
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>







4139 65-54.

LAW AND RIGHTEOUSNESS.

AN

ADDRESS TO ALL WHO LOVE THE TRUTH,

“To Probe all Things,”

Before the Darbyite theory which rejects the Law be accepted.

K

BY

SHONAGAROWANE,

A MOHAWK INDIAN, LIVING IN CANADA WEST:

Otherwise in English,

ISAAC BEARSFOOT.

“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God.”—2 *John* iv. 1.

“Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.”—1 *Thess.* v. 21.

LONDON:

WILLIAM HUNT AND COMPANY,
HOLLES STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

PRICE TWOPENCE.



“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God.”—1 JOHN iv. 1.

“Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good.”—1 THESS. v. 21.

My brethren in Christ, it would be well indeed for us were we to obey and carry out the injunctions here given by Christ's holy Apostles ; for our great adversary is continually watching if by any means he can deceive even the very elect. When he fails to entrap us by one plan he will try another : when he is unable to drive us into open sin, he will endeavour to ruin our souls by means of false religion and false hopes ; therefore it well becomes us all to “Try the spirits,” and to “Prove all things.”

It is a matter of no small regret to the godly soul to think that in spite of the abundancy of the Word of God, so many professing Christians are readily led away and tossed about by every vain wind of doctrine.

Teachers of false doctrines there are in the world at the present day it cannot be doubted, for so it was predicted by the Apostles.

Some twenty-five or thirty years ago a new religious sect sprang up in England which professed to be more spiritual, and more scriptural in its teaching than any other ; and to take the Bible for its only guide. This sect is commonly known as the “Plymouth Brethren.” It has found its way across the Atlantic Ocean into our midst ; it is endeavouring to advance rapidly far and wide by means of tracts and pamphlets ; its doctrines are almost all in direct opposition to those that have been established by time, and considered to have been taught by the Bible—these new doctrines have the garb of Scripture language, and strike at the very root of our belief ; hence it becomes our duty, as responsible beings, to examine them by the Word of God, and settle for ourselves whether they are on a sure foundation.

Let us take heed, however, my brethren, in examining these doctrines, that we allow neither bigotry and prejudice on the one hand, nor zeal for the cause of truth on the other, to influence us by making use of any expressions unbecoming our profession as Christians ; but manifest in

ourselves that charity which St. Paul says is greater than either faith or hope (1 Cor. xiii. 13): and let us invoke the special aid of the Holy Spirit in this, our investigation, to guide us into the truth as it is in Jesus.

These "Brethren" advance certain statements in their doctrines which they allege is their justification for withdrawing from all other bodies of Christians: the examination of which is my object in this address, but its limits will not permit me to take up every statement; I will therefore glance only at a few of them, and endeavour by God's grace to answer.

STATEMENT I.

The professing Christians have divided the body of Christ into many sects. - The Christians of the Apostolic age said, "I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas:" and the Christians of the present day follow the example by saying, I am of the Church of England, I am a Baptist, I am a Methodist, &c. (*R. T. Grant's opening sermon, 1862.*)

ANSWER.

This statement I admit is true,—*i.e.*, so far as divisions are concerned; but what a miserable excuse is this for the conduct of the "Brethren!" Verily it "deserves to be mentioned only that it may be despised."

It is to be regretted that we, as Christians, are not united,—that we are not "one body" as well as "one spirit;" but the "Brethren" have indeed good reason to take heed lest when a "mote" appears to them to be in our eyes a "beam" shall be in their own. If we are censurable for dividing the body of Christ, certainly they are more so for making the rent worse by adding another, in three branches, to the number of pre-existing sects. They certainly did not apply the proper remedy for sectarian divisions when they organized a sect peculiar to themselves, worshipping and holding communion with none but of their own, denouncing, in no measured terms, the doctrines of all other denominations of Christians as anti-scriptural and mischievous, and assuming unto themselves the lofty title of being the *only true* Church of God.

STATEMENT II

The "Brethren" themselves do not form a sect; they meet together simply as Christians, and only in the name of Jesus, while all other Christians meet in the name of their respective sects.

ANSWER.

This statement is totally destitute of foundation, and unrighteous. The "Brethren" cannot deny with any truth that they *do* form a sect, as they have all the characteristics of one.

The followers of Mr. Darby—commonly known as the Darbyite portion of the "Plymouth Brethren,"—are indeed a sect of sects; they would no more think of holding the Communion of the body and blood of Christ with other Christians than with the very heathens, for hear what their recognised champion says:—"For my own part, I should neither go to Bethesda in its present state; nor while in that state, go where persons from it are knowingly received." (As quoted in "*Profession and Practice.*")

The "Plymouth Brethren" originally formed one sect; but in a short time dissensions arose among them, ending in the formation of three distinct bodies, headed respectively by Messrs. Darby, Newton, and Muller:—the followers of Mr. Muller are those to whom Mr. Darby alludes in the above quotation.

If, then, Mr. Darby declines communion with the Mullerites, who were once of his own party, it is but reasonable to suppose that he would still be the less inclined to have fellowship with Episcopalians, Methodists, etc., whom he regards as having "fallen from grace."

But however much Mr. Darby may feel inclined to believe that other Christians have "fallen from grace," instances can be adduced in which members of two different denominations have united in celebrating the death of their common Saviour, thereby carrying out the emblem of Christ's discipleship (John xiii. 35) by smothering blind prejudice in the tide of love.

Thus it is that the first part of the statement on this point made by the "Brethren" is unfounded; the latter part is

also without foundation, and, at the same time, unrighteous. The members of the Church of England do not meet in the name of Episcopacy, neither do the Wesleyans meet in the name of Methodism, etc., etc.; but I am firmly convinced that they meet in the name of Him alone whom they profess to worship, and whose house holiness becometh.

It would indeed be a source of ill comfort for the people of God to be told that they do not meet in the name of their only Saviour, were it not that it is a small thing for them to be judged of by man or by man's judgment; and that it is to their Master in heaven, and not to mortals on earth, that they are to render an account hereafter, and before whom they are to stand or fall.

It certainly is an indication of spiritual pride for the "Brethren" to declare that they are the only ones who meet in the name of Jesus alone, while all other Christians meet in the name of some sect; being tantamount to declaring that their system, and theirs alone, is heaven's favourite, to the exclusion of all others! I would just beg leave to remind the "Brethren" that "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." (Matt. xxiii. 12.)

The "Brethren" may turn, twist and do what they like to prove that they are no sect, in order to escape their own accusation against us, but it is of no avail; the accusation *must* recoil upon their own heads with double force. "First, cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." (Matt. vii. 5.) Let the "Brethren" cease divisions among themselves, and discountenance such, both by example and precept, and then shall cease all those evils resulting from divisions which are experienced by the true Christians at the present day.

STATEMENT III.

"Hence imputing God's righteousness could not be employed or thought of by me, because I deny all such previous sum of righteousness made out and then imputed, to be the meaning of righteousness being imputed." (*Brethren and their Reviewers* : " page 18. J. N. D.)

“ We are not justified by works of law, by whomsoever done, but entirely in another way.” (*Ibid*: page 21.)

“ The Gentiles, we are solemnly assured by Scripture, had not the law ; have no law.” (*Ibid*: page 22.)

“ Christians are not under the law in any way.” (*Ibid*: page 25.)

“ But though the Christian alone fulfills the law, it is not his rule of life.” (*Ibid*: page 41.)

ANSWER.

This is a most important question, as it treats specially of the ground-work of salvation, and requires the most attentive and prayerful consideration ; let us, however, continue our investigation, never doubting but that the Holy Spirit, whose aid we have invoked, will guide us into all truth.

For the better treatment of this question, we will examine each quotation separately.

SECTION I.

“ Hence, imputing God’s righteousness could not be employed or thought of by me, because I deny all such previous sum of righteousness made out and then imputed, to be the meaning of righteousness being imputed.”

It is really difficult to know what are the exact ideas of Mr. Darby as set forth in his mystic work, from which the above extracts are taken, containing, as it does, such conflicting statements. On page 16 he says:—“ The very essence of practical Christianity is our partaking of the divine nature, and having God’s moral attributes conferred on us or implanted with His nature in us. And as to ‘ righteousness ’ as an attribute, this is equally true. But an attribute being imputed to us is simple nonsense. * * * Nobody has said that the righteousness of God is imputed. * * * * Nobody ever thought of imputing an attribute of God, or any attribute at all.”

This is a specimen of Mr. Darby’s style of writing. In the first place he says, “ God’s moral attributes,” including righteousness, are “ conferred on us, or implanted with His nature in us ; ” and immediately afterwards says, “ An

attribute being imputed to us is simple nonsense, and "nobody has said that the righteousness of God is imputed * * * * or any attribute at all!" Again, on page 17, he says, "But although a man must be born again, have Christ as his life, to have a part in the righteousness of God, yet that is not being righteous before God;" and on page 18, we read, "Imputing righteousness is the estimate of man's relative state to God. The man is righteous in the sight of Him who judges."

In other words, the man *is not* righteous before God, and *he also is!* Profound consistency, indeed!

If I understand Mr. Darby correctly, he holds that imputing righteousness to man means, accounting or reckoning him righteous when he is in no sense said to be so, and no "sum of righteousness" put to his account, or put on him; for he says, "Scripture never speaks of imputed righteousness as of a sum of righteousness first existing and then imputed," "for the essence of this (Gospel) is that God justifies the ungodly." Here is, then, Mr. Darby's theory of imputing righteousness; you will at once see, my brethren, that he holds there is no real imputation at all: but what saith the Bible on this point, "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness." (Isa. lxi. 21.) "Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and he stood before the angel. And he answered and spoke unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments." (Zach. iii. 3, 4, 5.) "Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, *unto* all and *upon* all them that believe." (Rom. iii. 22.) "God imputed righteousness without works." (Rom. iv. 6.) "To her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints." (Rev. xix. 8.) Now, my brethren, do not these texts speak of a real imputation of righteousness? Is not righteousness put upon

all believers, even as a garment is put upon them? To my mind, these texts are conclusive that God *does* impute righteousness, that there is no sham about it, but all a reality.

But Mr. Darby thinks he must insist that the man to whom righteousness is imputed, is not righteous in *any sense*, in order that the "essence" of the Gospel may not be interfered with; *i.e.*, that God may justify the ungodly—ungodly in *every* sense.

If Mr. Darby would only pause a little and reflect, I think he would find himself guilty of branding the character of Jehovah, by representing Him as holding a man to be what he in no sense is!

He evidently has experienced the truth of the saying, that "a lie is always troublesome, requiring the aid of many more to support it," as he has found it necessary to have recourse to another error after having taught one. His teaching that there is no real imputation of righteousness to the believer is one error, and by consequence, that God justifies the ungodly, in *every sense* ungodly, is another.

But if real imputation of righteousness to the believer takes place, how comes it, then, that God justifies the *ungodly*?

Scripture declares that it *is* the ungodly whom God justifies. (Rom. iv. 5.)

My brethren, in order to understand this blessed doctrine we must remember what we are in ourselves. Man, when first created, was a pure and spotless being, without the least taint of sin and mortality, and had he continued so, there would have been no sin in the world. But having disobeyed God, he fell from this condition, and brought sin and death into the world, and transmitted his evil and corrupt nature to his posterity. We, my brethren, as the descendants of Adam, have each of us this corrupt nature, and in ourselves, such is the enormity of our guilt, that our place is to lie prostrate in dust and ashes, never once daring to lift up an eye to the highly offended Jehovah, but to cry out, "Unclean, unclean!"

In this view, we rightly say we are ungodly; but, when the Almighty, in His gracious goodness, sees fit to clothe

us with the garments of salvation, to cover us with a robe of righteousness, so that we are said to be perfectly righteous, holy, and without spot or blemish, then it is that He justifies us. God does not justify us in our ungodliness,—*i.e.*, when we are in no sense righteous,—but when He views us through the complete robe of righteousness with which He covers us. Thus it is that God justifies the ungodly.

I think, my brethren, that enough has been said to convince any mind open to conviction, that imputing righteousness means, in Scripture, covering the pardoned believer with a robe of righteousness put *upon* him, and that *that* is the ground-work of his justification, not his ungodliness; and that justifying the ungodly means justifying the believer who is in *himself* ungodly, but is without spot when looked at through the complete “robe of righteousness.”

Presuming this to be settled, let us pass on to

SECTION II.

“We are not justified by works of law, by whomsoever done, but entirely in another way.”

As a starting point, let us, my brethren, consider what Justification is. Suppose a person is brought up before a high court for the murder of his neighbour, and it is there satisfactorily proved that he is innocent of the crime, he is said to be justified; for to justify, is to clear from guilt; or, in other words, to justify a man, is to show that he is innocent. A man once being guilty can never become innocent in *himself* afterwards; hence, if he is justified at all, or declared innocent, it can only be done so by viewing him through the innocency of some other person.

Such is man's state in the sight of God: he is no longer innocent; he has become a sinner, and the idea of his ever becoming innocent in *himself* is absurd.

Continuing our illustration: the man in the criminal dock is pronounced “not guilty.” Justified of the crime of murder, how? It is proved that he has complied with the demands of the law of murder; hence he is justified by *his own* deeds of the law.

But suppose that instead of being pronounced innocent, he is found guilty, and sentenced to death; her Majesty,

out of compassion for the doomed man, conceives the idea of saving him from any punishment whatever, and of restoring him into her favour, but not at the expense of justice—what course will she adopt? Her first consideration would probably be, how is justice to be satisfied? She cannot justify or pronounce the man innocent as he is in *himself*; but suppose she condescends to send His Royal Highness to him with a written document, pledging herself not only to pardon him, but also to look at him through her own son as perfectly innocent—as having never broken her law; if he believed her then, it is that she can justify him, and pronounce him innocent for the sake of the Prince. As the man's perfect substitute, what must the Prince do? Evidently what the man was required to do: and what was that?

Had the murderer committed no murder, the law would have had but one claim upon him—obedience; but having broken it, he necessarily came under its condemnation. Now, had the claim of obedience been done away with by the fact that man came under the condemnation of the law, then mere suffering would have been sufficient to warrant her Majesty taking the criminal into her favour. But such is not the case; for if a man in prison for theft, commits a robbery there, he is at once, if found guilty, condemned. Hence the Prince must *keep* the law which the man was unable to keep, and *suffer the penalty* due to the man for breaking it. When these two requirements of the law are complied with, then, and not till then, can her Majesty pronounce the poor criminal, in his substitute, perfectly innocent, pure and without blemish; and it is not till then that the law is magnified and its righteousness fulfilled—then it is that the law can witness the righteousness of the Queen in justifying the criminal.

Hence, the condemned culprit is justified, or declared innocent, by the deeds of the law, done by the Prince, his substitute; and mark you, my brethren, that the man receives the benefit of the Prince's work, when he believes on Her Majesty. If the man does not believe her, the Prince does not benefit him in the least.

Now, my brethren, who is this condemned criminal I

have been picturing to your mind? It is man. He is weighed in the balance of Divine justice, and found wanting. He is arraigned before the Great Judge, found guilty, and sentenced to eternal death. But in judgment, mercy showed itself. The Great Judge, out of compassion and extreme love, planned a redemption for him. He sent His own Son from His bosom into the world, to save mankind from eternal death; and not only that, but also to make us sit in heavenly places. Yes, my brethren, in order that you may not only escape the eternal punishment you justly deserve for your sins, but that you may be made Kings and Princes in Heaven, Christ left His heavenly glory, came into the world to be despised and rejected of man, and finally to die upon the shameful tree, despising the shame of so ignominious a death! The Son became man's substitute—a most precious substitute!—and from His mission, justification, or innocence for man (though not in himself) resulted.

Let us, for a moment, imagine ourselves the condemned criminal (such is our state by nature),—Her Majesty the Great Jehovah,—the Prince our blessed Redeemer, who is indeed the Prince of Princes; and the plan of salvation will shine forth in its brightest lustre of love, righteousness, justice, and holiness.

But perhaps Mr. Darby will say,—You are justifying yourself by works, and that of the law; whereas St. Paul plainly tells us that we are justified by faith. (Galatians iii. 24, &c.)

I answer: I am not endeavouring to justify myself by *my own* works; but I am trying to find out what gives faith its intrinsic value,—*i. e.*, why is it that faith in “Him, who raised up Jesus, our Lord, from the dead,” justifies a man. We both agree in attributing this to Christ's meritorious and substitutional work; but you deny that this is of the law. Now, if you deny the active obedience of Christ to the law is a part of the work which secures our justification, and confine it to the Atonement upon the Cross alone, how are believers to establish the law and its righteousness fulfilled, in them?

You cannot deny that the law has a double claim upon

the sinner,—viz: obedience, and penalty for its breach; if, therefore, you confine Christ's substitutional work to the Cross alone, you, of necessity, throw overboard His active obedience to the law, so far as sinners are concerned. But you endeavour to account for His active obedience by saying that "it was needed for His personal perfection." What a miserable expediency! In order that you might have something to say against your opponents, you must needs dishonour Him who died that you might live, by charging Him with *personal imperfection*! If Christ kept the law during His life, not for His people but "for His personal perfection," He must have been imperfect without it.

On page 7 of your "*Brethren and their Reviewers*," you call upon all godly souls to denounce, with you, doctrines dishonouring to Christ; and on page 23, of the same, you yourself do dishonour Him! Verily, the truth of St. James' observations, respecting the tongue, is established by you. Out of the same *pen* proceedeth blessing and cursing!

I, for one, will respond to your call, and denounce doctrines dishonouring to our common Saviour: but I will do so without reserve; therefore your own doctrine of Christ's *personal imperfection* shall receive my denunciation as well as the others.

My brethren, let us investigate what composes this robe of righteousness which the Lord puts upon the believer, and which is the ground-work of his justification. Scriptures declare that we are justified by faith. (Rom. iii. 28; v. 1.: Gal. ii. 20—21; iii. &c.) Faith, in itself, is not righteousness; but righteousness comes by it. Thus, we read: "Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith." (Rom. iii. 22.) "For we, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." (Gal. v. 5.) "And be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God, by faith." (Phil. iii. 9.) Hence, we find that we are justified by the righteousness which comes by faith; it therefore only remains to ascertain what is this righteousness. The Bible teaches that we are saved, if saved at all, only by the merits of Christ;

therefore this "robe of righteousness," "garments of salvation," must be Christ's work.

The Darbyites flatly deny that Christ's righteousness is imparted to the believer; in fact, they go so far as to state positively that the "righteousness of Christ" is never mentioned in the whole Bible. Hence, according to them, the work of Christ, and the robe of righteousness which Isaiah speaks of, are two distinct things. They admit that they are saved only by the work of Christ, but it would be inconsistency for them to call it His righteousness. Isaiah speaks of being arrayed "with the garments of salvation," by being covered "with the robe of righteousness;" and the Darbyites speak of being saved by the merits of Christ. Are there two modes of salvation? Surely not. Listen now what the Bible says upon "the righteousness of Christ." ". . . to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." (Dan. ix. 24.) Who is to do all these? It is Christ. What righteousness was He to bring in? According to the Darbyites, it must be God's. If so, it must either be the *quality* that is in Himself, or that which he has wrought out. The Lord cannot part with the first without ceasing to be God; hence, Christ must have brought in the second—the wrought-out one. Now, I simply ask the "Brethren" to advance one single text of Scripture to prove directly, or indirectly, that God has wrought out the righteousness which Christ is to bring in. There is no idea of it in the whole Bible.

Besides the righteousness that is in God, or His character as a righteous God, had existed, or had been manifested in the world, *before* the birth of Christ. It is quite plain, then, that the righteousness spoken of by Daniel is *not* the righteousness of the Father, but that of the Son.

Again, Christ's righteousness may be considered either as the *quality* that is in Himself, or that which He has wrought out. He could not have brought in the former, because that had already been manifested in the world, being united with the righteousness of the Father. If so, Christ must have brought in the latter. At least, so Jeremiah intimates when he says,—“In those days, and at

that time, will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall EXECUTE judgment and RIGHTEOUSNESS in the land." (Jer. xxxiii. 15.) Again, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a Righteous Branch he shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." (Jer. xxiii. 5—6.) "And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." (Matt. iii. 15.) And, "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 Peter i. 1.) Now, do not Daniel, Jeremiah, Christ, and Simon Peter all speak of the "righteousness of Christ"? Are you prepared to believe Messrs. Darby, Mackintosh, Stanley, and others, when they tell you that Scriptures never speak of the righteousness of Christ? "Yea, let God be true and every man a liar." (Rom. iii. 4.) Jeremiah says Christ is "our righteousness," but St. Paul says He is the righteousness of God. Why so? It must be because He is our substitute, and was given to us by God himself. (Gal. iv. 3—5; John iii. 16.) The Lord Himself provided us with a righteousness in Christ; hence we meet with many such expressions as "the righteousness of God" in the Bible.

Consider now, my brethren, what was Christ's work. As our perfect substitute, He must perform whatsoever is required at our hands. All true Christians believe that His death upon the Cross was in the room and stead of His people. Mr. Darby confines the substitutional work of Christ to this alone, for he says: "I am not called upon, the law being in question, to believe that He kept it for me. The making Christ a keeper of the law for us, as being under it, is destroying the very nature and truth of Christianity as Scripture teaches it." ("*Brethren and their Reviewers*," pp. 29—30.) If it can be proved that punishment due to our sins is all that is required of us, then the Atonement alone would be a sufficient passport to heaven. But what does the Bible say of it? "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (Gen. iii. 15.) "The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us

all. For the transgression of my people was He stricken." (Isa. liii. 6—8.) "Without shedding of blood is no remission. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." (Heb. ix. 22—28.) Here Scriptures teach that the Atonement paid the penalty due to Adam's disobedience, and to the iniquity and transgression of God's people, and that it was necessary for the remission of sins.

What is sin? "Sin is the transgression of the law." (1 John iii. 4.) Thus the transgression of the law brought Christ to the Cross. Why was it requisite that satisfaction by way of death upon the Cross should be rendered to the law by Christ? Simply because, as the sinners' substitute, He came under its curse, for "Cursed is every one that continued not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them"—(Gal. iii. 10); and, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (verse 13). Mr. Darby denies that Christ kept the law in His life-time for His people. Now, a law, so long as it is not broken, has only the claim of obedience upon those who are under it. I suppose Mr. Darby admits that. But so soon as man breaks it, he comes under its curse. (Gal. iii. 10.) In other words, another claim comes in. Is the original demand of perfect obedience revoked, now that the man is condemned? If so, suffering the punishment alone would produce innocence, would establish the law, magnify it and make it honourable, and its righteousness fulfilled. Would you, my brethren, be prepared to pronounce the man innocent who has served his time out in penitentiary for stealing a horse? I am persuaded you would not. Suppose some person went to penitentiary for him: is he innocent? Surely not: and if he is not innocent in some sense, he cannot be justified. Must not the perfect obedience to the law against stealing, rendered by the thief's substitute, be taken into consideration, in order to justify the culprit? Evidently so. It is just the same with man. If it were possible for suffering the penalty of God's holy law alone to be a sufficient work for man to enter heaven, then it is quite clear that any man may die for another. A law-breaker may become the substitute of his fellow law-breaker, because he is capable of receiving the punishment.

But when the Great Jehovah, in His infinite mercy, planned our redemption, did He appoint one sinner to become the substitute of another? No. Why? Because that sinner had a punishment to receive of his own deserving. No, my brethren, "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men. . . . They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy, there is none that doeth good, no, not one." (Ps. xix. 2—3.) "Then said the Lord, what shall I do? I will send my beloved Son." (Luke xx. 13.) Yes, my brethren, God sent His beloved Son,—one that had no sin, and who could comply with every precept of God's broken law. Why was such a precious ransom required? Why was so much care taken in choosing a sinner's substitute, to select one who could *obey* the law perfectly, and suffer the penalty of its breach? It is but reasonable to suppose that the plan of salvation required it; so that while mercy was poured out to the lost sinner, the law—the Divine justice—is also fully vindicated; hence we hear Isaiah, in speaking of Christ, say, "He will magnify the law and make it honourable." (Isaiah xlii. 21.) This same idea is taken up by St. Paul, when he says, "Do we, then, make void the law through faith? God forbid. Yea, we establish the law." (Rom. iii. 31.) Once more, "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." (Rom. viii. 3—4.) Hear also Christ's declaration, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." (Matt. v. 17.)

Now, it is quite evident that so long as the holy law of God is not met with in *all* its requirements, it can never be said to be magnified, made honourable, established, or its righteousness fulfilled,—and by consequence the work of man's redemption is incomplete.

The "Brethren," perhaps, will say, "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight." (Rom. iii. 20.) True, by my *own* deeds of it I cannot be

justified, simply because I cannot render unto it that perfect obedience which it requires; but in my substitute I have complied with all its requirements. I obtain my justification or innocence by faith: I live by faith. (Gal. iii. 11.)

If it had been possible for me to obtain eternal life by my own observance of the law, then the inheritance would have been by the law and not by promise (Gal. iii. 18); but because the law "was weak through the flesh," the inheritance must be of promise, that it might be by grace. The promise is to be realized by faith; if therefore I endeavour to obtain the inheritance by *my own* obedience to the law, then, so far as I am concerned, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. Thus it is that "the law is not of faith." Believers now are placed on Abraham ground; they are "blessed with faithful Abraham" (Gal. iii. 9), and are justified exactly in the same way—by faith.

Abraham was to look *forward* to Christ as the fulfilment of the promise made to him; and now the believer is to look *back* to the same Christ. Christ's work gave the intrinsic value to the faith of both. "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness" (Gal. iii. 6), so, "if we believe on Him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead" (Rom. iv. 24) righteousness "shall be imputed" to us. This principle of faith must not be departed from, for so soon as we depart from it, and attempt to win salvation by our own works, from that moment we may regard ourselves as having "fallen from grace." (Gal. v. 4.)

So, my brethren, we find from the examination we have made of the Bible, that we are justified just in the same way as Abraham was—by faith: *i. e.*, our justification comes by it; that faith in itself is not righteousness, but is the channel through which righteousness passes; that Christ's work gives that property to faith; and that the righteousness so imputed to the believer is Christ's, which we have found to be composed of His *active* and *passive* obedience to the holy law of God.

SECTION III.

“The Gentiles, we are solemnly assured by the Scripture, had not the law,—have no law.”

The Word of God says, “Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” (Rom. iii. 19.) Now, I ask, what can be more universal? Not *one* mouth only is to be stopped,—nor the mouths of *one* nation,—but *every* mouth; and *all* the world is to become guilty before God, which is done by “what things soever the law saith.” But, according to the Darbyites, the Gentiles’ mouths are not to be stopped, they are not to become guilty before God! “All have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” (Rom. iii. 23.) “Sin is the transgression of the law.” (1 John iii. 4.) And, “Where no law is there is no transgression.” (Rom. iv. 15.) Here again, according to the Darbyites, among the Gentiles there is no transgression, not only because there is no sin, but because they *cannot* sin, as they have no law!

The Bible defines sin to be the transgression of the law, and states positively that where no law is, there is no transgression; if, therefore, the Darbyites say there is no law for the Gentiles, then it is quite clear that the Gentiles have no sin, and, by consequence, have no need of Christ at all! “They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick,” says the Bible. (Luke v. 31.) Hence the Darbyites limit the benefit of Christ’s work to those only who have the law; this is the inevitable result, and it becomes their duty to prove that they do not. Their champion, however, takes an easy plan of getting over this difficulty; he says, “Only one passage would seem to bear out the doctrine advanced—‘Sin is the transgression of the law;’ but any one acquainted with Greek knows that this is not the word elsewhere used for ‘transgression of law,’ and that that is not its true sense.” (“*Brethren and their Reviewers*,” p 23.) “Only one passage,” Mr. Darby! Well I should think one is enough; but the way in which you imagine to get over your difficulty is very expeditious, indeed. It is certainly easier to *cut* a hard knot than to

untis it, especially if the more you endeavour to loosen it the harder will it get. When we "quote evangelicals and modern theologians by sacks full" against him (as he was pleased to term it), he said, "it is no use; answer my arguments from Scripture;" but so soon as we do that, he tells us that the text we quote is not the right translation! My brethren, what are we to do? for Mr. Darby will give us no rest until we close our Bibles, and submit to the dictates of his own expositions!

I think we can find no difficulty, however, in knowing what to do, for "Cease ye from man" is a Biblical advice, and is one which is insisted upon us by the "Brethren," giving it thereby a peculiar force at this period of our investigation. Let us, therefore, take it, and accept the Word of God as it is, instead of man's ingenuity.

The Bible tells us that the law "is our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith" (Gal. iii. 24); "by it are the motions of sin" (Rom. vii. 4); without it "sin was dead" (verse 8); and by it sin becomes exceedingly sinful (verse 13). Now, do you think, all these could be done by an obsolete law, or one which is a dead letter? In Washington, a cheer for Jefferson Davis and the Confederates would be treason. Is it so in Canada? No. Why? Simply because the laws of the Northren States are not in force here. Just so with the law of God; when it is not in force, sin is dead; sin does not become sinful at all, and by consequence, the office of the law, as a schoolmaster, ceases. Thus we find that Mr. Darby and his associates set up one truth against another; they quote Rom. ii. 12—14; 1 Cor. ix. 21, and explain them at the expense of other texts; this mode of explaining Scriptures is certainly erroneous. I am well convinced that no two inspired texts, upon any given subject, are irreconcilable, however much they may seem at first sight to be contradictory.

Mr. Darby says: "To say that sin became exceedingly sinful by the commandment, and yet that men had the law everywhere, is simply nonsense. It cannot be in vigour everywhere, and at all times, and yet sin became exceeding sinful by its being given." (*"Brethren and their Reviewers,"*

p 23.) Of course, he takes it for granted that sin came first; afterwards came the law which made it more sinful; but this is opposed to plain Scripture teaching, as we have seen. Before sin can exist there must be a "transgression of the law;" but that cannot be done without a law. But further, let us trace out Mr. Darby's statement: he assumes that sin was in the world before the law, but it became more sinful by the law being given; so that in the main either he admits that all became under law, in order that their sins might become exceedingly sinful by it; or he teaches that although our sins are computed by the law; nevertheless, so far as we Gentiles are concerned, it remains a dead letter. Now, if he admits that all eventually became under the law, he evidently contradict himself, when he tells us that "the Gentiles have no law;" but if he means to teach that the Gentiles' sins are to be computed by that which, so far as he is concerned, is a dead letter, it is plain that his teaching is ridiculous, and ought to be rejected.

Mr. Darby, perhaps, may say, Does not St. Paul declare that the Gentiles have not the law? (Rom. ii. 12—14; 1 Cor. ix. 21.) The reply is, He does; but in what sense are we to understand him? He does not mean that they are altogether without law; for if he did, he would have had no need to tell them to "owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Rom. xiii. 8, 9.) The Apostle himself tells us how the Gentiles were under the law; he tells us that the works of the law were "written in their hearts." Again, he tells us that it matters very little whether or not we hear the law uttered by the Lord, as did the Jews; "the *doers* of the law shall be justified," not the *hearers* of it.

What St. Paul means is, that the Gentiles had not the law as had the Jews.

SECTION IV.

“Christians are not under the law in any way.”

The chief reason which the Darbyites have for telling us that the “Christians are not under the law in any way,” is that the believer is not in the flesh, to which law applied, but is dead, and risen again, in Christ; but it is quite plain that they go too far when they speak of our deliverance from the law. They quote, and dwell upon, Rom. vi. 14; vii. 5; Gal. v. 18—25; and overlook, entirely, Gal. iii. 13, which is, in fact, the exponent of the Scripture doctrine on this point. If I am led of the Spirit, I am not led of sin; this is self-evident; and I am not subject to sin; I am not under the *curse of condemnation* of the law, because those that serve sin are under the *curse*; but it is a very different thing to say that I am “not under the law in any way,” for it is possible for me, *in Christ*, to be under the law, and yet not under its curse.

Suppose Mr. Darby to be right, what need had St. Paul to speak of our redemption from the *curse* of the law (Gal. iii. 13), when it would have been sufficient for him to say, we “are not under the law in any way”? The Apostle also says: “To them that are without law, as without law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law.” (1 Cor. ix. 21.) He here speaks of the extensiveness of his labours, he made himself convenient to all. To them that were without law, he says he became as without law, but in reality he was not *without* law to God, but *under* the law to Christ. Does he assure us that the “Christians are not under law in any way”? No, he teaches just the contrary. He tells us that he himself is under law; and if he, who is one of the greatest of the New Testament Saints, and who enjoyed the blessed privileges of the Gospel to the full, if he, I say, declares that he is “not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,” surely it becomes us poor and weak believers to acknowledge the same. Place the statements made by Mr. Darby and Saint Paul, side by side, and judge how far they agree; the former tells us that “Christians are not under the law in *any* way,” and the other admits that he is “not without law to God,

but under the law to Christ." It is as plain as day-light that Mr. Darby here contradicts even the Apostle Paul himself! St. Paul further tells us that the believers establish the law by faith (Rom. iii. 31); and that it is in those "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit,"—those who are dead and risen with Christ—that its righteousness is to be fulfilled. (Rom. viii. 4.) Now, could these statements be true, may we very properly ask if the believers were "not under the law in any way"? I call upon Mr. Darby to answer this question fairly.

A thief, just from the prison, may say, "I am not under the punishment of the law against theft, because I have paid to the full the penalty of it; I am no longer in the same position that I was in, ere the punishment was inflicted:" but it is going too far to say, "hence I am no longer 'under the law in any way;'" because he is still under it—the best proof of which is that if he commits another theft, he will find himself in prison again. Just so with the Christian. He is saved from the curse of the law by Christ (Gal. iii. 13), and can say, I am no longer under the condemnation because my substitute has suffered for me; I am now no longer in the life that I was in ere redemption came; I, in my sins, was crucified with Christ, but am now risen with Him in newness of life: but it is going further than Scriptures will warrant, for him to say, "by reason of these things I am no longer 'under law in any way.'" As, in the case of the thief, if he commit sin, he shall come under the curse of the law again.

That the believers are not in the flesh is *not* a sufficient proof that they "are not under law in any way;" but it is a proof that they are not under its *curse*. When they were crucified with Christ it was on account of sin,—*i. e.*, it was because they were under the *curse* of the law; but doing away with the curse does not necessarily put away the law *itself* altogether. The law does not, as the Darbyites suppose, apply only to man in flesh, for it is spiritual. (Rom vii. 14.) St. Paul experienced this, and it was not until he had been born again in spirit, that he was led to say, "For we know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal, sold under sin;" and, "I was alive with-

out the law once : but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." What, then, does this Apostle mean when he says, "if ye be led of the spirit, ye are not under law?" Gal. iii. 13 answers the question: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." By the aid of this text, Rom. iii. 31, viii. 4, and Gal. v. 18, can be explained harmoniously; but in the Darbyites' way, they cannot be expounded without setting up one truth against another. The Christians are not under the law, also as a covenant by which to obtain eternal life, because Christ is the end of the law, for righteousness to every one that believeth.

SECTION V.

"But though the Christian alone fulfills the law, it is not his rule of life."

Mr. Darby states that the law is neither *the* rule, nor *a* rule, of the believer's life. He says, "Christ is the rule of walk;" but where is the Scripture that so states it? He cannot adduce a single text to prove *directly* his assertion; neither can we find a text that sets forth, in so many words, that the law is a rule of the believer's life: both sides, then, must have recourse to indirect proofs.

Let us hear what the Darbyites have to say. Mr. Mackintosh, in his "*Inquiry into the True Nature of the Sabbath, the Law, and the Christian Ministry*," tells us that "the continual inquiry of the Christian should be, not is this or that according to law? but, is it like Christ? The law never could teach me to love, bless, and pray for my enemies." What! The law does not teach you to love your enemies! Is not love the fulfilling of the law? (Rom. xiii. 10.) Does the law make any distinction between friends and enemies, who shall be the objects of your love? No. It tells you to love your neighbour—friend or enemy; and if you love him as you ought, you will "bless and pray for" him, too! Again, Christ is *never* spoken of as a *rule*, but as a ruler (John xii. 13), and, besides, if we take Christ as our "rule of walk," we must imitate His *conduct*. But what was that? What example did He set us? We are told that He went about

doing good. What impelled Him to do this? His extreme love. But love is the fulfilling of the law (Rom. xiii. 10), and is that upon which the law of God hangs (Matt. xxii. 40.) So that, in reality, even according to the Darbyites' own showing, we must accept the law as a part of our rule of life—though not the whole rule.

Again, the Darbyites tell us that they need not the law as a rule of life, because they are led by the spirit; He will teach them all things; they are called upon to manifest in their lives the fruits of the Spirit. Does not such a language seem to imply that the Spirit is to teach them something above and beyond what is in the Bible? If the Spirit is to do this, then the Bible itself must be deficient! Besides, one of the fruits of the Spirit is "love," and that is manifested, we are told, by keeping God's commandments (John xv. 15, 21; 1 John ii. 5): so that, in the end, the Darbyites really come to the same principle they so lustily deny.

Were we to carry out practically what the "Brethren" advocate theoretically, we should ignore the necessity of the Bible, because the Spirit would be everything to us. But the Comforter was not given for this end; His office is to illuminate and renew our minds; to bear witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God, and to seal us unto the day of redemption. Not a word here of doing away with the necessity of the Bible. Spiritual ideas can only be grasped by a spiritual mind, hence the spirituality of God's Word can be understood and realized by none but those whose minds are subject to the Holy Spirit. We may conclude our investigation on this section by challenging the Darbyites to account for the wonderful and remarkable prominence in which the law is held by the Bible Saints, such as Job, David, Isaiah, Paul, etc.

Mr. Darby says: "We want life, power, motive, but that is in Christ and the Spirit, not in law;" but of what purpose is this to the question at issue? Who denies that we get these things from Christ? I do not. The question is, what is our line of conduct *after* we have received "life, power, motives"? Evidently, that which is most

pleasing to God; and what is that? "Hath the Lord as great a delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than to sacrifice." (1 Sam. xv. 22.) Obedience, after we have received the power so to do, to every precept and command of God. That should specially characterize our conduct; but that can only be done by acknowledging the law to be a part of our rule of life. The law is to our conduct what a straight line is to a crooked hedge.

STATEMENT IV.

"We believe that none but God can make or appoint an elder; and therefore for man to set about such a work, is but a powerless form—an empty name.... Neither do we believe that men have any divine authority for their act, when they set about making and appointing elders... We believe it was the Holy Ghost then, and it must be the Holy Ghost now.... We ask where is the Church's warrant for calling, making, or appointing pastors?.... If we could only find direction in the Word of God to make and appoint pastors, we should at once seek to carry such directions into effect; but, in the absence of any Divine warrant, we could only regard it as a mimicry, on our part, to attempt such a thing.... No man, or body of men, can impart gifts.... Now we believe that the laying on of hands, as expressing ordination, if there be not the power to impart a gift, is worth nothing, if indeed it be not mere assumption."—"*A Scriptural Inquiry into the True Nature of the Sabbath, the Law, and the Christian Ministry.*" Pages 16, 17, 18, 19, and 21. "C. H. M."

ANSWER.

As I have not had the opportunity of perusing Mr. Darby's work on *Ministry*, I have selected as the exponent of the Darbyite doctrine on this point, the work of Mr. Mackintosh, his follower, who is also a prominent man among the Darbyites.

Mr. Mackintosh, in the above quotations, plainly teaches that God is to appoint His ministers without the agency of man: this, he says, He did in the Apostolic age, and is

to do it now. Christ's body, the Church, is therefore to remain quiescent, without obeying the instructions laid down for its guidance in the Bible, until the Lord deem it proper to fit up miraculously ministers for it, to "take the oversight thereof." So we, my brethren, if we belong to the Church, must wait until the advent among us of *gifted* men, like Messrs. Mackintosh, Darby, etc., and reject our ordained ministers; who, Mr. Mackintosh would have us to believe, did not derive their commission from the Holy Spirit, simply and solely because they were ordained through human instrumentality! I quite agree with Mr. Mackintosh, that Christ, "and not the Church, or any section of the Church, is the reservoir of gifts;" and that "He imparts them to whom He will;" but this is no reason why the Church should not follow the directions of the Bible, and ordain her ministers. What would you think of the farmer who gives up sowing, simply because it is God that giveth the increase? Doubtless, you would think it absurd for the farmer to do such a thing; but where is the difference between his case and that of the Church?

"It is not," says Mr. Mackintosh, "if a man say he has a gift, but if he in reality has it. A man may say he has a gift, on the same principle as he may say he has faith (James ii. 14), and it may only be, after all, an empty conceit of his own ill-adjusted mind, which a spiritual assembly could not recognise for a moment. . . . A divinely gifted evangelist is a reality; a teacher is a reality; and such will be duly recognised, thankfully owned, and counted worthy of all esteem and honour, for their works' sake." So, then, here we are told, that the "spiritual assembly" can at once recognise the really gifted teacher from an impostor, it necessarily follows that this "assembly" must be *inspired*; for it is only such an assembly that can read the secrets of hearts. Indeed, were you, my brethren, to take the trouble of reading some of the "Plymouth" Tracts, you would be satisfied that the "Brethren" actually claim to be *inspired* in their "gatherings:" read, for example, the "*Presence and Operations of the Spirit.*"

The "Brethren" may find it an easy task to convince

themselves of their own inspiration; but, sad to think, their deliberations and conduct in their gatherings, convince *us*, not, indeed, of their inspirations, but just the reverse. No two inspired men could utter such conflicting statements as do Messrs. Darby and Newton,—still they each claim to be inspired! “By their fruits ye shall know them,” says Christ. (Matt. vii. 16.) Suppose the “Brethren” to be right in their theory of inspiration, and that the “spiritual assembly” can at once detect any and all hypocrites, where is the need of teachers, pastors, etc.? They can be dispensed with in such an assembly. But the Scriptures declare that there were such in the time of the Apostles themselves. (1 Cor. xii.) These modern *spiritualists*, then, it seems, can easily dispense with the services of ministers, which we find were necessary in the Apostolic age. Verily, “the disciple is” *now* “above his master!”

We are also told by Mr. Mackintosh that men have no divine warrant in ordaining ministers for the Church; that were we to find direction in the Bible to ordain, we ought to do it; but there is no such direction to be found, therefore it is a mimicry on our part to attempt such a thing; and that it is mere assumption to lay hands on man, as expressing ordination, because no gift is imparted thereby. His advice to all is, “Search the Scriptures. . . . try everything by that standard;” and it is one that I would endorse. Let us, therefore act upon it, and examine *his* statements “by that standard.”

The first ordination of a minister spoken of in the Bible, after the ascension of our blessed Saviour, is mentioned in Acts i. 21—26. Mr. Mackintosh appeals to this to support his views, hence I ought to account for it. He says, “Even the eleven Apostles could not elect a brother Apostle, but had to commit it to higher authority.” True; but certain features of this transaction present themselves for our consideration. First, the Apostles themselves *chose* the two men; secondly, the day of Pentecost was not yet come,—the wonderful out-pouring of the Holy Spirit was not yet done; thirdly, the directions regulating the appointing of ministers, afterwards given, were not then given;

and fourthly, the conduct generally of the Apostles, *after* the day of Pentecost, was different.

The next instance of appointing ministers in which the Apostles were engaged is recorded in Acts vi., *after* the day of Pentecost. Who appointed these seven men, Mr. Mackintosh? You answer: "It was the Holy Ghost, then." But not so answers the holy Bible; it says,—“whom we may appoint,”—the Apostles themselves! Mr. Mackintosh endeavours to weaken, if not to destroy entirely, the force of the argument this transaction affords in our favour, by maintaining that the business of these men was to serve tables. But let us trace out their history, so far as we have it in the Bible, and see if they were appointed for the *sole* purpose of serving tables. Read Stephen's apology (Acts vii.) and the record of Philip's conduct (viii.), and you will be satisfied that they were called upon to take part in the ministry. It is in vain for Mr. Mackintosh to say that these men “might possess a spiritual gift independently altogether of their deaconship;” the point is, did they *exercise* that gift ere they received their ordination at the hands of the Apostles? The word of God does not intimate so. After the death of Stephen, a fearful persecution of the Christians took place, so that “they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria.” In an *extraordinary* case like this, it is quite possible for ordination by men not to be absolutely necessary; accordingly, we find that “they, that were scattered abroad, went everywhere preaching the Word.” But it is quite different in *ordinary* cases; hence we find that the Apostles ordained elders in every Church.” (Acts xiv. 23.) Let us now examine St. Paul's two Epistles to Timothy, and one to Titus. In 1 Tim. iii., we find a list of instructions given to Timothy as a guide in ordaining ministers of the Church; these same instructions are repeated 2 Tim. 24—26, and again in Titus i. Now, Mr. Mackintosh, if “it was the Holy Ghost then,” was it possible that these instructions were intended to guide Him? The Holy Spirit, then, according to Mr. Mackintosh, has caused instructions to be given to guide Him in choosing His ministers! And this is the “Scriptural Inquiry,” too! What

man of the least intelligence, cannot understand that such instructions were given not, indeed, to guide inspired men, much less the Holy Spirit, but ordinary mortals, in ordaining ministers of the Church? Mr. Mackintosh says: "Human assumption is perfectly contemptible." Quite so; especially *his* own assumption of inspiration!

Thus we find, my brethren, that *men* have a Divine authority, in ordaining ministers of the Church, both from the Apostolic practice, and from the minute details given respecting the qualifications of ministers; hence, when Mr. Mackintosh's statements are tried by the Bible standard, they are "found wanting." The *mode* of ordaining ministers of the Church being a subject of minor importance, is by the imposition of hands, as we find from the following texts: Acts vi. 6; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6.

Now, I ask you candidly, my brethren, have men, in the face of all this, no "Divine authority for their act, when they set about making and appointing elders?" Is not the investigation we have made of the Word of God sufficient to show that the Church *has* a Divine warrant to ordain her ministers, though she has not the power of imparting a gift? Is not the Church, by remaining inactive, and refusing to ordain her ministers according to the directions given in the Bible, as guilty of tempting the Lord, as the athletic man, capable of earning his living by the sweat of his brow, to sit down and fold up his strong arms, expecting the Lord to supply him with "daily bread" without the least effort on his part? Are we to regard those men who ordain ministers as daring encroachers upon the prerogatives of the Holy Spirit? Are we to reject our ordained ministers simply because they were ordained by men, and not miraculously by the Holy Ghost? Is it mere assumption to lay hands upon men in ordination, because no miraculous gift is imparted thereby? I put these questions seriously, not only to you, my brethren, but to the "Plymouth Brethren" themselves, and to Mr. Mackintosh in particular.

Let us, for a moment, take up the other phase of this question, and trace out the practical result of Mr. Mackintosh's theory. He says, "It was the Holy Ghost then, and

must be the Holy Ghost now :” that is, as soon as a man imagines he receives the Spirit’s impulse, he is to regard himself as a Christian minister, and is to teach others unto edification, without ever dreaming of seeking human literature or human ordination, let him be as great a fool as ever saw the light of day ! Yes, and we, on our part, must recognise and thankfully own him ! To prevent such a circumstance, Mr. Mackintosh insists that the Church is an *inspired* assembly, and “ could not recognise ” such “ for a moment : ” but it is quite evident that he begs the question, for he has not proved that the Church *is* inspired. Spiritual anarchy and confusion, priestly despotism, almost, if not as dreadful as that experienced during the triumphant reign of Popery, would be sure to follow in the train of evils with which the “ spiritual assembly ” would be flooded ! The spiritual assemblies themselves would be at the mercy of any fanatic, who might be fortunate enough to gain adherents. Such is exactly the state of things now in Plymouthism ! there are in it three ruling spirits, Messrs. Darby, Newton, Muller, together with their respective satellites.

CONCLUSION.

And now, brethren, I have endeavoured to examine with you four of the many statements which the “ Plymouth Brethren ”—especially the Darbyite portion of them—have made against Christians, who do not agree with them, and which they urge as their reasons for creating a new division in Christ’s already mutilated body ; for sowing the seeds of discord, strife, and ill-feeling among brethren, rending asunder the bonds of love heretofore existing between brother and sister, between parents and children, and scattering to the winds every vestige of amity that has been fostered in their social circles. The “ Brethren ” seem to have forgotten that “ He that soweth discord among brethren is an abomination unto the Lord.”

They profess to be great imitators of St Paul, and build, almost, if not altogether, upon his writings alone : but it seems that they do not take any heed to his plain directions to those situated like ourselves—“ Now I beseech you,

brethren, mark them which cause divisions...and avoid them." (Rom. xvi 17.) They endeavour to quiet their consciences, when they meet such texts, by persuading them to believe that professing Christians are not enjoying sound scriptural teaching: that the flock is not rightly fed; hence it is only on an "evangelistic mission" that they are engaged when they come among those who have already received the pure Word of God, and inaugurate the work of proselytism, scattering, *not* the Bible itself, but their own *tracts*, thousands upon thousands in number, broadcast among them. Surely, this is not following the glorious example of their patron saint; for he, himself, "strived to preach the Gospel not where Christ was named, lest" he "should build upon another man's foundation." (Rom. xv. 20.)

One word more, and I have done. How far, in your estimation I may have succeeded in proving that the statements of the "Brethren" are unfounded, I know not, but one thing I know, I have endeavoured to do my duty. I suppose I could imitate Mr. Darby by telling you that my only object is to defend the truth, but I will forbear. I leave it with you to weigh carefully, by the Bible, what I have said. I do not wish you to take my statements as Gospel truths, without testing them. I would have you imitate the noble Bereans, and search the Scriptures if what I have said is true. Take Mr. Mackintosh's advice, and try my own statements by "that standard." If aught I have said be unintelligible to you (which, I doubt not, is the case), I pray you to have the charity to remember, first, that my ideas are dressed in a borrowed garb,—the English being not my native tongue; second, that I am but a youth; and, third, that theology has not been the subject of my study, and the very little I can speak about it is not derived from theological books, but from the Bible alone; hence, when flaws do appear, it can scarcely be expected otherwise. Again, I say, "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God;" and "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Grand River, C. W. 7 FE65 9

London: William Hunt & Company, Holles Street, Cavendish Square.

