition.* Price 2d.

**FOUNDATION TRUTHS.** 12mo., cloth. Price 2s. 6d.

*Containing the following Tracts, which may still be had separately, viz.:*—

1. Ancient Truths respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus. Price 3d.
2. Christ our Suffering Surety. Price 6d.
3. Note on 1 Peter ii. 24. Price 2d.
4. The Blood that Saveth. *Ninth Edition, 12mo. Four for 1d., or 2s. per 100. Eighth Edition, 32mo. Two for 1d., or 4s. per 100.*
5. Acceptance with God. *Third Edition.* Four for 1d., or 2s. per 100.
6. Regeneration in its Connexion with the Cross. *Second Edition.* Price 2d.
- 7.\*Salvation by Substitution. Price 3d.
- 8.\*On Justification through the Blood and Righteousness of a Substitute. *Second Edition.* Price 2d.
- 9\*On Sanctification by the Blood of Jesus. Price 1½d.
- 10\*Jesus Washing His Disciples' Feet. Price 2d.
11. Propositions for the Solemn Consideration of Christians. *Third Edition.* Price 2d.

\* Extracted from Occasional Papers.

**DOCTRINES OF POPERY.** 12mo., cloth. Price 1s. 6d.

*Containing the following Tracts, which may still be had separately, viz.:*—

1. On Holy Scripture and Tradition. Price 8d.
2. On Original Sin. Price 4d.
3. Reflections suggested by the present movement in England against Romanism. Price 4d.
4. In a Dispensation of Failure, Catholicity the Sure Token of Apostasy. *Second Edition.* Price 2d.

LONDON: HOULSTON & WRIGHT, 65, PATERNOSTER ROW.

**WORKS ON PROPHECY**  
BY  
**BENJAMIN WILLS NEWTON.**

---

**AIDS TO PROPHETIC ENQUIRY.**

First Series. Second Edition, 12mo., cloth. Price 3s. 6d.

*Contents:*—No Poetic Exaggeration in Scripture;—Objections to the Millennial Reign considered;—Futurity of Antichrist and his connection with Israel and Babylon;—Remarks on the Prophetic Views of Mr. Fleming, Mr. Elliott, and Dr. Cumming;—Thoughts on Zech. xii., xiii., Matt. xxiv., Luke xxi., &c., &c.

**BABYLON: its Revival and Final Desolation.**

Being the Second Series of Aids to Prophetic Enquiry.  
Second Edition, 12mo., cloth. Price 3s.

*Contents:*—The Futurity of the Final Judgments on Babylon;—its Gradual Declension, Present Condition of its Ruins (with plans);—the Establishment of the Ephah in the Land of Shinar;—Remarks on Isa. x., xi., xii., xiii.; Rev. xvii., &c., &c.

**PROSPECTS OF THE TEN KINGDOMS of the Roman Empire Considered.**

Being the Third Series of Aids to Prophetic Enquiry.  
12mo., cloth. Price 4s.

*Contents:*—The Scope of the Roman Empire; History of Governmental Power as taught in the Vision of the image of Dan. ii.;—Formation of Ten Kingdoms;—on the Four Beasts of Dan. vii.;—Thoughts on Matt. xiii., Dan. ix., x., xi., xii., 2 Thess. ii., &c., &c.

**THOUGHTS ON THE APOCALYPSE.**

Second Edition, revised. Demy 8vo., cloth. Price 8s. 6d.

**ANTICHRIST—EUROPE AND THE EAST.**

12mo., cloth. Price 2s.

*Containing the following Tracts, which may still be had separately, viz.:*—

1. The Antichrist Future. *Second Edition. Price 2d.*
2. The 1260 Days of Antichrist's Reign Future. *Price 3d.*
3. Conversation on Revelation xvii. *Price 2d.*
4. What is the Ephah of Zechariah v. ? or, the Exhibition of 1851 considered in Relation to Principles of Modern Legislation. *Third Edition. Price 3d.*
5. Final Predominance of Russia Inconsistent with the Declarations of Scripture. *Price 6d.*
6. England's Future Course in the East. *Price 6d.*

[OVER.]

WORKS ON PROPHECY, by B. W. NEWTON.

*Continued.*

**ISRAEL AND JERUSALEM.** 12mo., cloth. Price 2s.

*Containing the following Tracts, which may still be had separately, viz.:*—

1. On the Prophecies respecting the Jews and Jerusalem, in the form of a Catechism. *Third Edition. Price 2d.*
2. Jerusalem; its Future History. *Price 4d.*
3. Prophetic Psalms in their Relation to Israel, briefly considered. *Price 6d.*
4. Israel's Prospects in the Millennium. *Price 4d.*
5. Old Testament Saints not excluded from the Church of God. *Second Edition. Price 1d.*
6. The World to Come. *Third Edition. Price 1½d.*
7. The Millennium and the Everlasting State. *Price 2d.*

**THE COMING OF THE LORD; Events connected therewith.** 12mo., cloth. Price 2s. 6d.

*Containing the following Tracts, which may still be had separately, viz.:*—

- 1.\*Duty of Giving Heed to the Predictions of Scripture Respecting Events that are to Precede the Return of Our Lord. *Second Edition. Price 2d.*
- 2.\*The Second Advent of Our Lord not Secret but in Manifested Glory. *Price 2d.*
3. The Prophecy of the Lord Jesus, in Matt. xxiv., xxv. *Price 8d.*
- 4.†Order of Events connected with the Appearing of Christ, and His Millennial Reign. *Price 6d.*
5. The Christian and Jewish Remnants at the time of the End. *Price 3d.*
6. Scriptural Proof of the Doctrine of the First Resurrection. *Price 4d.*
7. The Day of the Lord. On Zechariah xiv. *Third Edition. Price 2d.*
8. A Letter to the Minister of Silver Street Chapel, Taunton, in reply to his Lecture against the Pre-millennial Advent of the Lord. *Third Edition. Price 3d.*

\* Extracted from *Occasional Papers on Scripture Subjects.*

† Extracted from *Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman Empire.*

LONDON: HOULSTON & WRIGHT, 65, PATERNOSTER ROW.









