

# THE SOUTHERN REVIEW.

No. XLII.

---

• APRIL, 1877.

---

- ART. I.—1. *The Southern Presbyterian Review, for Jan. 1872 : Article I. The Theology of the Plymouth Brethren.*
2. *Plymouth Brethrenism Unveiled and Refuted.* By William Reid, D. D. Edinburgh : William Oliphant and Company. 1875. Pp. 322.
3. *Literature and Mission of the so-called Plymouth Brethren : or an attempt at a just estimate of their testimony to the revealed truth of God.* By Rev. William Reid, M. A., of Edinburgh, Editor of the 'British Herald', and 'Author of "The Blood of Jesus",' etc., etc. Toronto : Dudley & Burns. 1875.<sup>1</sup>

The society or order of Christian men, usually styled the 'Plymouth Brethren', has already, and almost without observation, spread over the face of the civilized world. It seems, in fact, to have stolen a march on Christendom, and must now, whether for good or for evil, be acknowledged as a power in the present awful crisis in the world's history, or tremendous conflict between the powers of light and of darkness. That it is felt to be such a power, is evident from 'the fact of the controversy about Plymouth Brethren coming up all over the Protestant world

<sup>1</sup> This William Reid, M. A., must not be confounded with the one before named, or William Reid, D. D. They have the same name; but, to avoid confusion, we shall call the one Dr. Reid and the other Mr. Reid. Both are Presbyterians; but the first is the enemy, while the last is the friend, of the 'Brethren'.

just now', and by the innumerable articles, pamphlets, and volumes, which this wide-spread controversy has called forth. We have placed, at the head of this article, only three references to the literature connected with this controversy; but, if we had so chosen, we might easily have embraced in our list the titles of more than a hundred volumes of the same literature. Meagre as it is, however, it is sufficient to answer our present purpose; which is merely to discuss the following questions: Who are the Plymouth Brethren? What is the character of their theology and religion? Or, in one word, are they on the Lord's side, or are they in league with the powers of darkness?

It is the duty, as it has seemed to us, of every watchman on the watch-towers of Zion, to qualify himself to return true answers to these questions. We have endeavored to discharge this duty as honestly as possible, by going to the fountain-head for information, instead of catching up, and repeating, as so many have done, the hasty, unfair, and false assertions of unscrupulous sectarians. While engaged in this study, we have encountered many statements, even in religious journals, which, for unscrupulous and reckless mendacity, can vie with the most shameless assertions of a corrupt secular and partisan press. This has filled us with an inexpressible sadness; for, alas! what chance has justice in this little world of ours, when even our religious guides and teachers can so far forget the sacred claims of truth, as to allow carelessness, or indifference, or prejudice, or malignity, to preside over the formation and publication of their opinions?

For example, it was only the other day, while engaged in the preparation of this article, that we fell upon the following decisive and sweeping condemnation of the Plymouth Brethren, in the *Nashville Christian Advocate*, for Jan. 27th, 1877. 'We were conversing the other day', says the venerable editor of that journal, 'with a minister not of our communion, on the cropping out of Plymouthism in this country. We have seen it for some time. It is the fungus which appears after a considerable religious excitement. We have a sect in the West which has some of the principles of the "Brethren", but that sect does not go far enough away from Church-order and orthodoxy to meet the views of the Plymouth Brethren. We predict that if pastors

are not on the alert to watch and guard the flock, they will have no little trouble from this source. The *Christian Observer*—a staunch Church of England paper—discusses their ecclesiastical tenets in regard to “A Regular Ministry”, “The Assembly of God”, “Separation from Evil”, “The Presidency of the Holy Ghost”, “Spiritual Gifts”, “Sects”, “Rejection of Creeds and Confessions”. The *Observer* thus states their doctrinal views, which seem to be Antinomianism run to seed: [This statement is here omitted.]

Such is the severe judgment, which the editor of the *Nashville Christian Advocate* has pronounced on the ‘Brethren’. If it be true, they should be shunned as the plague, and detested as emissaries of the devil. But if it be false, what then? Why, then, it will follow, that a learned brother, in whose opinion thousands of readers have confidence, has brought very heavy accusations against the ‘Brethren’, who are not guilty of them. We do not wish to attack him for this; but we do wish to convince him, and his readers, that he has done the ‘Brethren’ very great injustice; that his judgment, instead of being a righteous one, is the result of the ignorance, or prejudice, or malice of those whom he has too hastily and rashly followed as guides.

The only authority to which he refers is ‘The *Christian Observer*—a staunch Church of England paper’; from which he copies a list of seven heresies laid to the charge of the ‘Brethren’. Now, we Methodists should be, it seems to us, exceedingly careful how we follow such guides; especially in view of the fact, that they now treat John Darby, the great founder of the Society of the ‘Brethren’, in the same way in which, more than a century ago, they treated John Wesley. He was not, like Mr. Darby, a seceder from the Church of England: he formed his societies within the bosom of that Church itself. But yet, as we all know, the papers, and pastors, and the emissaries of the Church of England, created such a prejudice against John Wesley, that ruffians everywhere assailed him, and his followers, with mob violence, and rowdies pelted them with ‘rotten eggs’. The same organs of the same church now pelt John Darby, and his followers, not with ‘rotten eggs’ indeed, but with rotten calumnies. Should we not be careful, then, how we listen to their accusations?

Should we not examine for ourselves, and endeavor to form 'a righteous judgment', lest, by giving currency to such calumnies, we be found to fight against God? Should we not pause, and weigh, and consider, before we join the hue and cry raised by men, whose predecessors treated Mr. Wesley as they are now treating Mr. Darby? We should do so, we think: we should certainly hear both sides before we proceed to sit in judgment.

It is not our purpose to examine, in this place, the charges of heresy, which the *Nashville Christian Advocate* has preferred against the 'Brethren'. The gross injustice of these charges will appear, with abundant clearness, when we come to examine them in the ignorant, or else malignant, productions mentioned at the head of this article. We very strongly suspect, indeed, that the *Nashville Advocate* copied these seven charges of heresy, not from *The Christian Observer* itself, but from *The Southern Churchman*, in which we first saw them. It is certain, that they appeared in the Episcopal paper some time before they were copied into the *Methodist Advocate* of Nashville; so that they might have been copied from that journal. *The Southern Churchman* copies them, with marks of quotation, just as if they had been taken directly from *The Christian Observer*. They are copied, without any marks of quotation, into the *Nashville Advocate*. The concluding sentence in the *Churchman* is, for a very obvious reason, excluded from the copy made by the *Advocate*. It says, 'they seem to hold "perfection" views as well'; a point of contact with Methodism which the Methodist editor seems to have been careful to exclude from his columns. The Episcopal editor, moreover, shows greater moderation, or less rashness, than the Methodist editor. He expresses no opinion of his own: he merely copies the list of the heresies imputed to the 'Brethren' by *The Christian Observer*, and then adds, 'if the above are their opinions, we had better have nothing to do with them'. The Methodist editor, on the contrary, says of their views, that they 'seem to be *Antinomianism run to seed*'. He says, moreover, that Plymouthism 'is the fungus which appears after considerable religious excitement'. Now here, as we read this passage, we seem to see before us, not a real Methodist, but only some Churchman, dying of decency, turning up his nose, and crying *fungus!*

at a revival of religion. True, in all revivals of religion, there is this growth of a mushroom religion, without vitality or power, springing up along with instances of genuine conversion and piety. But is it the Spirit of God, or of his great adversary, who seeks to bring all revivals of religion into contempt, by sneering at this fungus growth? Perhaps too much of this sort of mushroom religion—the delight of devils and the scorn of godless men!—attends our own earnest labors for the conversion and salvation of souls, to justify us in casting stones at others. We can assure our readers, that no man of the present century, with whose career we are acquainted, has labored more assiduously, or more successfully, at the evangelization of the world, than has Mr. Darby. He is, in fact, the Wesley of the nineteenth century; and it ill becomes the followers of his great predecessor, to pursue him with the calumnies and sneers of Churchmen, or of as cold-hearted and remorseless Presbyterians.

We confess that we do feel for this persecuted man, John Darby, for this Wesley of the nineteenth century, a sympathy as deep as it is warm, as strong as it is inextinguishable. His great learning, his earnest piety, his immense capacity for labor, and his high social position, might have secured for him, (they certainly ought to have done so,) a high place in the established Church of England. But the high places, the honors, and the emoluments of an established and worldly-minded church, were not to his taste. 'The low ambition of kings', or the worse ambition of prelates, was not one of the aspirations of his soul. Like Moses of old, he chose 'rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt'. [Heb. xi. 25, 26]. Hence, he seceded from the Church of England, and laid aside its ministerial robes of office. 'The Spirit drove him into the wilderness; and he was there . . . tempted of Satan' [Mark i. 12, 13].

'Ill wast thou shrouded then,  
O patient Son of God, yet only stood'st  
Unshaken. Nor stayed the terror there';

for men did make it, for thee, 'a howling wilderness': 'some

howled, some yelled, some shrieked', and 'some bent on thee their fiery darts'. He did not sit, indeed, 'unappalled in calm and *sinless* peace'; but yet in patience he did bear all 'the fiery darts' of graceless men. Therefore it is, that on chords of sympathy, more ethereal than electric wires, his sufferings and woes have crossed the great Atlantic, and struck into our souls in flames of fire. We pity the man, and the Methodist still more, who has felt no touch of his trials, or sufferings for Christ: the man who, instead of sympathy, has gathered up, and hurled at him afresh, the fiery darts of the enemy.

We do not agree with all the views of Mr. Darby. But, as he is a Christian man and brother, this difference of opinion is no reason why we should pursue him with the envenomed shafts of malice. We have known what it is, in some small degree at least, to be driven into the wilderness, and there made to suffer for conscience sake. We have known, also, how bitter a thing it is to bid a last farewell to the fondest and most cherished hopes of this mortal life, and to bear the reproach of former friends. Yet, for all this, we have not repented—no, not even for a moment—the step by which it was all incurred. We only regret, on the contrary, that it was not followed by a closer imitation of the heroic example of John Darby. Indeed, when we consider his courage, his fortitude, his zeal, and his immense labors in the cause of Christ, we are overwhelmed with a sense of shame. But if we did not imitate him then, we can now, by the grace of God, sympathize with his trials and sorrows, and raise our pen, however poor and feeble, in his defence. Nay, we cannot but do this, having been stirred up by the injustice of his enemies, whether they be Presbyterians, or Episcopalians, or Methodists. But, although our souls have been thus stirred up from the depths, there is not one particle of bitterness in our hearts for his enemies. We have no doubt, in fact, that this most Christian of all Christian prayers, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do', has often ascended from the lips, and from the heart, of Mr. Darby himself, in behalf of his persecutors and slanderers.

Those who have written strictures on his life and labors, or on the character of the society founded by him, may be divided into

three classes. First, those who have arraigned, accused, and judged the Brethren, in profound ignorance of their writings, and doctrinal views. At the head of this class, we may well place the writer of the article in *The Southern Presbyterian Review*, for Jan. 1872, which stands first on our list of references. This article was written, as is well known, by the Rev. Robert L. Dabney, D. D., of the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia; and is characterized by his well-known ability in hurling fierce polemics against books, or systems, of which he knows just exactly nothing at all, or at least next to nothing. This judgment will be fully justified, when we come to examine the article, in which 'the bitter and hasty' man has so rashly assailed 'The Theology of the Plymouth Brethren'.

The second class consists of those who have examined, more or less extensively, the voluminous literature of the Brethren, but not with a view to form a fair and just estimate of its value, or of the theology therein set forth. The worst of this class have, indeed, searched their writings only to draw thence, by means of gross perversions and misrepresentations, the weapons for their destruction. At the head of this class of venomous critics, Dr. Reid deserves to be placed; for no one, perhaps, who has ever pretended to write an account of a religious society, has ever exhibited greater unfairness, or perpetrated greater injustice, than has this learned Doctor of Divinity in his attack on the 'Plymouth Brethren'. His work is entitled 'Plymouth Brethrenism *Unveiled and Refuted*', but it is, in fact, Plymouth Brethrenism *veiled* in misrepresentations, as gross as pestilential damps and dark as night, and then beaten with the club of theological hate. We know of nothing worse of the same kind connected with the early history of Methodism. Alas! for the poor Methodist, who can now take part with others, in the very inhumanity under which his brethren of the last century were made to mourn.

The third class of Mr. Darby's critics, is composed of those who have read his writings, and who have endeavored to do him justice. We confess to a thrill of pleasure, when we met, as the first among this class of critics, the name of a distinguished English Methodist. Judge Marshall, the distinguished Methodist

just referred to, wrote a 'Tract on the Tenets of the Plymouth Brethren (so-called)'; and Mr. Darby's 'Reply' is now before us. He says: 'There is sufficient fairness in the statement of Mr. Marshall, *in rejecting the greater part of the stupid charges in the paper he quotes*, [a paper written by one of the accusers of the 'Brethren'], to make it *easy as well as pleasant* to deal calmly with his objections on other heads of doctrine. Though on one head Mr. Marshall is roused, in general he quietly discusses the merits of the question before him. I cannot be surprised that a Wesleyan should hold Wesleyan doctrine, though I may not agree with him; and I can assure Mr. Marshall, that though he mistakes the Brethren's doctrine in some points, and I think of course there is ignorance of Scripture truth on others, *yet seeing the spirit in which Brethren are assailed*, I HAVE RATHER TO THANK HIM FOR WHAT HE HAS SPOKEN, THAN TO COMPLAIN OF IT. The best return I can make, assuring him at the same time of my sincerity in thus recognizing the tone of his pamphlet, and my desire to reciprocate it, is to state what I, at least, hold on the questioned points, and to inquire whether the views he objects to, so far as they are justly stated, are supported by Scripture. I shall only take up the really important questions'. Then follows an honorable, high-minded, and able Christian discussion of the points in dispute between Mr. Darby and his Methodist brother. We shall again recur to this friendly controversy, this Christian polemic, which does equal honor to both parties. We can now only say, in passing, that we have found it an episode of refreshment in this unholy war of the passions against the Brethren, an oasis of delight amid the angry winds, and the driving sands, of a controversy, which must needs do the eyes of people a great deal more harm, than it can possibly do their hearts good.

But of all the writers, so far as we know, who have endeavored to do full justice to the Brethren, no one has appreciated their work more highly, or sympathized with them more keenly, than the Rev. William Reid, of Edinburgh, the editor of the 'British Herald'. Not Dr. Reid, but Mr. Reid. Both are Presbyterian ministers; but yet, in their judgment of the Brethren, they are as wide asunder as the poles. We shall ex-



amine each judgment, in due time; but we wish, in the first place, to call particular attention to one of the most prominent features of this whole crusade against the Plymouth Brethren.

We refer to the sectarianism, which leads those who are inimical to the Brethren, to extend their enmity to all ministers of the Gospel, especially to those of their own denomination, by whom the writings of the Brethren are read. The ways in which this enmity has shown itself, are, in most cases, disgraceful to the Christianity of the nineteenth century. We know some five or six Presbyterian ministers,—exceedingly dear to us,—who have read, and profited by, the rich biblical literature of the Brethren. For this, and for this alone, are they assailed in ways, and by means, which the Old Serpent alone could have suggested. The attempt is made to poison the minds and hearts of their own congregations against them—even those for whose souls they labor, and watch, and preach, and pray—with a view to ruin their character as ministers, and to undermine their influence. Secret slanders are propagated against them; and rumor, with her hundred lying tongues, is kept busy with their good names. ‘Plymouth Brethrenism’ is made the cover for all this sort of secret and diabolical work. ‘Plymouth Brethrenism’! that dark, mysterious, awful, and unknown something, is made to haunt the imaginations of ignorant men, women, and children, so as to load down, and blacken, if possible, the good name of their pastors, with all the lies and calumnies which have been invented to destroy ‘the Brethren’, and all who dare to read their writings. What, then, is ‘Plymouth Brethrenism’? What this dark, mysterious, awful, unknown something, which is thus set to do the work of the devil? Is it the diabolical counterpart of Herbert Spencer’s great ‘unknown God’? Is it anything real, or true; or merely the wicked invention of the father of lies?

This is the question which we now propose to examine and discuss. If we should judge from all that has been said and written about ‘Plymouth Brethrenism’, we should conclude, certainly, that it is a most ‘questionable shape’, and doubtful whether it brings with it ‘airs from heaven or blasts from hell’. But we need not so judge. We may sift the testimony; we may cross-examine the witnesses; we may detect the lies, and vindicate the truth.

In the prosecution of this task, we shall begin with the article of the Rev. Robert L. Dabney, D. D., whose title stands first and foremost at the head of this paper. Here in Alexandria, as well as elsewhere, this article has been made to do active service in the dark work of traducing the character of men and ministers, for the monstrous offence of having read the writings of the persecuted 'Brethren'. We have the proof of this before us, in black and white, and in such form as to make us blush for the mendacity of (so-called) ministers of the Gospel. We also have before us, in black and white, the very form and pressure of 'Plymouthism' itself; so that we can, thank God! see and decide for ourselves. May the Spirit of God be with us, and enable us to pronounce 'a righteous judgment'! never forgetting that 'He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord'. [Prov. xvii. 15].

Dr. Dabney has many admirers in the ministry of the Presbyterian Church, especially among those who were students under him in the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia. One of these said to us: 'It cannot be denied that Dr. Dabney is a man of great power, or that his article on the "Theology of the Plymouth Brethren" made a great impression on the Presbyterian Church of this country'. 'True', we replied, 'Dr. Dabney is a man of great power, and his article did make a profound impression on his own branch of the Presbyterian Church. But why, or how? Just because it was an appeal to the passions and prejudices of readers as ignorant as himself of the tenets of the Christian men so violently accused by him'. We are now prepared, if we mistake not, to make this criticism good. We do not mean by this, however, that we are prepared to refute all the strictures of Dr. Dabney. We only mean that, in our humble opinion, his judgments are, for the most part, as hasty as they are harsh, and founded on a wonderful ignorance of the writings he has so wantonly assailed.

A glance at the rubric of his article, or the list of references at its head, is sufficient to indicate this. Of the nine works there referred to, only three are known to have been written by 'the Brethren'; and yet they are held responsible for them all by Dr. Dabney. Let us see on what grounds.

They are made responsible, in the first place, for '*Waymarks in the Wilderness*. Inglis & Colles: New York. 8 vols.'; and for '*The Witness*. James Inglis & Co.: New York'. He first takes it for granted, and asserts that Mr. Inglis, the editor of the '*Waymarks*' and '*The Witness*', was a 'Plymouth Brother', and then proceeds to maul this devoted Baptist, because he belongs to the proscribed fraternity! Dr. Dabney says: 'The Rev. James Inglis, of New York, *their chief doctrinal representative in this country*, who was, we believe, first a Calvinistic Immersionist, and then a *Plymouth Brother*, seems to have been discarded by a part of the Brotherhood'. The reply of Mr. Inglis, not only to this unfounded assertion, but also to the whole of Dr. Dabney's attack, is wonderfully dispassionate and calm, patient and meek. He says: 'The design of these remarks is not to maintain the consistency of our testimony, or to defend ourselves from injustice, which is doubtless unintentional. In the personalities of the review, there are mistakes which are the results of *misinformation* regarding the editor of *Waymarks*. But the correctness of the views taught is unaffected by this; as it is farthest from our desire to give a name to a system, or gain personal adherents by the advocacy of it, we cannot occupy these pages with an autobiography. Only in justice to our contributors on the one hand, and to the Plymouth Brethren on the other, it is proper to say *that no one connected with that sect ever wrote a line for its pages*. Our contributors are chiefly "*pastors of our Reformed churches*", most of them well known, though they do not claim consideration for what they write on ecclesiastical grounds. So far from being "*the doctrinal representative of the Plymouth Brethren*", while we gratefully own our indebtedness to them, under God, for the testimony they have borne to our standing in Christ and the hope of our calling, *we have been constrained to testify against nearly everything in their theology which distinguishes them from the other men of God named in the review which occasions this statement*'.

It was certainly a most unfortunate blunder, or mistake, which led Dr. Dabney to attack Mr. Inglis as 'the chief doctrinal representative [of the Plymouth Brethren] in the United States'. He was never 'discarded by any part of the Brotherhood'; for he never belonged to them. He was a Baptist minister of the

Gospel; and 'so far from being the doctrinal representative of the Brethren', he had 'been constrained to testify against nearly everything in their theology which distinguished them from the other men of God named in the review' by Dr. Dabney! This prime mistake precipitated Dr. Dabney into other and stranger blunders. Thus, for example, as it turns out, every accusation which Dr. Dabney has made against the Plymouth Brethren, supposed to be the writers of *Waymarks* and *The Witness*, falls upon the heads of 'the pastors of our Reformed churches'. So far is it from being true, as Dr. Dabney alleges, that the Brethren have therein displayed 'a denunciatory spirit against those who do not utter their "shibboleth"', that this spirit has been manifested, if at all, by the 'pastors of the Reformed churches' themselves against their own 'shibboleth', or party. Or, in other words, one set of 'pastors of the Reformed churches' condemn another set of the same class of pastors, for their delinquency in regard to the 'true doctrines of faith and justification'. It is not the Plymouth Brethren, it is the Reformed pastors themselves, who thus complain of their own brethren; and the complaint is notoriously true. We have, during the last thirty years, heard much preaching in all the Reformed churches, and we have seldom heard the grand old Gospel doctrines of 'faith and justification' faithfully proclaimed in the ears of a dying world. The defection has become awful. '*The Witness*' has, thank God! borne a decided testimony against this awful defection of so-called ministers of the Gospel, in all the 'Reformed denominations': in its own as well as in others. If the Plymouth Brethren have done the same thing, then we should, and we do, say—'Well done, good and faithful servants'. We rejoice to know, and we are most happy to testify, from our own personal knowledge, that Dr. Dabney has been faithful to those grand old soul-regenerating, soul-justifying, and soul-saving doctrines, in his ministrations of the Word. Hence, if he has not been at one with *The Witness*, and with the *Plymouth Brethren*, in regard to the very point complained of by him, it must have been either because he was ignorant of the awful defection in question, or because he has not had the courage to condemn those of his own 'shibboleth'. It is certainly not very strange, or wonderful, that those who

complain of others 'for forsaking the true doctrines of faith and justification', should 'themselves give us, in their better moments, the very same views', or doctrines. We hope, indeed, and we believe, that 'they give us', at all times, 'the very same views', or doctrines, which they complain of others for having neglected. Their consistency so evidently required this, that we cannot but wonder that Dr. Dabney should have urged this as a proof of their inconsistency. The learned Doctor is, it seems to us, a little dim-sighted and confused in his complaints of *The Witness* and *The Brethren*.

He bestows great praise on George Müller, John N. Darby, James Inglis, and so forth. He says: 'The better part of this sect, among whom we include the names mentioned above, may be said to be characterized by many admirable and by some mischievous qualities. To the former we wish to do full justice. They profess to hold forth the doctrines of grace with peculiar simplicity, scripturalness, and freeness, and in many instances we can gladly accord that praise to them, and thank them for the clear light in which they set the sufficiency of Christ, the simplicity of faith, and the privileges of the believer's adoption, and for the fidelity with which they expose the covert self-righteousness of a half-gospel. Many of them also deserve all praise FOR THE STRENGTH OF THEIR FAITH, THE HOLINESS OF THEIR LIVES, THEIR ALMSGIVING, AND THE DISINTERESTEDNESS OF THEIR MISSIONARY ZEAL. BUT—'. Then follows the black catalogue of their 'mischievous qualities', showing a most wonderful communion between light and darkness, or concord between Christ and Belial. 'But', he continues, 'as we shall aim to evince, these excellent virtues are marred by a denunciatory spirit against those who do not utter their "shibboleth",' etc., etc.; winding up with ten heavy charges of heresy against the very men, who 'deserve all praise for the strength of their faith, the holiness of their lives, their almsgiving, and the disinterestedness of their missionary zeal'. Now, 'as we shall aim to evince', this strange jumble of conflicting and irreconcilable qualities exists, for the most part, in Dr. Dabney's own brain, and not in the men who 'deserve all praise for the strength of their faith, and the holiness of their lives'. This we shall do, the Lord helping us, when we

come to examine the same charges in the venomous book of Dr. Reid.

In the meantime, we shall notice, in passing, one source of Dr. Dabney's wonderful confusion. He has not read the writings of the Plymouth Brethren. On the contrary, he has read *Waymarks in the Wilderness* and *The Witness*, and, taking it for granted that they were the organs of the Plymouth Brethren, he gives them the benefit of his most particular thunder. But, as we have already seen, all this hot and heavy thunder of his falls, not on the Brethren at all, but only on the very 'pastors of our Reformed churches', in whose defence he entered upon his crusade against the Brethren. It falls, in other words, not upon the adversaries whom he has marked for destruction, but upon the very friends he has undertaken to defend against those adversaries! Well may 'the pastors of our Reformed churches', then, exclaim, 'Save us from our friends', if they be such as Dr. Dabney.

Having spoken of the '*Witness Theology*', Dr. Dabney adds, 'But just here begins our quarrel with it; first, in that these writers misrepresent *the pastors of our Reformed churches*, as though we hid these wholesome truths, and they alone held them forth. There is in the books under review much of this unjust denunciation. It would be easy to find several instances in which they sharply charge the churches with hiding the truth; saying in effect: "Ye unfaithful watchmen, why do ye not, like us, hold forth the doctrine of adoption, of pardon, of the new birth, of perseverance, *thus and so?*" And then they proceed to tell us how *they* preach them. And lo! their own statements (in their better moods) are the same with those usually heard in our Reformed pulpits, and set down in our symbols, save that theirs have not the symmetry and scriptural accuracy of statements which our church teachers have given to our statements; and save that this Witness theology is continually contradicting itself and the Scripture by its exaggerations and perversions. We are told that the ministers who have imbibed these opinions are much in the habit of saying that the gospel has not been preached in its purity in our time, except by them; and that it is another gospel which is usually heard in our pulpits. This is

a type of modesty which church history teaches us is a pretty sure sign of doctrinal defection. Another characteristic of the Witness theology is, to disparage all church teachers and church authorities who have reputation or influence, and to represent their human learning, pious writings, and fame, as simply a corrupting bane. These writers take great pleasure in admonishing us of this fact, and cautioning us, that if we would get at the real truth, we must roundly discard and condemn all the writers whom the Church has revered, (except their set!) and go direct to the Bible. Now all this species of talk is set in a sufficiently ridiculous light by one word. What are *they* aspiring to be, when they print these books, save to become human church teachers, to acquire influence over believers' minds, to have authority with them? Do they go to all this trouble, designing to have everybody neglect or reject their "witness"? We trow not. Or will they say they write only to teach believers the true meaning of the Bible? Well; no Reformed divine ever professed anything else. And by what patent of sincerity shall these late writers claim that they alone are honest in such professions? The fact is, that no uninspired church teacher is infallible; but yet they have their use; which use (in the case of these writers, and the wiser fathers of the Reformation who have preceded them,) is proportioned to their honesty, modesty, learning, and correspondence with the infallible word. But there is another fact, that the tone of consciousness we note is a symptom of an unhealthy mind; and that sensible people will not be very forward to adopt the writers who betray it as their special guides'.

Such is the terrible lash which, in imagination, Dr. Dabney applies to the Plymouth Brethren, but which, in fact, he applies to 'the pastors of our Reformed churches'; for, as we have seen, those pastors, and not the Plymouth Brethren, were 'the writers' of the 'Witness Theology'. As yet, then, Dr. Dabney has not touched the Plymouth Brethren; he has only skinned, or aimed to skin, 'the pastors of our Reformed churches', the very dear brethren whom he has undertaken to defend!

This is not all. He holds the Plymouth Brethren responsible, not only for the teachings of the *Waymarks* and *The Witness*,

but also for those of 'the Scotch Presbyterian', the Rev. H. Bonar. Now, the grounds on which Dr. Dabney does this, are not a little marvellous to our minds, namely, Dr. Bonar's ardent sympathy with the Plymouth Brethren in the matter of pre-adventism! He says: 'His ardent sympathy with these religionists in the matter of pre-adventism, leads even him in his little work, "*God's Way of Peace*", to some one-sided and ill-judged statements'. This, we say, 'is not a little marvellous to our minds'. What! must he, 'the Scotch Presbyterian', be mauled as a Plymouth Brother, because he sympathizes with them in one point? Or must all his errors be ascribed to such sympathy? Why, he might just as well ascribe the errors of Bishop McIlvaine, or Dr. Robert Breckenridge, or the great divines of the Westminster Assembly, to the fact that they were ardent believers in the doctrine of pre-adventism.

We beg leave to inform Dr. Dabney, that, in spite of their 'ardent sympathy' in regard to one doctrine, the errors of the Rev. Horatius Bonar are more unmercifully handled in the pages of Darby, Kelly, and other 'Plymouth Brethren', than they are in those of his own review. If Dr. Dabney had only read the writings of 'the Brethren', he would have been saved from the blunder now under consideration. We cannot stop, at present, to show how 'the Brethren' have handled Dr. Bonar. We are not concerned, indeed, with the quarrel between Dr. Dabney and Dr. Bonar: it is a quarrel, not between Dr. Dabney and 'the Brethren', but only between the Virginia Presbyterian and 'the Scotch Presbyterian'. They may fight it out in their own way, (like the Kilkenny cats if they please,) while we proceed with the matter in hand,—Dr. Dabney's accusations against 'the Plymouth Brethren'.<sup>1</sup>

The great wonder is, that Dr. Dabney should have undertaken to enlighten the public mind with respect to the 'Theology of the Plymouth Brethren', without having read, or even looked into, the writings of John N. Darby and William Kelly. Is it any wonder then that, in the blindness of his zeal, he should have

<sup>1</sup> If any of our readers should wish to see the terrible handling which Dr. H. Bonar has received at the hands of the 'Plymouth Brethren', they may find it in: '*Bible Treasury*, vol. x. pp. 250-252, and pp. 268-271; *Ibid.* vol. ix. pp. 284-288, and pp. 297-302.



committed so many huge blunders with respect to their theology? For the benefit of those, who may wish to acquire some knowledge of that theology, or enable themselves to enlighten others on the subject, we shall here add some account of its literature. With the exception of a few of its more imperfect scraps, Dr. Dabney has made no reference to that literature, or shown the least acquaintance with its rich and varied contents.

#### LITERATURE OF THE BRETHREN.

The collected writings of Mr. Darby, the founder of the society of the Brethren, including his five volumes of the Synopsis of the Books of the Bible, make no less than thirty volumes of six hundred pages each. A library of itself! 'He bids fair', says Mr. Reid, 'to become as voluminous an author as John Owen, of Puritan memory'; but 'he is incomparably more profound and learned'. Besides all this, Mr. Darby has translated the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures into German, and the Greek into French as well as English. He has also written tracts in the Dutch, German, French, and Italian languages. How the man, who has performed such herculean labors, has found the time to establish so many religious societies, or congregations, in every part of Europe, and to do so much for the evangelization of the world, is a marvel to ordinary mortals. How his distinguished reviewer has contrived to remain so profoundly ignorant of the labors of such a man, both in the field and in the closet, is only less wonderful than the fact, that he should have attempted to give an account of his 'Theology' without having looked into his writings.

The writings of Mr. Kelly are almost as voluminous, as varied, and as learned, as those of Mr. Darby. Yet Dr. Dabney, after having written his article, had never heard the name of William Kelly, the so-called 'Plymouth Brother'. The Rev. Mr. Reid, the Scotch Presbyterian, who is familiar with their works, says that 'their writings show that they hold, as firmly as any set of Christians can, many things they are said not to hold', such as—(1) The plenary inspiration of Scripture; (2) The proper humanity of Christ; &c., &c. The entire enumeration includes thirteen tenets, in which is repudiated every one of the ten

charges preferred against them by the Virginia Presbyterian. Now, who is the better judge, or the safer guide, the Presbyterian divine who has read their writings, or the one who has not seen them?

Mr. Reid continues: 'There are none who write more Scripturally and powerfully against Socinianism, Rationalism, Ritualism, Romanism, and Antinomianism, and all the leading errors of the day, than the Brethren; and I grieve to see respectable brethren in the ministry preferring many serious charges against them, *which an intelligent perusal of their works ought to have shown to be utterly groundless*'. [Accusers of the Brethren, p. 5.]

The time would fail us, and the space too, if we were to attempt to enumerate the learned, instructive, soul-stirring, and beautiful productions of other Brethren, such as those of Bellett, Jukes, Baines, Mackintosh, Horner, Paterson, Wigram, Stoney, Grant, Holden, Snell, Sir C. L. Brenton, Andrew Miller, Trotter, Charles Stanley, Sir Edward Denny, Lord Cecil, and a host of others. Indeed, when we consider that this society of Christians is only fifty years of age, the extent and variety of its literature—its richness, its fulness, its scripturalness, its power, and its beauty—fill us with admiration and wonder. All things considered, it is, perhaps, without a parallel in the history of the Church. It is not to be put down by the pop-guns, or the crackers, of our critical Reviews. Dr. Dabney loaded his blunderbuss against it; but, as we have seen, he only discharged its contents in the face of the very men he intended to defend—'the pastors of our Reformed churches'. Again, he loaded his dire instrument of destruction, with the best intentions in the world to annihilate the Brethren; but, instead of doing the execution intended, it only exploded in his hands, and blew himself into fragments. We shall illustrate, presently, the nature of the work he has done, by the production of some of these mangled and bleeding remains or fragments of his former self.

'O the folly of poor prejudiced Christians', exclaims Mr. Reid, 'in treating such a spiritual, Christ-exalting literature as dangerous and contraband!

'A man who is fit to make a new translation of the New

Testament Scriptures, as Mr. J. N. Darby has recently done—a translation such as will compare favorably with all attempts of the kind in modern times—is not a man who is here for nothing. Mr. C. Pridham, who helped not only in that English version, but also in the Englishman's Greek Concordance, and in the late Sir C. L. Brenton's (a deceased P. B.) Septuagint, as well as in some of the Bagsters' best works, is also an excellent Biblical scholar. This movement is headed, in the person of Mr. Darby, by one of the ablest men this century has produced—perhaps the only great original thinker in theology in our day or any other, who whilst deriving his views solely from a life-time's independent study of the Holy Scriptures, has at the same time moored his creed to a plenary-inspired revelation. No man, too, of such originality has ever proved himself more cautious and tenacious as to the doctrine of Christ and fundamental orthodoxy in general'.

No, such a man as John N. Darby 'is not here for nothing'. God has evidently raised him up, and man cannot put him down. Mr. Reid, though a Presbyterian, has truly said: 'What is "Brethrenism" in our day but a divine protest against the present defection, corruption, and latitudinarianism in the professing Church? They are the pioneers of the nineteenth century, who are thrusting the Scriptures afresh on the churches, and who, on the word of God being bound and denied free course, are forced into an outside position by the lack of doctrine, discipline, and worship, in the ecclesiastical Laodiceanism of the period. When we find a stampede, such as that which is now going on in this country, America, France, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and other countries of Europe, as well as in all parts of the world where Christianity has been introduced, of tens and thousands of the holiest men and women, from all the denominations, it is high time to look to the foundations, and inquire—"Is there not a cause?" Instead of condemning those who leave, better to cleanse the house that the most conscientious may have no Scriptural plea for leaving'. (Pp. 19-20).

Again, Mr. Reid says: 'It is written by divine inspiration, "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." Of late years the

enemy has been coming in like a flood ; and where is there anything in these lands that can be called the lifting up of a "standard against him," except it be the intensely spiritual movement and thoroughly Biblical writings of the "Brethren"? For, drawing only from the Holy Scriptures, have they not displayed a banner because of the truth against every great evil that has come in for the past forty years? Are they not the present-day standard-bearers of a *recovered* Christianity?

'Who answered F. W. Newman's *Phases of Faith*? J. N. Darby, in his great work, *The Irrationalism of Infidelity*. (See vol. vi. of his *Collected Writings*.) Others have *replied* to it, no doubt, but this has *refuted* the book. Who has answered his brother's—Dr. Newman's *Apologia pro sua Vita*? None save Mr. Darby ; and he has done it on its own ground, with a learning which evinces thorough competency. Who laid bare the showy scepticism of Prof. E. Sherer, when on his way from the theological chair of Strasbourg to the portfolio of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*? Above all, Mr. D., in his "*Lettre sur l'Inspiration de l'Écriture Sainte*" (translated for the substance into his English tract on Inspiration), and a subsequent brochure "*De l'Œuvre de Christ*". Who has exposed the sophistries and refuted the arguments of the writers of *Essays and Reviews*? Only Mr. Darby. (See vol. ix. of his *Collected Writings*.) Dr. Milner's *End of Controversy* has also been met and answered by him, and so have Bishop Colenso and Archbishop Whately. He has also dealt with and refuted the writers on Ritualism in *The Church and the World*, as no other man has done. He has, by anticipation, discussed and settled the *Church and State* question fully thirty years ago, as volume xv. of his collected writings shows. *The Church of God* has also been defended by him in its principles, privileges, spirituality, separateness from the world, its worship, destiny, and hopes, as it has been by no one writer in modern times. The doctrine of the Holy Ghost has also been expounded with a freshness, fulness, and scripturalness in such writings as *Is the Comforter come, and is He gone?* and *The Operations of the Spirit of God* by J. N. D.; and in *The New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, by W. Kelly, such as you will find nowhere else ; and surely the giving of Scriptural

views on the Holy Ghost is a most vital part of the standard against the enemy.

'Then the great subject of *prophetic truth* has found the clearest expounders amongst "Brethren". (Mr. Darby has at least four large volumes on it.) They have not only simplified the subject, but are at present almost the only parties who discuss and expound the prophetic word with clearness, fulness and intelligence. Sir Edward Denny has likewise spent his lifetime in the study of prophecy, and has published extensively on this subject, and has issued a series of prophetic charts, which are unique, and full of valuable instruction. *Plain Papers on Prophetic Subjects*, by the late W. Trotter, being a digested summary of all the best works on prophecy, is the best book on the subject for general readers, as it contains reliable papers on the whole of the prophetic word. Whatever they teach on prophecy may, as a rule, be relied on, and will never need to be unlearned, for it is substantially the truth. Then, again, the fearful errors about sin and its punishment which are abroad, and have been spreading so rapidly—such as annihilationism, non-eternity of punishments, and all the other phases of the eschatological scepticism and infidelity—have been answered by Mr. Darby as they have not been by any other man. And since the last Ecumenical Council, and the proclamation of the Infallibility of the Pope, Mr. Darby has been writing most learnedly and conclusively against Romish dogmas, and giving an awful exposure of Popery from its own chief writers (see *Familiar Conversations on Romanism*), with a severe reproof of Archbishop Manning. The learning, labor, and research needful to accomplish what he has done in lifting up a standard against Popery in its last days is quite amazing; and, though engaged in this great controversy with Rome, and also that with infidelity, he has not overlooked the little controversy about holiness that has been going on amongst Christians for some time back, but has settled it, too, for all subject minds, in his recent masterly pamphlet against "Perfectionism"—*A Review of R. Pearsall Smith's Book, "Holiness through Faith,"* and a letter on the practical consequences. His *Dialogue on the Wesleyan Doctrine of Perfection* might also be noticed; and his stand against E. Irving and B. W. Newton, repelling their false views.

‘ Perhaps in none of his writings is the weight, as well as the acumen, of Mr. D. more conspicuous than in his masterly critique of Irving’s grandest Essay, the “ Preliminary Dissertation to Ben Ezra ”. Irving was then in his zenith before his sad aberrations,—J. N. D. not thirty years old ; yet that most outstanding hero of the day was but as a child in the hands of a man of surpassing strength, who knew how to control it for Christ’s sake. Let the reader compare his “ Reflections ”, in the beginning of his *Prophetic I.* with Irving’s *Prel. Diss.* to Ben Ezra. But his most searching and sustained criticism probably is to be found in his “ Examination of B. W. N.’s Thoughts on the Apocalypse ”, which he simply and most fairly crushed to annihilation. (See his *Prophetic III.*)

‘ I might have enumerated many other topics, such as the person and work of Christ, regeneration, new creation, union with Christ, Christian standing and experience, and a full clear gospel, in which he has lifted up a standard against the enemy. (See his *Evangelic and Practical*, volumes xii. and xvi.) But these will suffice, and if any one competent to judge will read the works referred to, he will justify our assertion that the Spirit of God is emphatically and peculiarly using “ Brethren ” to lift up a standard against the enemy in every form in which he is presenting himself. If you look around you will indeed find thousands of true Christians resisting the hydra-headed monster of evil that is threatening to devour Christianity ; but their testimony, though good to some extent, is marred by blemishes, or halts abruptly at some point where their doctrine, want of discipline, or their ecclesiastical polity, hinders it from going farther ; and only “ Brethren ” appear to have the full and emphatic testimony of God, with freedom to use it with force and precision and deadly power against the enemy, unhampered by having to stand by any denominational institution—for they have none, but profess to walk at liberty on the divine ground of the Church of God on earth, where all the saints of God, of every shade or hue, if subject only to the Word and Spirit, may walk with them. This gives them immense advantage in warfare and testimony over all denominations who have to pull up and stop short of thoroughly going to the goal of genuine obedience, not mere reformation, for

fear of bringing down rotten corners of their ecclesiastical edifices by the weight of the public testimony as it passes shaking the situation. The great bulk of the effort in "the Churches" is directed towards keeping the old houses in repair; and whenever this is the case, the aggressive power of the truth is neglected, and by neglect is lost; and hence, in spite of themselves, "that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away". By their own showing, "the Churches", for some years, have been losing ground, and drifting into formality, worldliness, and general decrepitude — from which the present gracious awakening is only giving a very limited and temporary arousing to souls, without touching their unscriptural denominationalism and equally unscriptural clericalism'.

In relation to the distressing stampede of 'the holiest men and women', from the old denominations, into the society of 'the Brethren', Mr. Reid says: 'If numbers of the best workmen were leaving our shores it would lead to a serious consideration that something must be done to retain them, or else our trade with foreign countries must be materially damaged. If the best clerks were withdrawing from a house of business, and the partners were selling out in hot haste, the stock in the firm would not long retain its value. No manufacturer would carry on for long if his business made him as poor a return as the Church machinery does for all the capital invested in the working of it. We must not rashly lay the blame on God by referring the fearful religious declension in principle and practice to *his divine sovereignty*. The deadness, depression, error, lukewarmness, formality, lawlessness, crime, and outrage, *are not to be accounted for by talking of the sovereignty of God, but charged entirely to the sin of men*'.

This testimony of Mr. Reid is the more valuable, because he is personally acquainted with many of the most distinguished members of the society of the 'Brethren'; because he has been in the habit of reading their works 'for the last twenty-five years', as well as observing the fruit of their labors, and because he himself has suffered most seriously from 'the stampede' of which he so feelingly complains. He has written a tract entitled the '*Accusers of the Brethren*', in which he displays, in striking con-

trast, the difference between the generous, magnanimous, heroic, and charitable bearing of the true Christian, and the sectarian zeal, prejudice, and bigotry of the blind partisan. In this eloquent tract, he says :

‘The public will get their eyes opened by-and-by, even through the misrepresentations of their accusers. They have the means at hand every day of their lives for proving the charges of evil doctrine to be false, for they have the condemned people living amongst them, and demonstrating to them the impossibility of the correctness of such charges by their high-toned Christian character and holy lives. The Christian public will not be satisfied with anything short of Christ’s practical test of “good fruit” or “evil fruit.” “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.” (Matt. vii. 15–20.)

‘Who are the false prophets? Those whose teaching produces “good fruit” in practical life, such as all must acknowledge the Brethren, as a rule, are doing? Nay, verily, the false prophets are those, the Lord says, whose doctrine produces evil fruit.

‘I can testify from experience that those who withdrew from my own ministry were to a large degree the very cream of our congregation as to godliness. They were the best taught, and our working capital, our praying men, our lay-preachers, our Sunday-school teachers, our tract distributors, district visitors, the men and women who attacked sin in its most rampant forms at races, in fairs, and on the streets; the very bone and sinew, blood and heart, of our worshippers, and the most devoted and unworldly men and women I ever met with, precious and holy followers of the Lamb, who are still in my heart’s affections, to live and die with; and whom, although their withdrawment from us well-nigh broke my heart, as it did my health (a heart-break it was to them also to go), yet I could not leave without visiting



them, by my own request, at their places of meeting, and bidding them a united farewell; and we never knew that we loved each other with so deep and true a love in Christ Jesus as when we poured out our souls for each other before the mercy-seat, our hearts surcharged with sorrow, and our voices almost choking with emotion, until at last we all broke down in a universal sobbing and tears; and the name of the place was Bochim, for there we wept out our sorrowing yet loving farewell before the Lord, who had loved and redeemed us all. Was I mistaken in acting so? Surely it was done in the spirit of Christianity—but the very opposite of that of modern ecclesiasticism. They were and are my beloved brethren in Christ—the salt and the light of the city where they dwell; and God is using them still above many, to evangelize the city and country around, and he is crowning their labors in the Gospel with success. I left that farewell scene, not to condemn them and write them down for not being able conscientiously to remain with us, but to inquire whether we were not guilty of producing such sad divisions by upholding traditionary and unscriptural figments, which make it possible for well-taught Christians conscientiously to leave us. The action of Brethren ought to produce a thorough inquiry whether we have the Scriptural basis of Christian association—whether, in short, we or they have the Holy Scriptures under us; instead of the fleshly work of misrepresenting and running them down for heresy and lawlessness, which even their accusers know they have no connection with.

‘The public are beginning to inquire into the strange phenomenon represented to them, of a people said to be so full of all unscripturalness in doctrine, and yet so very holy, consistent, and Scriptural in their daily lives!

‘I have met with this. An elder of one who has lately joined the ranks of the antagonists of Brethren said to me the other day that a certain work was securing a good deal of attention; and if the one half were true that was said in it of Brethren, their doctrines were very bad.

“‘But it is not true,” I replied; “he has, with a considerable show of apparent fairness, entirely misapprehended their views, and consequently misrepresented them. It could be easily shown

from their writings that all the heresies (that are so) that he charges them with are not held by them."

"Well," he rejoined, "that must surely be so; for I know some of them intimately, and must say their fruits are good."

"You will find them generally very intelligent in Scripture," I said.

"Yes; but not only are they very superior to most Christians in that, but there is a something very uncommon about them both in business matters and in private life, and I cannot reconcile what the books of their opponents say of them with what I know of them from my own intercourse with them, for they are by far the best Christians I know."

"Fruits, then," I replied, "you would consider a fair criterion of doctrine. If the fruit of the doctrine be so very good as you say, the doctrine must be Scriptural, and the books that condemn them must be false."

"That is what I cannot get over. I know the people; their fruits are good; and every community's principles and doctrines are fairly judged of by the fruits they produce."

'Another said to me: "The craft's surely in danger that the ministers are needing to write so many books against the Brethren. Better agree among ourselves first, for our sects and denominations would puzzle all the Twelve Apostles. With what church could they worship? What sect would Paul join?" (1 Cor. i. 10-13).

'Another—"It is a very unchristianlike proceeding to write down Christian people for their belief. Are we not in a free country? Why not live and let live? It seems very like selfish opposition. In writing down Brethren, ministers appear to me to be fighting for themselves." This is how this persecuting ecclesiastical fanaticism is working on the minds of the community. They have overdone it, and are now creating a reaction against themselves.

'A Laodicean Christendom is feeling the spiritual incubus of the testimony of our Lord which the Brethren have been honored to bring out; and not wanting it, and refusing to admit it because it passes sentence on their own departure from Apostolic Christianity, they write down the troublesome intruder without either heart or conscience.

'The Lord's people throughout all the churches should rise up as one man and protest in the Name of the Great Shepherd of the sheep at the throne of majesty in the heavens against this unnatural treatment of their dear brethren in Christ at the hands of their ecclesiastical oppressors, and demand that the terrible indecency of representing as heretics and treating as outlaws tens of thousands of the holiest and most Christ-like of the saints of God should at once come to an end.

"HAVE THE WORKERS OF INIQUITY NO KNOWLEDGE? WHO EAT UP MY PEOPLE AS THEY EAT BREAD; THEY HAVE NOT CALLED UPON GOD."—Psalm liii. 4.

"I KNOW THY WORKS; BEHOLD, I HAVE SET BEFORE THEE AN OPEN DOOR, AND NO MAN CAN SHUT IT; FOR THOU HAST A LITTLE STRENGTH, AND HAST KEPT MY WORD, AND HAST NOT DENIED MY NAME."—Rev. iii. 8.

'Instead of heresy, Brethren's writings contain a vast amount of fresh light on the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, for which we as ministers should give hearty thanks to God.

'Brethren live in the Holy Scriptures, and writing in accordance with human theology is a thing outside of their religious thought; whereas ministers generally have unfortunately too little Bible and too much human system to judge fairly or Scripturally of Brethren's views; and when any of them who are intensely controversial and not over-burdened with spiritual discernment or scrupulosity of conscience, do battle with Brethren, theology and ecclesiasticism are cried up and Scripture is ignorantly run down.

'This is a tremendous evil, and is leading to fearful results; for in aiming at the daring, impious, and unholy work of stamping out Brethrenism, they are discrediting the Holy Scriptures (which the common people, with Brethren's writings in their hands, see to be on the Brethren's side)—sinning against the Holy Ghost, who has evidently called them out to give His testimony for this day—and they are, by opposing it, sowing far and wide the seeds of a terrible harvest of Laodiceanism, scepticism and infidelity.

'The real meaning of Brethrenism obviously is this: It is a Scriptural protest against traditionalism in religion, and a plea

for the restoration of the great doctrines, institutions and practices of primitive Christianity. It aims at having the Holy Scriptures given their rightful place of supremacy, and at recalling all saints to the enjoyment of the unity, fellowship and privileges of the Church of God. Should we not learn the lesson God is teaching us by it, instead of treating it as an intruder?

‘All the books against Brethren absolutely misrepresent them in every way, and consequently, the real truth regarding them not being known, the religious public are misled and prejudiced, to the great injury of Christ and themselves.

‘From my intimate knowledge of their own works, I am free to say that if the public believe regarding them exactly the opposite of what their adversaries’ books say they hold, they will have a pretty accurate account of what Brethren believe and teach! Being the Scriptural religious reformers of our day, and determined at all cost to have religion set on a thoroughly Scriptural footing, and everything merely human washed out by the Word, they have nothing else but opposition to expect from the advocates of things as they are. Christendom being sentenced by such a movement, must resent it. This has been ever the way with every great work of God’s grace for man’s blessing. “*Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did so do ye.*” (Acts viii. 51.)

‘Church history in them repeats itself. The virulent opposition to Brethren in our century is just a repetition of the opposition to John Wesley and those who were acting with him last century; and now, judging of that opposition calmly, as it has taken its place in history, we conclude that those who fought against John Wesley and the Gospel were fighting against God—just the very thing our posterity may be doing a century hence regarding the persecution of Brethren and the Gospel of God at the present hour. Their testimony to Bible Christianity can no more be put down than John Wesley’s could, for it has been called forth by God, who will sustain his own truth and cause. Brethren’s mission may be to save the Christianity of the country this century just as John Wesley’s and his associates’ was to save it last century; and lest it should be so, the opponents of

Brethren had better take the sound advice of Gamaliel (Acts v. 38, 39), and shut up their batteries—"For if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God."

'The string of charges usually brought against Brethren might be appropriately denominated stock slanders, for they have been doing duty for years in all the books written against Brethren. They hold not one of the serious heresies attributed to them, and it is therefore reckless and unprincipled to charge them with such things as Antinomianism, Rationalism, Socinianism, Pelagianism; the denial of Christ's proper humanity; the atonement; the binding obligation of the commandments of God; the denial that by the obedience of Christ believers are constituted righteous; the imputing of righteousness in justification; that we are justified by the blood of Christ; that Brethren do not confess sin with a view to forgiveness; that they do not preach repentance as anything but a mere change of mind; that they hold faith to be only credence of testimony; that they deny practical and progressive sanctification; repudiate Christian ministry and ordination, and forbid the unconverted to pray; deny the divine authority of the Lord's day, and teach Perfectionism. These and such like charges form the stock-in-trade of the adversaries of Brethren in pursuing their unholy traffic.

'I feel deeply grieved for the cause of Christ and his deceived and prejudiced saints that such unfounded charges are spread and believed by so many Christians; for, having read their works, I can say honestly before God and the Christian public that they are untrue, and could be all "unveiled and refuted" by straightforward quotation from their own writings, and for the truth's sake I would not shrink from the task of doing it had I time and strength'.

We shall not shrink from the task of doing so, as the Lord has given us a little 'time and strength' or the purpose. We shall expose ourselves, of course, to the unjust, unkind treatment, which unscrupulous partisans and bigots heaped on the head of Mr. Reid. But what of that? If we mean to serve man rather than God, or sect more than the salvation of souls, then, indeed, might such considerations of personal ease, comfort, and reputa-

tion, determine our course. But the man who, with the path of duty before him, can be made to swerve therefrom by such terrors, had better put off his armor *for good*, and hide himself away in some skulking hole of ignorance. We happen to know, from an examination of their works, some little about 'the stock slanders' against the 'Brethren'; and, cost what it may, we are not willing that our light, however little, should be hid under a bushel.

We have been touched—we have been profoundly moved—by the heroic words of Mr. Reid. 'An accuser says', he complains, 'I have gone over to the adversary, and (always true to the old faggot argument) he wants the ecclesiastical machinery set in motion to punish, instead of convincing me that I am wrong by Scripture; but I have, on the contrary, gone over to truth and fair dealing against "the adversary," as I think readers will see for themselves from the quotations given.

'He also complains that I say "*forbid them not*," even though "the cream of our churches" have gone to Brethren, and have "almost broken their ministers' hearts by their withdrawalment." Perhaps few have suffered this heart-breaking as I have done, but I dare not hinder, but would rather help, the dear saints of God at such a time when they have told me that their hearts were as sorrowful at leaving me as mine could be at parting with them. How could any tender shepherd forbid Christ's sheep from taking a step which they tell you is prompted by fidelity to Him? What I wrote is, "Seeing that they manifest a true and honest purpose to serve our common Master Jesus Christ, his word to us regarding them is '*forbid them not*.'" Is it not so? See his teaching on this head in Luke ix. 50. John says, in verse 49, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us. **And** Jesus said unto him, **Forbid him not**; for he that is not against us, is for us." The whole college of the Apostles would have the irregular brother put down, but the Lord said, *Forbid him not*; so that I am bold to say that, though all the ministers of the land be unanimous in their condemnation of the so-thought irregular workers called Brethren, they would be only flying in the face of the plain command of Jesus Christ, "*Forbid him not*."

'But, even regarding it on the lower ground of common citi-

zenship, why should they not enjoy the same liberty that we claim for ourselves of quietly working the Lord's work, and as the fruit of honest labor, having as many with them as they can fairly gather by the preaching and teaching of the Word? Do ministers dread the full and fair teaching of the Bible, and could they not risk letting their congregations hear fuller teaching than their own, that they resort to the unfair means and methods we have been exposing? Why persecute Brethren in this very special manner, and let Romanists, Swedenborgians, and Unitarians go on without a word of rebuke? Where in all this is the sense of the sacredness of religious liberty in this land of Knox and Melville, Erskine and Gillespie, Chalmers, and the noble men of 1843, when their descendants are hunting down as noxious vermin—without regard to common decency, truth, or fairness—the truest, holiest, and most devoted of their brethren in Christ? (Matt. v. 11, 12.)'

Dr. Reid has, in his book of 322 pages, no less than nine charges of gross heresy against the Brethren. We have never read a book more admirably adapted, or more cunningly contrived, to defame, blacken, and ruin its intended victims, than this volume of the learned doctor of divinity. It is styled 'Plymouth Brethrenism Unveiled and Refuted'; but, as we shall presently see, it may itself be most triumphantly *unveiled and refuted*.

In order to prepare the way for the more easy and certain lodgment of his accusations of heresy in the mind of his readers, Dr. Reid does his best to misrepresent, defame, and blacken the character of Mr. Darby. Hence we shall, in the first place, deal with his aspersions on the character of his intended victim, ere we proceed to *unveil and refute* his charges of heresy against him.

We are not the partisans, or advocates, of Mr. John N. Darby. On the contrary, if any man will show us anything evil in his doctrine, or in his life, we will condemn it as vehemently as we would in other persons. Nay, more vehemently; for his great learning and ability would render his errors more reprehensible, as well as more dangerous, than those of other men. But we will not listen to the lies of his enemies. First and foremost among these, as well as most infamous, is the following statement of Dr. Reid:

'Although claiming the designation "The Brethren" as expressive of their superior brotherliness (?), it does not appear that they are more highly favored with this Christian virtue than are their neighbors, *their history having been one of controversy, division, secession, and bitterness.* In 1845 Mr. Newton, in a laudable endeavor to *expose certain erroneous views* which had become popular among the Brethren, inadvertently *made use of expressions as to our Lord's humanity, which were equally untenable.* The opportunity was thus afforded Mr. Darby (who differed from him in certain prophetic views) to charge him with heresy; and although Mr. Newton withdrew the offensive expressions, *his rival persisted in assailing him, with a bitterness seldom equalled in controversy.* The result was not merely personal alienation, but the withdrawal of Mr. Darby and a party from the Plymouth Assembly, and the establishment of a separate cause. Not content with this, he called upon the Brethren everywhere to withdraw from all fellowship with Mr. Newton'.

Now, if this statement be true, then no Christian man could doubt, for a moment, that the conduct of Mr. Darby deserves the most severe reprehension, the most vehement condemnation. But it is not true. It is, on the contrary, utterly and most shamelessly false.

Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton were the two principal founders of the society at Plymouth, in England, whence it derived the name of the 'Plymouth Brethren'. Mr. Newton, the hero of Dr. Reid's story, in 'a laudable endeavor to expose certain erroneous views which had become popular among the Brethren, *inadvertently made use of expressions as to our Lord's humanity, which were equally untenable.* The opportunity was thus afforded Mr. Darby, [the intended victim of Dr. Reid,] who differed from him in certain prophetic views, to charge him with heresy; *and although Mr. Newton withdrew the offensive expressions, HIS RIVAL PERSISTED IN ASSAILING HIM, WITH A BITTERNESS SELDOM EQUALLED IN CONTROVERSY'.* If so, then Mr. Darby is a monster. But this is not so. The simple truth is, that Mr. Newton fell into a horrible heresy, as the following extracts from his own words most plainly and abundantly show:

'The doctrines of this lecture on Psalm vi. by Mr. Newton,



*it will be best to state in his own words.* Speaking of Christ, he says, page 7 :—“ For a person to be suffering here because he serves God, is one thing ; but the relation of that person to God, and what he is immediately receiving from his hand while serving him, is another ; and it is this which the sixth Psalm, and many others, open to us. *They describe the hand of God stretched out, as rebuking in anger, and chastening in hot displeasure ; and remember, this is not the scene on the cross*”. He says, on the same page, that this—the scene on the cross—“ *was only one incident in the life of Christ. . . . It was only the closing incident of his long life of suffering and sorrow ; so that to fix our eye simply on that would be to know little what the character of his real sufferings was*”. After saying, “ I do not refer to what were called his vicarious sufferings, but to his partaking of the circumstances of the woe and sorrow of the human family ; and not only of the human family generally, but of a particular part of it, of Israel ”, he goes on to speak of the curse having fallen on them ; and then adds, “ *So Jesus became part of an accursed people—a people who had earned God’s wrath by transgression after transgression*”. Again :—“ *So Jesus became obnoxious to the wrath of God the moment he came into the world*”. Again : “ Observe, this is chastening in displeasure ; not that which comes now on the child of God, which is never in wrath, *but this rebuking in wrath, to which he was amenable, because he was part of an accursed people ; so the hand of God was continually stretched out against him in various ways*”. From this dreadful condition he represents our Lord as getting partially delivered at his baptism by John. I say partially ; for elsewhere he distinctly affirms that he only emerged from it entirely by death : “ His life, through all the thirty years, was made up, more or less, of experiences of this kind ; so it must have been a great relief to him to hear the voice of John the Baptist, saying, ‘ Repent ye ; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand ’. Here was a door opened to Israel at once. They might come, and be forgiven ; so he was glad to hear that word. He heard it with a wise and attentive ear, and came to be baptised, because he was one with Israel — *was in their condition, one of wrath from God ; consequently, when he was baptised, he took new ground ; but Israel*

would not take it", &c. Such were the doctrines promulgated by Mr. Newton. The exposure of them by Mr. Harris excited general alarm among those who had been associated with their author; and he, finding it needful that something should be done, issued two pamphlets, in neither of which did he disclaim the lecture, or the doctrines asserted in it; but first stated it more at large, though in a less palpable and offensive form, and then defended and supported it'.

Such was the deliberate and blasphemous heresy, which Mr. Newton put forth in regard to the person of Christ, and of which Dr. Reid says, he '*inadvertently* made use of expressions as to our Lord's humanity'. 'Mr. Newton', says Dr. Reid, 'withdrew the offensive expressions', so '*inadvertently*' dropped by him. True, he did withdraw the paper containing those '*offensive expressions*', with a view to soften them down, and render them less offensive, which he did. But this is not the whole truth. For, with hypocrisy worthy of such a heresy, he only modified his views, or '*expressions*', till the storm created by them blew over. He afterward reproduced the same heresy in a form, if possible, still more offensive than ever. Was this, also, an '*inadvertency*'?

The confession of one who was mercifully delivered from the heresy of Mr. Newton, describes most solemnly, yet most truthfully, its character and consequences. He says:—'This summary of Christ's standing before God *at birth*, and the awful experiences and sufferings of his soul and body under God's inflictions on this account, I solemnly present to you, as containing Christ's *disqualifications* for becoming *our* Surety, *our* Sacrifice, *our* Saviour! For he had to extricate for *himself*! He had to be delivered *himself* out of this horrible distance, and from these fearful judgments. However free from taint his person might be, and is declared to have been, yet because of these relations, which it has been said he took *at birth*, it was even a question as to the fact whether he could deliver *himself* and be owned of God. This was, however, settled as regards *his own* acceptance by *his* keeping the law, and by *his* obedience *unto death*; but then, alas! all this was due from *him* to God—due to the law, as having been *born under its curse*—due for *himself* and for *his*

own extrication: all that he could render *to the last moment of his life*, all that he could offer up *in death*, was needed *by him for himself*, and for *his own* deliverance! But then what becomes of the blessed doctrines of grace? What becomes of the glorious gospel of God's salvation? What becomes of the Church? What becomes of us individually? We have lost Christ!

'I have been blamed for calling such fearful doctrines "blasphemy against Christ", as being too strong language; yet I find in I. Timothy i. 20, that Paul says he had delivered Hymeneus and Alexander unto Satan, "that they may learn not to blaspheme"; and in II. Timothy ii. 17, 18, I find that the blasphemy consisted in saying that "the resurrection is past already". But Mr. N.'s blasphemies are directed against the Blessed One upon whom all resurrection from the dead depends (I. Cor. xv. 12-23). I find a *false Christ in a false position*, the result of carnal reasonings about his birth, presented to souls, and not the Holy One of whom the Father said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased".'

'We have lost Christ', is the awful cry which went up, from many a heart, among the Plymouth Brethren. 'The name of Christ being the centre of their union, that which they looked for in any who sought fellowship with them, was *the saving knowledge of that name by the quickening of the Holy Ghost*'. This was the principle, or ground, on which the society at Plymouth was constituted by its two principal founders, Messrs. Newton and Darby. The former was left in charge of the society, while the latter, animated by a truly missionary zeal, was engaged in his labors abroad. Mr. Newton, as one of the founders of the society, and as its resident minister, acquired a greater influence over the society than he was entitled to, even by his great learning and ability. He abused his position to endeavor to introduce, as Dr. Reid himself admits, 'a modified form of Presbyterianism'. Now this, considering the constitution of the society, was treason in the camp. But it was only after the Christological heresy of Mr. Newton, which had been secretly propagated among the Brethren, was detected and exposed by Mr. Harris, that the wail—'We have lost Christ'—burst from the agonized hearts of so many of

the Brethren. What was to be done? Expel the heretic, and his heresy, from the society? This was impossible. Mr. Newton had acquired too great an influence for this. Hence, when Mr. Darby passed through Plymouth on his way to his missionary labors in France, his attention was called to the state of things therein. Great, of course, was his surprise and distress; and yet, in our opinion, the course pursued by him was that of a Christian hero.

If he had been an ambitious man, anxious to build up a great and prosperous society, with a view to illustrate his own name, rather than the glory of Christ, he might have compromised with Mr. Newton; and thereby saved the society from the schism which followed. But if he had done so, he would have been justly contemptible in the eyes of the Christian world. If, after withdrawing from other denominations because they did not sufficiently honor Christ, he had retained his fellowship with the Plymouth Brethren, in spite of the outrageous dishonor they had put upon Christ, he would have been among the most inconsistent of men, the most patent of hypocrites. But such was not the character of John N. Darby. On the contrary, finding it impossible to expel Mr. Newton, with his 'blasphemous heresy', from the society of the Plymouth Brethren, he withdrew himself therefrom, and went on with his missionary labors for the conversion and salvation of souls. Dr. Reid complains, 'Not content with this, (his own withdrawal,) he called upon Brethren everywhere to withdraw from all fellowship with Mr. Newton'. He did right. He was a hero, and not a hypocrite; he was a champion of Christ, and not a coward. Many of the Plymouth Brethren, of course, followed the example and call of Mr. Darby; for they were not all apostates. Hence, when the true Christ was cast out of the camp at Plymouth, the faithful remnant went forth to seek him. They refused to worship with the assembly, or to hold communion with the apostate Brethren, who had set up the false Christ of Mr. Newton. This was the head and front of Mr. Darby's offending. If his whole life has been of a piece with this, (and we have no reason to doubt it has been,) then may we safely pronounce him a hero of the highest and purest stamp. He faced heresy in the very society originally formed by himself,

even when outwardly most prosperous and flourishing; and, in spite of the obloquy, scorn, and contempt of the Brethren once most dear to him, he continued, even as he had begun, to esteem the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. The world may pour contempt on such a man; sectarians may dip their pens in wormwood and gall for his destruction; and the eulogists of hypocrites and liars may denounce him as a fiend incarnate; but, in our very heart of hearts, we honor and reverence him as a true soldier of the Cross. Dr. Reid has a most telling chapter entitled, 'The Brethren as described by themselves', that is to say, telling upon those who are ignorant of the history of the Plymouth Brethren, properly so-called. But it should be entitled, 'the hero of the Brethren, and his heroic followers, as described by the apostates'.

#### THE HERESIES OF THE BRETHERN.

Dr. Dabney acknowledges the great difficulty of detecting and exposing their heresies. 'The reader will readily grant', says he, 'that no great uniformity or consistency is to be expected in a company of Christians whose fundamental principles repudiate the divine authority for any catholic visible Church, the existence of any regular order of ordained ministers, and the use of all authoritative creeds. Their common traits can amount to no more than a species of prevalent complexion. Nobody among them is responsible for anything, unless he has been found doing or saying it himself. Hence there arises an unavoidable difficulty in dealing with their system; and description or conviction can only approximate a correct application to individuals'.

Now, if such be 'their system'; or, as Dr. Reid more properly calls it, 'the absence of system in Brethren theology', then why attempt to describe their 'system'? Why attempt to describe that which does not exist? Indeed, if these writers speak the truth, the 'unavoidable difficulty in dealing with *their system*'—with that which does not exist—must amount to an utter impossibility. Yet this difficulty—this impossibility—is most easily surmounted by Dr. Dabney. On the next page but one, he levels no less than ten charges against 'their system' or 'theology of the Plymouth Brethren', whose principal writers he has

not even so much as condescended to look into. In spite of his own declaration, that 'Nobody among them is responsible for anything, *unless he is found doing or saying it himself*', he incontinently holds, as we shall presently see, everybody among them responsible for everything, which has been uttered by any one of their number. Inductions so easy, so rapid, and so general, are all the more wonderful, because they set before us 'the system', which at the same time is declared to be no system at all! Such a process may be defined, *the short and easy discovery of order and system in a real chaos*.

'Still', continues Dr. Dabney, 'the features of the common family resemblance can be drawn with general accuracy'. True, this can be done, if any one will be at the pains to read, and examine the literature of the Brethren, and then judge it fairly and candidly. But, as it is, the enemies of the Brethren have not only failed to notice the real features common to their theological writings, but have substituted in their place the shams and masks invented by themselves.

In reading some twenty or thirty volumes of the theological literature of the Brethren, (and these by their most approved and distinguished writers,) we have found them preëminently characterized by two things: (1) By a supreme devotion to the word of God, as over against the traditions of men; and (2) by an implicit reliance on the guidance and work of the Holy Ghost. They have, more than any other men after whom we have ever read, placed their reliance on the Word and Spirit of God, refusing to put their trust in an arm of flesh. Yet, as we have said, their enemies have not only failed to give them credit for these high and heroic Christian virtues, but have imputed to them the opposite vices.

Mr. Kelly, in particular, is remarkable for his supreme devotion to the word of God, the *ipsissima verba* of the Spirit. Yet is he precisely the writer, whom '*The Christian Observer*—the staunch Church of England monthly', has selected and marked as the culprit by whom the word of the Spirit is treated with contempt. But let us see the proof. Let us see how this heavy charge is enforced, or established, by the heavy artillery of the Church-of-England logic.

The *Christian Observer* says:—‘When Scripture does not use the exact words that suit his theory, he undertakes, with the most astounding presumption, to speak for the Holy Ghost, and says (referring to the expression in Acts ix. 31, “Then had the churches rest”)—But that which, I am persuaded, the Holy Ghost wrote here, was “the Church.” The Holy Ghost is continually made answerable for what Mr. Kelly asserts, which to us sounds very much like profaneness, not reverence. Whether it be so, let others judge’. A very kind permission this: after having pronounced Mr. Kelly guilty of throwing out the word of the Spirit, and substituting his own word in its place, he will ‘let others judge’, whether this is ‘profaneness’, or ‘reverence’! Who can doubt as to the character of such an act? Is it not both taking from, and adding to, the word of God; on which the awful judgment of God himself has already been pronounced? [Rev. xxii. 19.]

But if we may be permitted to judge for ourselves, we shall decide upon the act of Mr. Kelly, not as it is presented in ‘The Christian Observer’, but as it is in itself. In preferring the word *church* to *churches* in Acts ix. 31, Mr. Kelly only exercised a right which is claimed by all the most learned, pious, and humble students of the word of God. Every scholar knows, or should know, that certain corruptions have crept into the text of the New Testament, which it is the first duty of critical commentators to correct. Mr. Kelly did this in regard to Acts ix. 31; and the grounds on which he did so were right under the eye of ‘The Christian Observer’, in a foot-note to the very book reviewed by that Church of England monthly. He says:—‘I gave full proof in a foot-note that the genuine reading of the most ancient authorities, both manuscripts and versions, of the east, west, and south, presents the singular, not the plural [*church*, not *churches*], and because I certainly accept this, and therefore state my conviction that such was the Holy Spirit’s original form, as contrasted with the plural brought in by the blunder or meddling of scribes at a later day, the writer allows himself in unbecoming language! Did he not know that almost every critic of our day holds my view?’

If he did not know this, then he was ignorant of the subject

of which he speaks as one having authority ; and if he did know it, then was he knowingly guilty of a false accusation against Mr. Kelly. The case is this. In the estimation of almost 'every critic of our day', the evidence is overwhelming, that the Spirit used the word *church* in Acts ix. 31, and that the word *churches* was substituted therefor by 'the blunder or meddling of scribes of a later day'. And because Mr. Kelly, with all competent critics, preferred the word of the Spirit to that of blundering or meddling scribes, he is denounced for having treated the inspired record with contempt! He is boldly accused of setting aside the word of the Spirit, because it did not suit 'his theory', and putting his own word in its place! What a profane wretch!

Precisely the same thing, however, is done by Dean Alford—the great biblical critic of the Church of England itself. But this makes all the difference in the world: it was very pious in the Churchman, but altogether profane in the Darbyite! This is not all. We have before us 'A Critical English New Testament: presenting at one view the Authorized Version and the Results of the Criticisms of the Original Text', [Bagster's], in which the word *church* is set forth as the form used by the Spirit in Acts ix. 31, instead of the plural form 'churches'. Hence, as we learn from the note to the verse in question, this correction has been approved and adopted by 'Lachman, Tischendorf, T. S. Green, Alford, Tregelles, etc.:' and that on the overwhelming authority of all the most authoritative manuscripts and versions, including 'κ, A, B, C, etc., Vulgate, P. Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic, Æthiopic, Armenian, etc.' Why, then, should Mr. Kelly be singled out, and gibbeted for a profane dealing with the word of the Spirit, merely because he agreed with 'almost every critic of our day', in restoring the word *church* to Acts ix. 31? Now was this ignorance, or malice, on the part of his accuser in 'The Christian Observer'? If it was ignorance, there was the less excuse for it; because in the work of Mr. Kelly, right under the eye of this very sharp-sighted 'Christian Observer', he was notified that the correction introduced was authorized by 'the most ancient authorities, both manuscripts and versions, of the east, west, and south'. Why could he not take warning? Did he see so clearly that which had no existence—namely, the 'pro-



fanity' of Mr. Kelly—that he could see nothing else, not even the most palpable facts right under his nose? How wonderfully blind some people are, just because they are so wonderfully sharp-sighted! But it is a very sad thing, it seems to us, when this happens to be the case with a '*Christian Observer*'.

We know of no writers, indeed, who adhere to the very words of the Spirit more closely than do the Brethren; and we know of no writer among them, who is more remarkable for this supreme devotion to the Word than Mr. William Kelly. We might easily give, if necessary, a hundred illustrations of the justness of this remark. But one must suffice; which we have selected, not only because it is an illustration exactly in point, but also because it has a very great independent value of its own. If we read the modern commentators on the first chapters of Genesis, we are lost amid their speculations about the Elohistic and Jehovistic records, as if the Mosaic account of the creation were a patchwork of conflicting records, which he had somewhere found in archives or debris of the past. Mr. Kelly, in his devotion to the written word, as inspired by the eternal Spirit, rises above all these crude speculations, and sets before us the following beautiful explanation of one of the chief difficulties connected with the Mosaic record of the creation:

'I must be permitted here to say a word on a subject which, if it has called out enormous discussion, betrays in its course, I, am sorry to say, no small amount of evident infidelity. It has been gathered from the varying names of God, &c., by speculative minds, that there must have been different documents joined together in this book. Now there is not really the very least ground for such an assumption. On the contrary, supposing there was but one writer of the book of Genesis, as I am persuaded is the truth of the case, it would not have borne the stamp of a divine communication if he had used either the name of Jehovah-Elohim in i.-ii. 3, or the name of "Elohim" only in ii. 4-25. The change of designation springs from distinct truths, not from different fabulists and a sorry compiler who could not even assimilate them. Accepting the whole as an inspired writing, I maintain that the same writer *must have used* this distinctive way of speaking of God in chapters i. and ii., and that

the notion of there being two or three writers is merely a want of real intelligence in scripture. If it were the same writer, and he an inspired one, it was proper in the highest degree to use the simple term "Elohim" in chapters i.-ii. 3, then the compound "Jehovah-Elohim" from verse 4 and onward through chapter ii. A mere historian, like Josephus of old—a mere commentator, like Ewald now—might have used either the one or the other without sensible loss to his readers through both chapters. An inspired author could not have expressed himself differently from Moses without impairing the perfect beauty and accuracy of the truth. If the book were in each of these different subjects written according to that most perfect keeping which pervades scripture, and which only God is capable of producing by his chosen instruments, I am convinced that as Elohim simply in chapter ii., so "Jehovah-Elohim" in chapter i., would have been wholly out of place with their respective positions in i. and ii. As they stand, they are in exact harmony. The first chapter does not speak of special relationships,—does not treat of any peculiar dealing of God with the creature. It is the Creator originating what is around us; consequently it is God, Elohim, who alone could be spoken of as such in ch. ii. 1-3, taking the Sabbath as the necessary complement of the week, and therefore going on with the preceding six days, not with what follows. But in chapter ii., beginning with verse 4, where we have special position and moral responsibility coming to view for the first time, the compound term which expresses the Supreme putting himself in relation with man, and morally dealing with him here below, is first used, and with the most striking appropriateness.

'So far is the book of Genesis, therefore, from indicating a mere clumsy compiler, who strung together documents which had neither cohesion nor distinctive propriety, instead of there being merely two or three sets of traditions edited by another party, there is really the perfect statement of the truth of God, the expression of one mind, as is found in no writings outside the Bible. The difference in the divine titles is due to a distinctness of object, not of authorship; and it runs through the Psalms and Prophets as well as the Law, so as to convict of ignorance and

temerity the learned men who vaunt so loudly of the document hypothesis as applied to the Pentateuch.

'Here accordingly we find in chapter ii., with a fulness and precision given nowhere else, God's entering into relationship with man, and man's relation to Eden, to the animal realm, and to woman specially. Hence, when notice is here taken of man's formation, it is described (as all else is) in a manner quite distinct from that of chapter i.; but that distinctiveness self-evidently is because of the moral relationship which the Spirit of God is here bringing before the reader. Every subject that comes before us is dealt with in a new point of view suitably to the new name given to God—the name of God as a moral governor, no longer simply as a creator. Could any person have conceived such wisdom beforehand? On the contrary, we have read all these chapters in the Bible, and we may have read them as believers too, without seeing their immense scope and profound accuracy all at once. But when God's word is humbly and prayerfully studied, the evidence will not be long withheld by the Spirit of God, that there is a divine depth in that word which no mere man put into it. Then what confirmation of one's faith! What joy and delight in the Scriptures! If men, and men too of ability and learning, have tortured the signs of its very perfection into proofs of defective and clashing documents, ridiculously combined by a man who did not perceive that he was editing not fables only but inconsistent fables, what can believers do but wonder at human blindness, and adore divine grace! For themselves, with glowing gratitude they receive it as the precious word of God, where his love and goodness and truth shine in a way beyond all comparison, and yet meeting the mind and heart in the least, no less than in the most serious, wants that each day brings here below. In every way it proves itself the word not of men, but as it is in truth of God, which effectually works in them that believe'. [Lectures on the Pentateuch, pp. 13-16.]

Blessed and beautiful are such expositions of Scripture, such indications of the divine wisdom of the very Word. There are many such in the writings of the Brethren; especially in those of Mr. Kelly. His errors are those of the literalist, not those of

the rationalist. In other words, when he misses the true sense of Scripture, it is from a too blind adherence to the letter, and not from a preference of his own word, or reason, to that of the Spirit. Hence were we filled with amazement at the utterly unfounded and false criticism of 'The Christian Observer'.

(2) The second characteristic of the Brethren is, an implicit reliance on the power of the Spirit, both for the guidance of the believer in his search after scriptural truth, and for the efficacy of that truth in the conversion and salvation of souls. This is, in fact, one of the grand and distinctive peculiarities of their theology. Strange is the accusation, therefore, which is so often preferred against them, that they do not sufficiently honor the work of the Spirit, or the 'Mission of the Comforter'. Nothing could be more diametrically opposed to the truth.

In proof of the justice of this accusation, 'The Christian Observer' quotes them as teaching, that 'we are wrong in asking for the Holy Spirit, because he abides with all true Christians, and they have no need to ask for what they have already'. In this position, as understood by themselves, they appear to us to be very clearly in the right. If, after God had sent his Son into the world, and he was dwelling with his disciples, would it not have argued unbelief in them, as well as ingratitude, to pray that he would send his Son into the world? Most assuredly it would, as Mr. Kelly truly asserts. In like manner, is it not an evidence of unbelief and ingratitude, if we continue to pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit, after we 'have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father'? We may, and we should, pray for larger measures of the operation of the Spirit in our hearts; but if he already dwells with us, if our very bodies are temples of the Holy Ghost, then to pray for his descent upon us, is simply absurd, not to say impious. We should freely, fully, and gratefully acknowledge all the gifts of God, and above all the most glorious gift of the Holy Spirit, and not continue to wound his heart by the cold, unbelieving, and ungrateful prayer for what he has already given us.

We do not, *as a general thing*, admire the logic, or the philosophy, or the theology of the Brethren; but when any of these

things do shine out in their writings, we hail them with joy and gladness. Is not this right? Must we fight against them, right or wrong? and when reason fails us, must we betake ourselves to the low weapons of prejudice, or passion, or malice to put them down? God forbid! They are not logicians, nor philosophers, nor theologians; they are simply earnest and devout students of the Word; and logicians, philosophers, and theologians would do well if, instead of despising their works, they would study and profit by them.

Especially is this true in regard to their works on the great Christian doctrine of the Holy Ghost. If we may believe Dr. Dabney, their teaching depreciates 'the dispensation of the Holy Ghost' (p. 4). But if any theological student, who has graduated under Dr. Dabney, and who has mastered all the ordinary text-books of our theological seminaries, will read Mr. Darby's work on 'The Operations of the Spirit', or Mr. Kelly's on 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit', he will be amazed at his former ignorance. If we may judge from one or two instances of this kind, which have fallen within our own personal knowledge, a student of Dr. Dabney, even after graduation and years of preaching, cannot read these books without being made to feel how very poorly he had been instructed in 'the doctrine of the Holy Spirit'. Nor is this sad deficiency in teaching peculiar to the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia. It is far too common, we fear, to all of our theological seminaries, as well as to the theological literature of the Christian world.

The following impeachment of that literature, by Mr. Kelly, appears to us, as true as it is terrible, as sad as it is solemn. He says:—'*This at once leads one to feel how solemn is the sight which everywhere meets our eyes in Christendom. If there be one truth more than another that has been abandoned, it is the personal presence of the Holy Ghost. There is no adequate testimony to it whatever; and this is not said unadvisedly. I say it not merely of that great city which reigns over the kings of the earth, but of smaller cities that kings have built themselves to reign over, or those yet smaller cities their subjects love to reign over as rivals and an improvement to both. I say it of the Protestant bodies, no matter what, no matter where, national or*

dissenting. It is a remarkable fact, that if you look at their confessions of faith, many of which were drawn up when men, no doubt, were far more simple and thorough-going than they are now—at the time of the Reformation, or at any subsequent great crisis—if *there be one truth more especially absent from every one of these confessions that has come under my own observation, it is the testimony to this truth.* You will find other truths: the necessity of being born again, the value of the work of Christ, the glory of his person as God and man. Not that they deny that the Holy Ghost is a divine person—surely they do not. But I am not speaking of his personality, or deity either, but *of his personal mission to the earth, and of his presence now with Christians, both individually and collectively*—the presence of the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Is it to be found anywhere acted on or confessed? Where is it set forth? I have never met with any approach to it, even in my reading; and of course I do not wish to give any one the impression that I have not read a good deal upon the subject. I have searched diligently for it, and I have desired to learn what is really held by Christians universally; but never, *in any one confession, creed, article of faith, or rule, have I discovered the smallest expression of that which is evidently the great characteristic truth of Christianity*—that truth which ought to be continually sounding out, and continually in practice within the Church. Is it not, then, a solemn consideration that this, the glory of the Christian, the strength of the Church of God, and the essential privilege for which it was expedient that even Christ should go away, is never attested in any one system of Christendom known to me? [Lectures on N. T. Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, pp. 97-99.]

There is, we believe, much truth in this statement. A good work on 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit' has been, if we mistake not, a *desideratum* in English theology. The work of Mr. Kelly is the best discussion of this all-important subject with which we are acquainted. Hence, when applied to by Christians for information respecting 'the doctrine of the Holy Spirit', we have not hesitated to recommend the work of Mr. Kelly; and, in every instance, it has brought great light and satisfaction to the mind of the reader. It has been of great

service to our mind ; and we have no doubt it would be of service to the mind of all our Methodist preachers. Hence it is, that we have recommended it in the pages of this review ; though it was written by a (so-called) Plymouth Brother. We have no doubt, that it would be of great service to all of Dr. Dabney's former pupils ; ay, and to the great Doctor himself, if he could only read it without knowing it was written by a Plymouth Brother.

It would be strange, indeed, if men who are remarkable for a supreme devotion to the Word, and for a prayerful reliance on the guidance of the Spirit, should fall into the manifold and serious heresies imputed to the Brethren by their enemies and accusers. In fact, as we shall now proceed to show, the heresies imputed to them are among the vilest of vile calumnies ever perpetrated by religious animosity. The first heresy charged upon the Brethren by Dr. Reid, is the doctrine of '*Christ's Heavenly Humanity*'. He attempts to make this charge good by extracts from the writings of Mr. McIntosh and Mr. Darby. He then adds : 'Those familiar with the history of Christian doctrine will, on reading these extracts, be reminded of the old Valentinian and Apolinarian heresy, which affirmed that Christ received not his body from the Virgin Mary, but brought it with him from heaven'. We shall see.

It seems that Mr. McIntosh, the 'Plymouth Brother', has actually called Christ 'a divine man' ! Does this deny that he was a man, as well as a divinity ? It might just as well be asserted, indeed, that it denies his proper divinity, while it asserts his real manhood. We say, for instance, the 'divine Plato' ; but this no more denies his proper manhood, than it asserts his real divinity. In fact, such language is to be understood, and interpreted, in connection with the known sentiments of the writer.

What, then, is the well-known sentiment, or doctrine, of Mr. McIntosh, in relation to the humanity of Christ ? His writings leave not the shadow of a doubt on this subject. Thus, in his *Notes on Leviticus*, (p. 37,) he says : 'From this magnificent passage, we learn that the *human body* into which the second person of the eternal Trinity entered, was formed by "the power of the Highest." "A body hast thou prepared me." (Comp

Psalm xl. 6 with Heb. x. 5). *It was a real human body—REAL “FLESH AND BLOOD”.* Could language possibly be more explicit? But this is not all. Mr. McIntosh continues: ‘There is no possible foundation here, on which *gnosticism or mysticism can base its vapid and worthless theories—no warrant for the cold abstractions of the former, or the misty fancies of the latter. All is deep, solid, and divine reality. . . .* The early promise had declared that “*the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head,*” and none but a *real man* could accomplish this prediction—one whose nature was as *real* as it was pure and incorruptible’. Now what, in the presence of such clear, distinct, and emphatic utterances as this, becomes of Dr. Reid’s worse than gossamer inferences, or cobweb sophistries?

Again, it seems that this bold and daring heretic has had the audacity to call Christ ‘a heavenly man’, and to assert—‘Such was the *humanity* of Christ, that he could at any moment, as far as he was personally concerned, have returned to heaven, from whence he had come, and to which he belonged’. Horrible heresy! How clearly it proves, that Mr. M. rejected the orthodox doctrine, that Christ’s body was ‘real flesh and blood’, ‘the seed of the woman’, and fell into the Valentinian heresy! And strangest of all, this inference is drawn from a passage on page 40 of his Notes on Leviticus, while, as we have just seen, the true, orthodox doctrine is so clearly and emphatically asserted on page 37 of the same work! Only three pages between the positive statement and fact of Mr. M.’s belief, and Dr. Reid’s flimsy inference; and yet that *inference* is made to obliterate the *fact*, and establish the charge of heresy!

‘He could at any moment, as far as he was personally concerned, have returned to heaven’. Why is Dr. Reid offended at this? Who doubts that such was the power of Christ, if he had chosen to exercise it, or if such exercise had been consistent with the Father’s will? Why, in fact, did not Christ burst the bonds of death, and ‘return to heaven’? ‘From whence he had come’. Does not Christ himself assert the same thing? In John viii. 25, he says, ‘I am from above’, which, in the estimation of all commentators, means, ‘I am from above, *from heaven*’. [Lange.] Will the learned and logical doctor convict Christ himself of heresy?



Another argument has been adduced to convict Mr. M. of the Valentinian heresy, that Christ did not receive his body from the Virgin Mary, but brought it with him from heaven. As this argument is unique, we shall give Mr. Darby's answer to it, which is also exceedingly unique.

Mr. Darby says:—"The next piece of Dr. C.'s theology that I shall notice is this very wise conclusion: "Again, page 36 (of Mr. Mackintosh), we have the words, 'the conception of Christ's humanity by the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin'. The doctrine is here again. The Scripture says in regard to the Virgin, 'Thou shalt conceive in thy womb', but Mr. M. says it was the Holy Ghost conceived in her womb, it was not the Virgin herself who conceived. According to this view, the Virgin had no more to do with the conception than, as Valentine said, the conduit has with the water that runs through it". What a mercy it is to have a detector of heretics! No doubt Dr. Carson is not of the Establishment, and has never learnt "the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue". I will quote one of these:—"And in Jesus Christ our Lord who was conceived by the Holy Ghost". This is the Apostles' Creed, Dr. Carson, and "the doctrine is here again". The creed the Church has been saying these 1400 years, and taken for apostolic, contains this dreadful doctrine, and, "according to this view", the whole Church has been Valentinian unto this day, without knowing it! I ask any reader in his senses what effect criticisms, which make Peter in the first sermon that founded Christianity in the world teach such doctrine, that "he had better join the Socinians"—criticisms by persons who have never read the Apostles' Creed, and accuse it of what Valentine said (of being Valentinian)—can produce upon the Brethren. But, further, Mr. M. has said, (p. 40,) "Such was the humanity of Christ, that he could, at any moment, as far as he was personally concerned, have returned to heaven, from whence he had come, and to which he belonged'. What do you think of this, reader? Could this be misunderstood?" Well, I should have thought not. I suppose Christ belonged to heaven, that he had come from it, (at least he says so,) nay, was in it; (the Son of man who is in heaven;) and that

his humanity was such, so holy, so pure, and undefiled, that he could have returned at any moment; that, as he "came from God", so, unsullied as he was, he could "go to God". And this purity is what Mr. M. is speaking of. He says:—"He assumed a body inherently and divinely pure, holy, and without the possibility of taint — absolutely free from any seed or principle of sin or mortality. Such was the humanity of Christ", &c. According to Dr. Carson, "No words could more plainly assert that the *humanity* of Christ could *return* to heaven, *from whence* it had *come*, and *to which* it *belonged*". The only answer is, that there is not a word of the kind. It is said, not *it*, but *he* had come, *he* belonged, and *he* could return, and that the humanity was of such a purity that it would not preclude his doing so. And if Dr. C. does not believe that, he is a very great heretic, and not a Christian at all'.

Dr. Reid endeavors to prove, by arguments equally weak and flimsy, that Mr. Darby himself denies the real humanity of Christ; though Mr. Darby has expressly and repeatedly asserted the humanity of Christ, as 'the seed of the woman', as 'born of the Virgin', to be 'a fundamental' tenet of the Christian scheme of redemption. Mr. Darby has, in fact, combatted the very heresy, which is thus imputed to him. But what difference does that make? The object is to convict him, not to try him, and cause his name to stink in all the orthodox nostrils of the Kirk of Scotland. His proof is, perhaps, worthy of a moment's notice, if it be only for the wonderfulness of it.

Dr. Reid says:—"Mr. Darby, at all events, uses the expression, "the heavenly man", and says:—"We, the Church, are bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh, now that he is glorified and the saints united to him who is on high. The thought is a totally different one, and does not refer to his incarnation, but to our union with him when glorified. *As incarnate, he abode alone*'. Now, gentle reader, is it not a most glaring heresy, to call Christ 'the heavenly man', after his risen and glorified body had ascended into heaven, and taken its seat forever on the throne at the right-hand of the Majesty on high? How absurd to call him, thus raised above all principality and power, 'the heavenly man'!

We suppose we are expected to find some heresy, too, in the last line—'*As incarnate, he abode alone*'—inasmuch as it is underscored by Dr. Reid. But he must be as ignorant of the Scriptures, as he is of the writings of the Brethren, who can snuff the least taint of heresy in the current expressions, 'He was the lonely One'; 'He was the Stranger'; or, in the pathetic words of the Psalmist, 'He was hunted as a partridge on the mountains'. Mr. Darby was right: the saints were not united to Christ, as members of his mystical body, while he was here upon earth, but only after he had become the risen and glorified 'head over all things to his Church'.

Having convicted Mr. Darby of the very heresy, which he has as pointedly repudiated as any man that ever lived, Dr. Reid then proceeds to overwhelm him by the proof of the three following propositions: 'I. *Christ is frequently designated in Scripture as a man*'; 'II. *He was constituted as a man*'; and 'III. *Jesus sustained all the relations of a man*'. Surely Mr. Darby should blush that, after having translated the Scriptures into three different languages, and made a 'Synopsis of the Books of the Bible' in five volumes, he should have to be taught such elementary truths, just as if he were an infant beginner, in the Sunday School of the Rev. William Reid, D. D. But, instead of blushing and groaning under such awful castigation, we only see 'the old man eloquent' with a good-natured smile on his face, and we hear him quietly saying—'What a mercy it is to have a detector of heresies!'

Now, this ridiculous charge has found its way into 'The Christian Observer', which alleges, as the third heresy of the Brethren, 'That Christ's humanity was not one like ours, but a peculiar and *heavenly* humanity, apart from that of any mortal man'. Thence it has been copied into *The Southern Churchman*, and thence again into *The Nashville Christian Advocate*; so that it will be read by thousands, and tens of thousands, who will never see any reply to it, or learn how utterly unfounded and false it is.

The second heresy, which Dr. Reid imputes to the Brethren, is in these words: 'II. *Christ's Righteousness denied*'. We shall not waste our time, or tax the patience of our readers, by fol-

lowing Dr. Reid through the thirty pages he has devoted to this heresy. It is simply and notoriously false in the eyes of all, who have looked into the writings of the Brethren.

In his treatise on 'The Righteousness of God', (p. 5), Mr. Darby says: 'I believe and bless God for the truth, *that Christ is our righteousness, and that by his obedience we are made righteous.* IT IS THE SETTLED PEACE OF MY SOUL'. Yet in spite of this, and of a thousand other expressions to the same effect, Dr. Reid would convince us that Mr. Darby denies 'the righteousness of Christ'!

Again, Mr. Darby says: 'What is, then, the righteousness of God, and how is it shown? How do we have part in it? How is righteousness reckoned to us? We are said to be the righteousness of God in Christ. (II. Cor. v.) The Apostle speaks of having the righteousness which is *of God.* (Phil. iii.) But it is not said, *God's righteousness is imputed to us.* Nor is *Christ's righteousness* a scriptural expression, THOUGH NO CHRISTIAN DOUBTS HE WAS PERFECTLY RIGHTEOUS. Still, the Spirit of God is perfect in wisdom, and it would be wonderful if that which was the necessary ground of our acceptance should not be clearly spoken of in Scripture. One passage seems to say so. (Rom. v. 18.) But the reader may see in the margin of a Bible, which has references, that there it is 'one righteousness'. There cannot be the least doubt that this is the true rendering. When the apostle would say, by the offence of one, he uses a different and correct form, a different one from that which he uses for one offence. Theology may make it "the righteousness of one", but not Greek. But the expression, "the righteousness of God", is used so very often, that it is not necessary to quote the passages. Now, it is not in vain that the Holy Ghost in so important a subject never uses one expression, that is, *the righteousness of Christ*, and constantly the other, that is, *God's righteousness.* We learn the current of the mind of the Spirit thus. Theology uses *always* that which the Holy Ghost *never* does; and cannot tell what is to be made of that which the Holy Ghost always uses. Surely there must be error in the whole way of thinking of theology here'. Surely, one would think, it is no very great heresy in Mr. Darby to insist, as he does, upon expressing the mind of

the Spirit in the words of the Spirit himself; and if theologians 'cannot tell what to make' of the words '*which the Holy Ghost always uses*', then let them go to Mr. Darby and learn. We have done so; and we can testify, that it is better to learn even of a Darby, than to rest in that worst of all the forms of human ignorance, namely, 'the conceit of knowledge without the reality'. Never until we had learned what to make of the expression—'the righteousness of God'—which the Spirit always uses, instead of the expression—'the righteousness of Christ'—which theologians always use, did we see the freeness, the fulness, the richness, the glory, and the inexpressible sweetness, of the grace of God in Christ Jesus. Mr. Darby, having cut loose from the creeds and traditions of men, and taken the word of God alone as the man of his counsel, has found, we doubt not, the true sense of the precious Scriptures which speak of 'the righteousness of God'. If Mr. Darby is a heretic here, it is just because he prefers the word of God to the word of man: he may be, for this, a heretic in the eyes of men, but not in the eye of God.

### III.—NON-IMPUTATION,

is the third heresy which Dr. Reid imputes to the Brethren. He says:—'Having got rid, they think, of the righteousness of Christ, [which, as we have seen, they assert as positively as any Christian under the sun,] it behooves Brethren to rid themselves in like manner of imputation; but as something very like it is found in Scripture, they explain it thus:—"I affirm", says Mr. Darby, "that Scripture never speaks of imputed righteousness as of a sum of righteousness, first existing in itself and then imputed. *The truth is, it never speaks of imputed righteousness at all, but of imputing righteousness,* and the difference is very great indeed. Imputed righteousness may carry with it [and usually does] in the mind the sense of a substantive quantity of righteousness, first existing and then imputed; imputing righteousness cannot. . . . When I say, God imputed his faith to Abraham for righteousness, *it is plain that he held Abraham to be righteous in his sight on account of faith, that is, imputing righteousness means, in Scripture, to hold a person to be a righteous man, to reckon or account him such*'.

Dr. Reid may sneer at this, and call it heresy; but is it not the clear and unequivocal teaching of Scripture? In 'imputing righteousness to Abraham', God simply reckoned or counted his faith to him for righteousness. This is the plain language of Scripture. Who will call it heresy? It is nowhere said in Scripture, that 'the righteousness of Christ was imputed to Abraham', or to any other person. The language is not scriptural; and besides, it is nonsense. The righteousness, or moral qualities, of one, not even of Christ himself, can be imputed to another. The whole notion of such a thing is as absurd as it is unscriptural.

In another of his works entitled 'The Righteousness of God', Mr. Darby says:—'There are eleven passages in Scripture which speak of imputing righteousness or for righteousness; in nine of them faith is imputed for righteousness . . . they are Romans iv. 3, 5, 9, 10, 22, 23, 24; Gal. iii. 6; and James ii. 23. The others, where it is said righteousness is imputed, are Rom. iv. 6, 11. In Rom. iv. 6, it is, "God imputes righteousness without works", saying, "Blessed is the man whose iniquity is forgiven, whose sin is covered". Here, clearly no positive external thing, [as the righteousness of Christ,] is imputed or put to another's account, but a man is reckoned to have δικαιοσύνη. Verse 11 leads to exactly the same result. The Gentile believers [such as we all are] were to be reckoned righteous, because faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness when he was uncircumcised' (p. 18). Now, if men will adhere to the human formula, that 'the righteousness of Christ is imputed', let them not denounce Mr. Darby as a heretic, because he prefers the words of the Spirit.

And he prefers the inspired words, because they are a divine safeguard against the accursed heresy of Antinomianism; which has also been most falsely laid at Mr. Darby's door. The danger of Antinomianism from the use of the human formula, is forcibly described by Mr. Wesley, in his celebrated sermon, 'The Lord our Righteousness'. He there says:—'In the meantime, what we are afraid of is this,—lest any should use the phrase, the righteousness of Christ, or the righteousness of Christ is imputed to me, as a cover for his unrighteousness. We have

*known this done a thousand times.* A man has been reprov'd, suppose, for drunkenness: "Oh", said he, "I pretend to no righteousness of *my own*; Christ is *my righteousness*". Another has been told, that "The extortioner, the unjust, shall not inherit the kingdom of God". He replies with all assurance, "I am unjust in myself, but I have a spotless righteousness in Christ". And thus, though a man be as far from the practice as from the tempers of a Christian; though he neither has the mind which was in Christ, nor in any respect walks as he walked; yet he has armor of proof against all conviction, in what he calls the righteousness of Christ'.

If men had only honored, as they should have done, the divine wisdom of the Spirit, by adhering to his words, they had never used the expressions, which so very easily lapse into the most monstrous and disgusting of heresies. 'It is', says Mr. Wesley, 'the seeing so many deplorable instances of this kind, [*i. e.* of Antinomianism], *which makes us sparing in the use of these expressions*'. He had been more sparing, no doubt, of these expressions—'Christ is my righteousness', and 'Christ's righteousness is imputed to me'—had they not been sanctioned by the standards of the Church of England, whose doctrines he had taken a vow to preach. Even as it was, he has somewhere said, 'I rarely use the expression the imputed righteousness of Christ'. Why so? If the expression be scriptural or true, then why not use it as often as one pleases, or finds it convenient? And if it be not scriptural, nor true, as well as dangerous in its tendency, then why use it at all? Why not, on the contrary, *always* adhere to the words invariably used by the Spirit, and shun those of human wisdom, or folly, which so easily lapse into the most horrible of heresies? We do not admire Mr. Darby in all respects; but we do admire his Christian heroism in preferring the word of God to the word of man, be it the word of Popes or Presbyterians, Churchmen or Dissenters.

For the want of space, we pass over the fourth charge of heresy, which Dr. Reid urges against the Brethren. The fifth charge, by Dr. Reid, is found under the following head:

#### 'V.—CHRIST'S NON-ATONING SUFFERINGS'.

Now, there can be no doubt, we think, that Christ did endure non-atoning, as well as atoning, sufferings. No one can doubt, for instance, that he did suffer, and suffer most acutely, from contact with the world. The slowness of belief, even among his disciples, causing him to exclaim, 'O ye of little faith!' 'How long shall I suffer you!' the 'contradiction of sinners', and the coarseness of men in general, must have inflicted, at times, upon his pure spirit, a degree of anguish amounting almost to agony. Who has not often reflected, with tears of sympathy, on this source of the sorrows of the Son of man? Yet no one can, or will, pretend that these were among the atoning sufferings of Christ: they were clearly non-atoning. At least, so Mr. Darby contends, and so we have always believed. But these non-atoning sufferings of Christ, which were from men, do not preclude his atoning sufferings, which were from God. Is not this true? Or is it a heresy? Let the Christian reader decide.

But the worst thing under this head, or perhaps under any head in the history of theological malice, is the attempt of Dr. Reid to fasten on Mr. Darby 'the blasphemous heresy' of Mr. Newton. Dr. Reid says, under this head, that Mr. Newton 'withdrew from fellowship with Mr. Darby and those who took part with him in the controversy'; that is, in the controversy relating to Mr. Newton's heresy. Now, in direct opposition to this statement, Dr. Reid had previously stated the truth, that 'The result was, not merely personal alienation, *but the withdrawal of Mr. Darby and a party from the Plymouth Assembly, and the establishment of a separate cause*'. (p. 7.) This first statement of Dr. Reid is true; his last statement is false. Mr. Darby withdrew from Mr. Newton, and not Mr. Newton from Mr. Darby. If Dr. Reid wished to preserve his credit, he should not have thus flatly contradicted himself, in regard to a plain matter of fact.

*Mr. Darby withdrew from Mr. Newton, and left the Plymouth Assembly, with its 'blasphemous heresy', in the hands of his (so-called) 'formidable rival'. In less than two years, the building occupied by the Plymouth Assembly was advertised 'to let'. Mr. Newton withdrew from his God-forsaken and fallen*



cause ; and has since, as we are credibly informed, retired to his beautiful residence in the Isle of Wight, in the enjoyment of his elegant leisure, his fine horses and carriage. In the meantime, Mr. Darby, with his missionary zeal unabated, has continued to visit the nations of Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and America ; seeking the conversion and salvation of souls. His cause has flourished more than ever before. The very building at Plymouth, which Mr. Newton deserted, is now occupied, as a place of worship, by the friends and followers of Mr. Darby ! This is the simple truth, in regard to the heretical Assembly, which, at the time of Mr. Darby's withdrawal therefrom, contained seven hundred members. Behold, then, the fate of heresy, and the reward of heroism !

But yet, in spite of all this, and in contempt of all truth, Dr. Reid now makes the nefarious attempt to fasten on Mr. Darby, the very heresy which induced him to separate from Mr. Newton. He says :—' Mr. Darby having thus got rid of a formidable rival, [most formidable indeed !] proceeded to invest himself in Mr. Newton's discarded garments, made down of course, and altered to suit the figure of him who assumed them. This Mr. Darby denies '. Of course, Mr. Darby denies this ; for this is notoriously false. But yet, in spite of Mr. Darby's positive denial, and all the evidences of its truth, Dr. Reid endeavors to prove his infamous accusation against his intended victim. Let us examine his proof.

His first proof is what he calls the testimony of ' the Brethren themselves '. In his own words :—' This Mr. Darby denies. Those, however, who are *best qualified to judge*, namely *the Brethren themselves*, have regarded the views of the one as but a modification of those of the other, and we are disposed to be of the same opinion, grounds for which will immediately appear. Mr. Henry Groves says :—" The doctrine is identical in this, its main feature, that Christ is personally placed under the judgment of God, otherwise than atoningly. This was the real poison in the doctrine of the one, and it is the real poison in the doctrine of the other " .'

This witness, Mr. Henry Groves, adduced by Dr. Reid to prove his charge against Mr. Darby, is one of the adherents of

Mr. Newton, and the enemy of Mr. Darby. That is to say, he is one of the apostate Brethren, and not, as Dr. Reid would have his readers to believe, a friend and brother of Mr. Darby. Either from the weakness of his brain, or from the strength of his bigotry, or a combination of both, his judgment is utterly false. 'Best qualified to judge'! says Dr. Reid. No one, indeed, was less qualified\* to judge, than Mr. Henry Groves. Angry with Mr. Darby for having denounced the heresy of 'the Plymouth Brethren', and left them to go down with their apostacy from the true Christ, Mr. Groves endeavors to fasten on him the very heresy and apostacy from which he had withdrawn! The non-atoning sufferings of Christ, says Mr. Groves, 'was the real poison in the doctrine of the one, and it is the real poison in the doctrine of the other'.

Now, according to Mr. Darby, 'the non-atoning sufferings of Christ', were endured by 'the spotless Lamb of God'. According to Mr. Newton, as we have seen, his 'non-atoning sufferings' were endured, not for others, but for himself; even to deliver himself from 'the wrath of God', from his 'outstretched arm' and 'hot displeasure'. Such was 'the poison', as it is called, 'in the doctrine of the one', and such 'the real poison in the doctrine of the other'. How very like! Just as like, indeed, as 'the spotless Lamb of God', and the sin-stained Christ of Mr. Newton's heresy.

But Dr. Reid appeals to the words of Mr. Darby himself, in order to fasten on him the horrible heresy of Mr. Newton. He finds these words, in a work on 'The Sufferings of Christ, by J. N. Darby, p. 31'. He says, 'Mr. Darby declares, that Christ experienced "the sense of guilt under a broken law".' If this be true, then Mr. Darby himself makes Christ a sinner, and says he experienced 'a sense of guilt (*as such*) under a broken law'. But, on turning to the passage from which Dr. Reid makes his garbled extract, we find no allusion to Christ whatever, much less to his 'sense of guilt'. The whole passage relates, in fact, to the Israelites, and not to Christ. This falsification, by Dr. Reid, is so bare-faced and shameless, that it must be established by the production of the passage itself. Here it is:—'Now here the judgment of God against them, [not against Christ, but against

them, the Israelites,] *the sense of guilt under a broken law and national unfaithfulness*, the full power of Satan and the darkness it brings—all rest on the spirit of *the people*;—yet, though smitten in the place of dragons, there is integrity of heart, earnest desires after the law, and after God himself and his worship, and trust in him as *their only resource*'. Now, from this passage, every word of which relates to the Israelites, Dr. Reid copies the part of a single phrase, 'the sense of guilt under a broken law', and applies this to Christ without the least shadow of authority, or regard for truth. The remaining part of this phrase—'the sense of guilt under a broken law *and national unfaithfulness*'—would, if copied, have exposed the falsehood of Dr. Reid's quotation. Could unfairness, or mendacity, be more utterly shameless?

The fatuity of his next extract, purporting to be from the same work, surpasses belief. It is in these words:—'Man may be looked at morally as suffering, though awakened, quickened, and upright in desire, under the exercises of a soul learning, *when a sinner*, the difference of good and evil, under divine government, in the presence of God, not fully known in grace and redemption, whose judgment of sin is before his eyes, exposed to all the advantage that Satan can take of him in such a state; such suffering, for example, as is seen in the case of Job. *Christ has passed through all these kinds of suffering, ONLY THE LAST, OF COURSE, AS HIMSELF, A PERFECT BEING TO LEARN IT FOR OTHERS*'. (The italics are Dr. Reid's; the capitals are ours.) Now this quotation is made to prove that Mr. Darby regarded Christ as an imperfect and sinful being; and yet in this very passage, as well as everywhere else in the writings of Mr. Darby, Christ is set forth as a 'PERFECT BEING'. It is very hard, indeed, to believe the fact, that a learned doctor of divinity should be so blind in his infatuation, or so foolish in his fatuity; but the evidence of the fact is irresistible. Belief is difficult, but doubt is absolutely impossible.

This is the more wonderful; because, in the very work under the eye of Dr. Reid, Mr. Darby has repudiated the very heresy imputed to him as clearly and fully as this could possibly be done in human language. The following passage, alone, is

sufficient to show his utter abhorrence of the heresy of Mr. Newton, which has been so unscrupulously imputed to him by Dr. Reid :

‘It is in respect to the remarks in my papers on the “Sufferings of Christ”, which arose out of the consideration of this psalm [Psalm lxix.], that difficulties arose in some pious minds. These difficulties I respect, and delight in the jealousy which would not bear anything that they thought touched the divine perfections and relationship with God his Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Whatever expression might throw a cloud on that, or if any did, I condemn it already. I am sure I have no doctrine which does. I HOLD HIS CLOUDLESS RELATIONSHIP WITH HIS FATHER, SAVE IN THE ACT OF ATONEMENT, TO BE AN ESSENTIAL TRUTH. It was to make this clear that I drew attention to his sufferings from man which brought judgment on man, and his sufferings from God, that is, atoning sufferings, which brought forgiveness and peace. This clearly distinguishes a life of communion, and the forsaking and wrath on the cross, and denies distinctly and unequivocally, in whole and in part, the doctrine of Christ being subject to the displeasure of God as a born Israelite and a born man. He never was but his delight. He was not by birth subject to what he sought to *escape*, and did partly escape from by prayer, obedience, or any other virtue or quality. All this is fundamentally false, makes a false Christ—not the true one at all—let it be vicarious or not vicarious. The former indeed is absurd, if he is subject to the displeasure of God by birth and position as the necessary consequences of these; for he is in it whether he delivers others or not—in it by his own position, not therefore for others. But vicarious or not, it is false; it denies, before the question of vicariousness can arise, the true being of Christ and his true relationship to God, which alone made his gracious work for others possible’.

Now in this passage, we have as clear, full, and pointed a condemnation of the heresy of Mr. Newton, as it is possible to frame in language. Yet, overlooking all this, Dr. Reid has attempted, by means of garbled extracts from the very work containing this passage, to prove that Mr. Darby has adopted the heresy of Mr. Newton! that, after having warned against this heresy, he

'proceeded to invest himself in Mr. Newton's discarded garments'! Comment is unnecessary; comment is beggared; belief is staggered; imagination is confounded; and we are lost—absolutely lost—in the contemplation of the heights and depths of the delusion, or of the mendacity, into which a poor soul may be driven by its theological animosities.

We have not the space, in this article, to notice and refute all the charges of heresy, which have been urged against the Brethren. Hence we have selected, for notice and refutation, only five out of the nine charges thus preferred by Dr. Reid and others. These five are the most important of the nine; and the other four might, if we had the room, be refuted as easily and triumphantly as those we have taken in hand. The fifth charge of heresy, which we have undertaken to refute, yet remains to be noticed; and as it is the most plausible of all, if not the most important, so we have reserved it for the last place in this defence of the theological orthodoxy of Mr. Darby and his adherents. It is stated as follows by Dr. Reid:

'VI.—DENIAL OF THE MORAL LAW AS A RULE OF LIFE'.

Dr. Reid is very bold, and roundly asserts, that the Brethren '*are opposed to almost every doctrine of Christianity*'. [Preface, p. v.] Especially, if we may believe Dr. Reid, are they opposed to the purity of life enjoined by Christ and his apostles, by holding and setting forth the horrid heresy of *antinomianism*. 'Antinomianism', says he, 'is no new thing in the history of Christianity. John Agricola was its chief advocate in the days of Luther; and what Agricola and Münzer did for it then, Saltmarsh and Crisp did for it in the days of the Commonwealth. *It was the sad drawback in the revival of religion under Whitfield and Wesley*'.

Now, all this is abundantly and most sadly true; especially the last sentence, which we have placed in italics. But there is another fact connected with this last sad truth, which Dr. Reid has not been pleased to notice. It is this: The antinomianism which assailed the great work of Whitfield and Wesley, and, like a huge serpent, threatened to strangle Methodism in its cradle, *was Calvinistic in its origin*. This is well known to all

who have read the early history of Methodism, or 'The Checks to Antinomianism, by John Fletcher, of Madeley'. But since, by the labors of Fletcher, Wesley, and the grace of God, Methodism was delivered from the grasp of Calvinism, it has been in no danger whatever from the frightful abominations of antinomianism.

'Antinomianism is no new thing in the history of Christianity'; especially is it no new thing in the history of revivals of religion. As it assailed Methodism, the great revival of the last century, and threatened to crush it in its infancy, so, in this century, has it assailed the great religious movement under Mr. Darby. The advocate of Wesleyanism is, of all the men in the world, the last who ought to urge this fact as an objection to Darbyism. And the Presbyterians who, like Dr. Reid, Dr. Dabney, and others, have urged this objection with the greatest self-satisfaction against Darbyism, should just be reminded that the antinomianism which has shown its hideous features, either in whole or in part, in connexion with this new movement, has sprung from the bosom of Calvinism. The only writer among the Brethren upon whom Dr. Dabney has charged the heresy of antinomianism, is Mr. McIntosh; and Mr. McIntosh is an out-and-out Calvinist. Thus in his Notes on Genesis, p. 203, he says:—'To make salvation dependent, in the most remote manner, upon anything in, or done by, man, is to set it entirely aside. Human religion gives man a place more or less. . . . On the contrary, Christianity excludes the creature from all interference in the work of salvation'. Thus, according to Mr. M., our Methodism, and all Arminianism, which gives man a place in the work, and, with St. Paul, requires us 'to be laborers together with God' (I. Cor. iii. 9), is merely a 'human religion'. On the contrary, the Calvinism which gives man no place, either 'more or less', but 'excludes the creature from all part, however subordinate or humble, in the work of his own salvation, is Christianity, is the only divine religion'. That is to say, Calvinism is Christianity, and Christianity is Calvinism. All beside is the mere bosh of 'human religion', the sheer legalism of Arminianism, or Methodism, or Pelagianism; for, in the estimation of the McIntosh and Dabney school of theology, these three *isms* are only modified

forms of the one 'human religion', the one fundamental heresy of the human heart, which, in its rebellion against God, denies the absolute and unconditional dominion of His omnipotent power, or arbitrary will. It is 'no new thing in the history of Christianity', that such a Calvinist, if only a little overheated in a revival of religion, should become an antinomian heretic. But even if Mr. McIntosh were as gross an antinomian as his brother Calvinist, Dr. Dabney, makes him out, this would no more disgrace Darbyism, than did the far more fearful antinomianism of the last century disgrace Wesleyanism. Dr. Dabney has himself admitted, that 'nobody among them [the Brethren] is responsible for anything, unless he has been found doing or saying it himself' (p. 2). Let Mr. M., then, be held responsible for *his own words*, and let not the whole brotherhood be condemned for his individual aberrations, whether great or small. Above all, let him be candidly and fairly judged by his own words, *by all his words*, and not be grossly misrepresented by partial extracts, as he has been by Dr. Dabney. We shall presently see the fearful truth of this accusation against the grand accuser of the Brethren.

Especially let Mr. Darby, the founder of the Society of the Brethren, be judged in the same fair and candid way; that is, by his own words, *and all his words*, not by partial and misrepresenting extracts. We confess that we did, at one time, regard Mr. Darby as guilty of the heresy of antinomianism. But this was before we had a sufficient knowledge of his writings to form a calm, dispassionate, and righteous judgment. We did not make haste, however, to rush into print on the subject, and to expose our own ignorance, in a premature attempt to expose his heresy. Thanks to the restraining grace of God! We are now prepared to vindicate this venerable soldier of the Cross, John N. Darby, against the heresy of antinomianism.

We wish we could as easily vindicate him against every serious error of expression, and unsoundness of argument, in connection with 'the moral law as a rule of life'. This is the first great question which he debated with Judge Marshall, the English Methodist, to whom reference has already been made. We have not seen the pamphlet of Judge Marshall, but only the reply of

Mr. Darby; and, if we are not greatly mistaken, the arguments of the latter may be successfully refuted. We hold, with Judge Marshall, and with all orthodox theologians, save Messrs. Darby, Kelly, and other Brethren, that 'the moral law is a rule of life'. We have examined and weighed all the arguments against this doctrine, which are set forth in Mr. Kelly's Lectures on the Epistle to the Galatians, and they have appeared to us to be wanting. But the question here is, does this assertion of theirs, that 'the Mosaic law is abolished, both as a covenant *and as a rule of life*', justify us in pronouncing them guilty of the heresy of antinomianism? of taking away the obligations and the motives to religious obedience? It does not.

Even Dr. Reid has admitted this. He says:—"It is proper, however, to admit that its Antinomianism is not of the coarse and licentious character of the days of Wesley and Whitfield, but rather akin to that propounded by Milton in his treatise on Christian Doctrine". All this, of course, makes it as clear as mud to the reader. But what did they really teach? Dr. Reid continues:—"Although the Brethren consider the whole of the Mosaic law abolished, both as a covenant and a rule of life, **THEY ADMIT NOT THE LEAST RELAXATION OF THE OBLIGATIONS AND THE MOTIVES TO A RELIGIOUS OBEDIENCE**". If this be so, and so indeed it is, then the Brethren are not, in any offensive sense of the word, guilty of antinomianism at all, much less of this heresy in 'the coarse and licentious character of the days of Wesley and Whitfield'.

They 'consider the whole of the Mosaic law abolished'. But how? Why, as Dr. Reid himself has shown, the Mosaic law was abolished as a rule of life, not otherwise than as the stars of heaven are abolished by the glory of the sun. That is to say, it was superseded, or swallowed up, by the introduction of a higher, fuller and better law for the regulation of the Christian's life and walk. To this effect, Dr. Reid quotes Mr. Stanley, one of the Brethren, as saying:—"The law was perfect for the purpose for which it was given. But the new commandment goes much further, "That ye love one another, **AS I HAVE LOVED YOU.**" "He that abideth in Him, ought himself also to walk, **EVEN AS HE WALKED**" (p. 245).



Mr. Darby says:—‘If I make of the law a moral law (including therein the precepts of the New Testament, and all morality in heart and life), to say a Christian is delivered from it is nonsense, or *utterly monstrous wickedness*. Certainly it is not Christianity. Conformity to the divine will, and that as obedience to commandments, *is alike the joy and the duty of the renewed mind*’. [Collected Writings, vol. x., p. 4.] Again, p. 3:—‘That a Christian should walk according to the precepts of the New Testament, and all the divine light he can gather for his walk from the Old, be it the Ten Commandments or anything else, no consistent or right-minded Christian could for a moment deny. I could not own as being on Christian ground one who would. I may not be his judge, but I am bound to judge the principles he professes. I need hardly dwell on it otherwise than to reject it *as utterly evil and unchristian*. It is one of the distinctive marks between heresy and any advance in true divine knowledge that *the latter always holds the moral foundation fast*, the difference of right and wrong immovable and fixed, as it is in the divine nature and revealed in the Word, the heretic slights and loses sight of it’.

Now, to charge such a teacher with the heresy of antinomianism, with having denied and rejected the obligations and motives of religious obedience, is in the very highest degree unjust. When Mr. Darby says, that ‘the Mosaic law was abolished’, he merely means that, however perfectly its moral precepts or rules were adapted to the people for whom they were given, they fall short of the duties brought to light by the fuller revelations of the New Testament. As this has enlarged and deepened our view of the relations we sustain to God, to Christ, and to our fellow-men; so these new views, or relations, impose higher and holier duties than those prescribed in the law of Moses. There may be error in this view of Mr. Darby, or *at least in his way of putting it*, but there is certainly no heresy. We hold it to be impossible, that the man who has been as pure in life, as self-sacrificing in conduct, and as heroically devoted to the cause of Christ, as Mr. Darby has been, should be found wallowing in the heretical filth of antinomianism. No man ever embraced a heresy in morals, so loathsome and so disgusting as

antinomianism, who had not first become utterly corrupt and depraved in heart, life, and practice.

Hence, if Mr. McIntosh really entertains the gross and revolting antinomian sentiments which are attributed to him by Dr. Dabney, we should not hesitate to pronounce him an unmitigated hypocrite. A hypocrite of the very lowest and meanest type, who would fain cloak the villanies of an impure life under 'the spotless robe of Christ's righteousness'. But before we pass sentence on Mr. M., or denounce him as deserving the reprobation and scorn of the universe, let us, as God-fearing and truth-loving men, look a little more closely into his real sentiments, than Dr. Dabney seems to have done.

Now, as we have already shown, it is not necessary to the defence of Mr. Darby's theological orthodoxy, to prove that all his followers were free from antinomianism. Neither Luther, nor Wesley, nor any other great reformer, could be, as history testifies, defended on any such grounds; for antinomian hypocrites have appeared in connection with all great revivals of true religion. But although it be not necessary to our present purpose to defend Mr. M. against the hideous heresy in question; yet we cannot afford to abandon him to the tender mercies of his Calvinistic brother. The man McIntosh is, indeed, far too important a personage, and far too useful in the present state of the Christian world, to be abandoned to the tender mercies of his enemies. We shall, therefore, judge him, not by partial or garbled extracts, but by *all his words*, and show that, in spite of his Calvinism, he is entitled to the respect, admiration, and gratitude of all good men and Christians.

Mr. McIntosh has published, in all, about thirty volumes. His critic has noticed only one of these, namely, his *Notes on Genesis*. And if in this *one* volume, he has discovered anything good, he has been pleased to keep the discovery to himself. He has, on the other hand, been pleased to signalize four defects, which he has found, or thinks he has found, in the *Notes on Genesis*. Now, if these four defects were all real, and not imaginary, what would they prove? Why, that Mr. M. is, like all the rest of us, a fallible man. But is this the way, we ask, for a candid or fair critic to judge a man or his book? He

might just as well, in fact, cut four black spots from a white horse; and putting these together, hold them up to give an idea of the general complexion and color of the horse. This were bad enough, even if the four spots were actually taken from the horse; but if the reader will look at these defects, as set forth in pages 4 and 5 of Dr. Dabney's review, and then look at them in the pages of Mr. McIntosh, he will find that at least three out of the four have been painted black by the critic himself.

'On pages 69 and 74', says Dr. Dabney, 'we seem to be taught that Christians ought not to improve or ameliorate the state of the earth, which God has been pleased to put under his curse. Such lives as those of Jethro Tull, Sir Jno. Sinclair, Jesse Buel, of Albany, etc., are then unchristian'.

'We seem to be taught', says Dr. Dabney. But let us look at the passage in Mr. McIntosh himself, and then see what we are really taught. He says (pp. 74 and 75):—'To walk with God must, necessarily, put one outside the sphere of this world's thoughts. Enoch realized this; for, in his day, the spirit of the world was manifested; and then, too, as now, it was opposed to all that was of God. *The man of faith felt he had nought to do with the world, save to be a patient witness, therein, of the grace of God, and of coming judgment.* The sons of Cain might spend their energies in the vain attempt to improve a cursed world, but Enoch found a better world, and lived in the power of it. His faith was not given him to improve the world, but to walk with God'.

Now, is not all this true? Has not Christ himself said the same thing in substance? 'To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that *I should bear witness unto the truth*' [John xviii. 37]. Again, 'As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world' [John xvii. 18]. 'They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world' [John xvii. 16]. 'Let the dead bury their dead' [Luke ix. 60]. Ah, let the dead bury their dead, and, as much as they please, beautify 'the earth', this vast burying place of all the generations of men; 'but go thou and preach the kingdom of God' [*Ibid.*] Let the Tulls, the Sinclairs, and the Buels, do their work; 'but go thou and preach the kingdom of God. And

another also said, Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go and bid them farewell which are at home at my house. And Jesus said unto him, No man having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God' [Luke ix. 60, 61, 62]. Now, we hold all this to be sound doctrine; and certainly it is, to the full, as stringent and exclusive as the language of Mr. McIntosh.

'The sons of Cain may spend their energies in the vain attempt to improve a cursed world'; they may, as of old they did, invent the arts and sciences, and hope thereby to restore a fallen world. 'But go thou and preach the kingdom of God'. They may, as did those sons of Cain — the infidel reformers of the French Revolution — labor 'to regenerate the world'. 'But go thou and preach the kingdom of God'. Let them boast, as they did, that in ten years they would convert France into a paradise; and yet, as they did, in less than ten years, convert it into a pandemonium. But seek thou 'the paradise of God'. Let them, as they always have done, and now do, oppose 'culture to Christianity'; but go thou and preach 'the gospel of the kingdom'. Now, we submit to the Christian reader, if the above stricture on the language of Mr. M. is not simply outrageous.

Dr. Dabney continues:—'On page 271, Jacob is greatly condemned, because, having prayed for deliverance from his angry brother, he used prudent precautions to protect his family. The author thinks "prayer and planning" very inconsistent. Bible Christians expect God to answer through means. Their maxim is: "Trust in providence, and keep your powder dry." Now this, for aught we know, may look very dreadful in the eyes of the readers of the *The Southern Presbyterian Review*. But let us see how it looks in the pages of Mr. M.

'He (Jacob) evidently feels uneasy in reference to Esau, and not without reason. [True!] He had treated him badly, [True!] and his conscience was not at ease; [True!] but instead of casting himself unreservedly on God, he betakes himself to his usual planning again, in order to avert Esau's wrath. He tries to *manage* Esau, instead of leaning on God'. Every word true! Was not 'planning', after the fashion of Jacob, 'very inconsistent' with prayer to God, and faith in Him? 'Bible Christians'

do, indeed, 'expect God to answer through means'. But not through such means as those employed by Jacob. *His* planning 'to avert Esau's wrath', was utterly inconsistent with faith in God, who had promised that 'Esau should not hurt him'. It was the planning of cowardice and fear, not the planning of courage and faith. It may be 'the maxim' of some 'Bible Christians': 'Trust in Providence, and keep your powder dry'. But the Brethren do not use powder; they use only 'the sword of the Spirit'. The maxim, 'keep your powder dry', smacks of Henry Ward Beecher's 'Sharpe's rifles'. Both may, perhaps, admit of a good sense, but neither is to our taste. Dr. Dabney's quotation is shocking in the place in which he puts it.

He says again:—'On page 153, the author denies all vicarious worth to all Christ's sufferings and works, save his pangs on the cross. His aim seems to be to show a valid reason why the sufferings of believers, in imitation of their Head, are not propitiatory. To us this seems a very bungling way of reaching that conclusion at the expense of contradicting the Scriptures, when reasons so much more valid might have been presented, in the fact that a believer's nature and person lack all those properties which fitted Christ to be a substitute and sacrifice'.

It is only necessary to place, by the side of this criticism, the passage against which it is directed, in order to show 'what a mercy it is to have a detector of heresies'. 'But let it be remembered', says Mr. M. (p. 153), 'that the suffering of which the joint-heirs participate has no penal element in it. It is not suffering from the hand of infinite justice, because of sin; all that was fully met on the cross, when the divine victim bowed his sacred head beneath the stroke. "Christ also hath *once* suffered for sins," and that "*once*" was on the tree and *nowhere else*. He never suffered for sins before, and he never can suffer for sins again. "*Once*, in the end of the world (the end of all flesh), hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself." "Christ was *once* offered."'

Dr. Dabney has, in our humble opinion, discovered a heresy in this passage, only because he has not sufficiently reflected on the distinction between the non-atoning and the atoning or vicarious sufferings of Christ. Hence we would advise him to read Mr.

Darby's excellent little treatise on 'The Sufferings of Christ', in which this distinction is established. So much for three of Dr. Dabney's black spots. Take his paint off, and they are fair enough.

His fourth objection appears to us well taken. On page 39, says he, the '*Notes on Genesis* pervert the words that Adam and Eve knew good and evil after they transgressed, as teaching that then only they acquired a *conscience!*' This proves to us, what we have already admitted, that the errors of the Brethren are those of the literalist, not those of the rationalist. In the instance before us, Mr. M. has certainly, as it seems to us, been misled by too close adherence to the very letter of the Word.

No author could stand the sort of criticism applied by Dr. Dabney to the *Notes on Genesis*. Even John Calvin could not bear such a test, or mode of treatment. To show this, we will now set before our readers four specimens of his Commentary on Romans, which all must admit have far transcended the four specimens selected from the *Notes on Genesis*. With all Calvin's professed reverence for the word of God, and with all his learning and genius, we mean to produce, as an offset to Dr. Dabney's four black spots, four worse ones from one of Calvin's most celebrated works. They are as follows:

Rom. vi. 16 — 'Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?' On this Calvin has the temerity to say that the apostle spoke improperly (*improprie locutus est*), for if he wanted to make the parts of the sentence correspond with each other, he ought to have said 'or of righteousness unto life', instead of 'or of obedience unto righteousness'. And again, on Rom. viii. 2, he says, 'By the law of the Spirit he improperly designates the Spirit of God', '*Legem spiritus improprie vocat Dei Spiritum*'. Again in his Commentary on Rom. xi. 12, he says Paul would have spoken more properly if he had opposed the raising up again [of Israel] to their fall, '*magis autem proprie locutus fuisset, si lapsui opposuisset suscitationem*'. Again in his comments on Rom. xi. 1-10, he says in reference to the quotations there from the Old Testament, 'The quotations which he (Paul) adduces, collected from

various parts of Scripture, and not taken from one passage, do seem, all of them, to be foreign to his purpose, when you closely examine them according to their contexts'. [Calv. Transl. Series Com. on Rom., p. 417. Edinb. 1849.]

Now, in these four amazing passages, all selected from Calvin on Romans, he convicts St. Paul of four blunders. 1. *He spoke improperly*; and it remained for Calvin to show how *he might have spoken properly*, if he wanted to make the parts of the sentence (so disjointed in the language of St. Paul) *correspond with one another*! 2. 'By the law of the Spirit *he improperly* designates the Spirit of God'. Pity St. Paul had not the benefit of John Calvin's instructions. 3. St. Paul '*would have spoken more properly, if*', &c.—that is, if John Calvin, instead of the Holy Ghost, had been his guide and instructor. 4. Finally, his quotations from the Old Testament to prove the doctrine of reprobation, are, one and all, '*foreign to his purpose*'. Poor blundering Paul! He aims to prove reprobation; but yet his proof texts, *when closely examined according to their contexts*, prove no such thing. They miss the mark! How much better Calvin would have reasoned, and reached the doctrine of reprobation, which blind and blundering Paul so sadly missed!

Now, if any one of these four things had been found in any one of the Brethren, instead of in John Calvin, how fiercely had the whole Calvinistic press roared with its loudest thunder against the miserable miscreant, who had thus dared to substitute his own word for the false word of the great Apostle to the Gentiles! But it is John Calvin, and not John Darby, who thus treats the word of God with sacrilegious contempt. These things fill the Brethren with horror. Indeed, it is to the very prince of the Plymouth Brethren, Mr. William Kelly, that we owe the exposure of these four black spots in one of the works of John Calvin. We defy Dr. Dabney, or any other Presbyterian doctor of divinity, to produce their match from any, or from all, the writings of the so-called Plymouth Brethren. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again'. [Matt. vii. 1, 2].

But it yet remains for us to notice the most particular and

tremendous bolt, which Dr. Dabney has hurled at the head of Mr. McIntosh. It is in these words:—' But take the following from "Notes on Genesis", p. 200: "Regeneration is not a change of the old nature, but the introduction of a new. . . . Nor does the introduction of this new nature, alter in the slightest degree, the true, essential character of [the] old. This latter continues what it was, and is made in no respect better; yea, rather there is a full display of its evil character in opposition to the new element", &c. 'It is not hard to see', adds Dr. D., 'how terribly all this may be carried out to a God-denying carnal security'. True. Nor is it hard to see, how the principles of Calvinism itself may be carried out, as they have often been, to the same God-defying carnal security. But Mr. M., no more than his Calvinistic brethren, has carried out his principles to any such fearful consequences. We had supposed, that it is a universally accepted principle of just criticism, that men are to be held responsible, not for the consequences which *may* be drawn from their principles, but for those, and for those only, which they themselves have *actually* drawn. No men stand more in need of this principle of fair criticism, or just judgment, than do our Calvinistic brethren. Let them, then, observe the golden rule, and 'Do unto others, as they would have others to do unto them'.

It appears to us that, in all fairness, Dr. Dabney should have quoted the whole paragraph, from which he has taken only a part of the first sentence. This would have enabled the reader to see Mr. M.'s reasons for the assertion, that 'Regeneration is not a change of the old nature, but the introduction of a new'. As it is, these reasons, and the scriptural authorities for them, all disappear under Dr. Dabney's 'five points' (. . . .) But we agree with Dr. Dabney, that the 'two natures', or 'the two men' in one, as understood by the Brethren, is erroneous. In regard to these 'two natures', or 'two men', Mr. Inglis confesses to an agreement with the Brethren. We have no doubt that he has adopted *one* of their errors, which has arisen from a too literal understanding of the figurative language of St. Paul. But this is a very different sort of error from that of John Calvin, who prefers his own word to the word of St. Paul. We



consider their doctrine erroneous; but we do not condemn the men as heretics, for having taken the figurative language of St. Paul in a too literal sense.

But Dr. Dabney continues his extract from page 200 of the 'Notes on Genesis', (without the least hint of any break or disconnection in the original,) in the following words:—'The notion of progressive sanctification is false, and the work not to be expected. The evil nature in me is not at all weakened by grace, but rather inflamed. If I have faith, I have the "standing"; and am not to doubt my faith because of a supposed deficiency of fruits; because to conclude it a true faith by any frames in myself, or works of self, is sheer legalism'. Having completed this extract, Dr. Dabney adds, 'What more does any Antinomian negro desire, to encourage him in his foulest hypocrisy, and most fanatical joys?'

Now the above extract is, we admit, truly horrible; and the judgment of Dr. Dabney thereon is not, and could not be, too severe. But is the extract really found in the writings of Mr. McIntosh? On turning to the reference of Dr. Dabney—page 200 of the 'Notes on Genesis'—we find not a syllable of this horrible extract there. Perhaps it was in Dr. Dabney's edition, and has been expunged from ours, which is the 'SIXTH EDITION, REVISED'. Guided by this thought, we consulted the edition used by Dr. Dabney, which is that of 'Inglis and Colles, New York'. But even there we have discovered no sign or trace of the abominable extract. Whence did it come, then, and how has it found its way into the accusation of Dr. Dabney against Mr. M.? He certainly owes it to himself, and to all the friends of truth and fair-dealing, to answer this question. In order to give him an opportunity to do so, we asked one of his friends and one of our own, to inquire of Dr. Dabney himself, hoping he would be able to clear up the mystery. Both promised to write to him. Our friend did so, and mailed the letter in Alexandria. As yet, however, no answer has been received; and we are consequently still in the dark. It may yet come, as we hope it will, before this article is published; and if so, we will lay it before our readers. We do not conceive, for a moment, that Dr. Dabney has intended to impute a false extract to Mr. M. We hope and

believe, on the contrary, that he will be able, in some way unknown to us, to acquit himself of all intention to deceive, or to wilfully misrepresent Mr. McIntosh.

It is easy to show, in the meantime, from the writings of Mr. McIntosh, that he loathes, abhors, and detests the heresy of Antinomianism. One passage, which is perfectly explicit, is sufficient for this purpose. In 'Things New and Old', vol. ix. p. 119, Mr. McIntosh says:—'There is something perfectly shocking to a serious mind, in the thought of men appealing to certain principles of the gospel, in order to establish a plea for the indulgence of the flesh. They want to fling aside the authority of Moses, not that they may enjoy the authority of Christ, but merely to indulge self. But it is vain. It cannot be done with any shadow of truth, for it is never said in Scripture *that the law is dead or abrogated*; but it is said, and urged repeatedly, that the believer is dead to the law, and dead to sin, *in order that he may taste the sweetness of living unto God, of having his fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life*'. We might easily produce, from his writings, many passages to the same effect; but surely this one is sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man.

The writings of Mr. McIntosh are, in some respects, very far from being to our taste. Even in the three passages, which Dr. Dabney has so unjustly condemned, the mode of expression is not altogether agreeable to us. It smacks of the writer's Calvinism rather too strongly for us. We have not the shadow of a doubt, that these three passages, or 'black spots', would have appeared perfectly orthodox, if they had only been found in the writings of a regular Presbyterian, and not in those of a Plymouth Brother.

Mr. McIntosh is not a dialectician, nor a philosopher, nor a theologian. He is none of these things; he makes no pretension to them; like most of the Brethren, he seems to despise them utterly. He is not even a psychologist. Otherwise he would be, in our opinion, a much better interpreter of Scripture. But he is a simple, earnest, and devout student of the Word, and a firm believer in the omnipresence and power of the Holy Spirit. Hence, in spite of all his deficiencies, he is an evangelist, who has no reason to be ashamed of his work. He has, under God, been

the honored means of sending forth more powerful preachers, than any that have ever issued from our theological seminaries.

Mr. Moody is one of these. That Mr. Moody is under great obligations to the Brethren in general, and to Mr. McIntosh in particular, is well known to all who have looked into the history of this new order of Christian men. He received the first great impulse, which sent him forth, on his high and dazzling career, as a star of the first magnitude, from Mr. John N. Darby. 'About three years ago', writes Mr. Moody, 'I had my attention called to C. H. M.'s Notes, and was so much pleased, and at the same time profited by the way they opened up Scripture truths, that I secured at once all the writings of the same author, and if they could not be replaced would rather part with my whole library, excepting my Bible, than with these writings. They have been to me a very key to the Scriptures. D. L. Moody.'

Another celebrated evangelist thus writes:—'I take great pleasure in heartily endorsing to all Christians who desire to be more thoroughly taught in the word of God, the notes of C. H. M. Under God they have blessed me more than any books, outside of the Bible itself, that I have ever read, and have led me to a love of the Bible that is proving an unfailing source of profit. D. W. Whittle.'

The most celebrated of living Baptist preachers, also, has publicly acknowledged his obligations to the Notes of Mr. McIntosh. 'When Mr. C. H. Spurgeon', says Mr. Reid, 'was preaching in the City Hall, Glasgow—some years ago—he inculcated *Christian charity* by telling that having received much edification by reading a book he wrote to thank the writer, and the author turned out to be "a Plymouth Brother"—namely, Mr. C. H. Mackintosh—and the book was *Notes on Exodus*'.

A Baptist preacher, in the State of Virginia, borrowed one volume of the Notes of Mr. M., and he was so much pleased with the volume, that he sent to London, and purchased all the writings of Mr. McIntosh. It was not long before a wonderful improvement was observed in his preaching: the people were amazed at the change, and were at a loss to imagine what could have caused him to break forth afresh, with such a marvellous increase of power.

In this connection, then, we venture to apply one of the anecdotes related of Mr. Lincoln. One of his generals complained to him, that another of his generals, who had been most successful in the field, was in the habit of getting intoxicated. 'Very well', replied 'Uncle Abe', 'if you can find out what sort of whiskey he drinks, I wish you would get some of the same kind, and drink till you learn to fight as well as he fights'. In like manner, we say, do not complain of those preachers, who read the writings of the Brethren. If, instead of this, our hum-drum preachers would only read the same writings, and learn to preach with something of the directness, the simplicity, the earnestness, and the power of a Moody, a Whittle, or a Spurgeon, they would pursue a far wiser course. Indeed, if it were the object of our theological seminaries to turn out effective preachers, as well as to train theologians, they should encourage them to drink deeply of the writings of the Brethren. This would do them more good, as preachers, than all the metaphysical theology of the schools. It is for this reason, that we have interposed our plea in behalf of Mr. McIntosh, and his writings.

The best preacher we know in the Presbyterian Church, or in any other, has long been a constant reader of the writings of the so-called Plymouth Brethren. He has long felt, and had the courage to acknowledge, his great indebtedness to them, for his efficiency as a preacher of the Gospel. For this awful offence of reading the writings of the Plymouth Brethren, he has been assailed and annoyed, by *some* of the ministers of his own church, in the most unjust and discreditable ways. Has it then come to this, that a Protestant Church has, like the Romish, an *index expurgatorius*, or list of prohibited books, into which 'the faithful' must not look under the pains and penalties of her *anathemas*? Must a minister's orthodoxy be questioned, his labors decried, and his character traduced, because his reading is not religiously confined to the writers of his own *syntagma*, or creed? The Methodist Church is, thank God! free from the littleness, the narrowness, and the bigotry, of such a Romanizing and persecuting spirit.

It is the genius of Methodism, as we understand it and rejoice in it, that, come from what quarter it may, she freely embraces

the truth. Whether a truth come from Dabney, or Darby, or Calvin, she receives it into her bosom, as a precious gift from God, and goes on her way rejoicing. She has nothing in her glorious creed, in her Twenty-Five Articles, which repels any foreign truth. On the contrary, she has therein a multitude of truths, all waiting and eager to receive into holy alliance with themselves, every other truth under the canopy of heaven.

Every Methodist, however, we are sorry to say, is not completely saturated with this genius, or spirit, of Methodism. When we first advocated, in the pages of this Review, the truth of 'the perseverance of the elect', a swarm of small critics gnashed their teeth, and rushed on us with the cry of 'Calvinism!' But the genius of Methodism, once fairly appealed to by us, brushed away this swarm of critics, and received into her bosom the truth. It is now peaceably domiciled in our midst. The thanks we have received for this, by letter and otherwise, would astonish our critics, if laid before them. But we have spared them the mortification, which these strictures on the course pursued by them, would have caused them to feel.

Again, we have known one Methodist preacher — only *one* — who had imbibed a violent prejudice against the Brethren. But we found upon inquiry—poor soul!—he had never read one word of their writings! He had only read the article of Dr. Dabney. We endeavored to correct his prejudices; but we fear in vain. The Southern Presbyterian Church, it is believed, knows little or nothing about the Brethren, or their doctrines, except what it has derived from the article of Dr. Dabney. Hence it is, that we have taken that article in hand, for the benefit of all the lovers of truth, whether Presbyterians or Methodists, Episcopalians or Baptists.

Are we, then, one of the Brethren? No, by no means, we are very far from it. Nor are we at all inclined to become one. *We are Methodists.* We have enlisted, for the war, under the banner of *The Twenty-Five Articles*; and we mean to fight it out on the lines therein laid down. But it is, and, by the grace of God, it ever shall be, our motto: '*Fair play and justice to enemies, as well as loyalty and love to friends*'. They may slander—they may vilify—they may misrepresent us—but all this shall only make

us the more careful, the more solicitous, to do them exact justice. If the truth, together with fair-play, will not give us the victory over them, then, God forbid! that victory should ever perch upon our standard. Death is, in our opinion, far preferable to any the most signal victory, gained *by unfair means or foul*. We pray God to cover us with defeat, and bury us in the profoundest and darkest depths of everlasting oblivion, rather than allow the devil to inspire us with the desire to triumph by the dirty tricks, or the crooked arts, of controversy.

Though we have defended Mr. Darby, and his Brethren, against the unjust charges of heresy, we have not forgotten that they are our enemies. We have read, and we have profited, by their writings. But we have not, and we never will, strike our colors to them. Our chief objection to Mr. Darby is, that, both in doctrine and in spirit, he is too much like Dr. Dabney. In this, especially, is he like Dr. Dabney, that he stigmatizes Methodist doctrine as Pelagianism. We know this accusation to be false. We know what Methodism is, and we know what Pelagianism is; and there is not the least taint of that miserable heresy in our Articles of Religion, or theological writings. We are prepared to stand, or to fall, by those Articles. We may be easily crushed; but, although a universe of Dabneys and Darbys should assail us, we will not strike our colors to them; or concede that Methodism is Pelagianism. We may go down; but, if so, it shall be with all our colors flying, and flaunting defiance in the face of our false accusers. So help us God!

#### NOTE.

The letter referred to in the foregoing pages, as expected from Dr. Dabney, has just been received, after the above article was finished. It is in the following words:

‘Mar. 2d, 1877.

‘I have looked at the quotation to which you refer, in my art. on the Plymouth Theology, Jan. 1872. If my memory serves me right, it is from a little anonymous book (but circulated and endorsed by Mr. Inglis) entitled, “A Word to Young Believers,” by W. De R. B., of Dublin. You may ask, Why do I still use an “if”? My reasons are, that, being *in transitu* with my study

arrangements from one room to another, and plasterers in the house, many of my books are boxed; and I cannot make a search for De R. B.'s book. Besides I have a sort of recollection that it is lent out anyhow; to—I forget whom—; some of our alumni, I suppose, who were investigating this subject.

'A fair construction of that paragraph of mine, will show, that I quote this *extreme statement*, from this out-spoken Irishman, in order to show whither the *tendency* of the more guarded and scholarly ones leads. But the same views in substance can be found almost anywhere in the "Inglis Theology", as for instance, "Waymarks in the Wilderness", vol. iii. p. 258-9, Bonar's Way of Peace, &c., &c.'

Such is Dr. Dabney's reply. It has filled us with disappointment and sorrow. We did hope and believe, as we have expressed in the above article, that he would, 'in some way unknown to us', clear his skirts of imputing so horrible an extract to Mr. McIntosh; though it was at war with his well-known sentiments. Having quoted this extract, as from Mr. M.'s 'Notes on Genesis', p. 200, Dr. Dabney asks:—'What more does any Antinomian negro desire, to encourage him in his foulest hypocrisy and most fanatical joys?' We endorsed this criticism as just; and if the passage was from Mr. McIntosh, we were prepared to give all his writings to the dogs. But we concluded to look, before we decided. Not finding the passage in the place referred to by Dr. Dabney, nor in any other portion of Mr. McIntosh's writings, we applied to Dr. D. himself for information. And we now learn, from his own confession, that he did not take the passage from the writings of Mr. McIntosh at all, but from an anonymous writer of a little book published in Dublin! If he had told the readers of his article this, the extract would have had no bearing whatever on the views of Mr. M., nor of any other Plymouth Brother. But quoting it, as he did, from Mr. McIntosh, his heaviest bolt of thunder fell on his devoted head! Now, strange to say, he endeavors to excuse this outrage, by saying, Well, if it is not in the writings of Mr. McIntosh, it is 'from a little anonymous book (but circulated and endorsed by Mr. Inglis) entitled, A Word to Young Believers, by [C. H. M.? no, but by] W. De R. B.'

Again, if the words quoted as from Mr. McIntosh's writings, are not to be found in them, the same views in substance can be found almost anywhere in the 'Inglis Theology', and in 'Bonar's Way of Peace, &c., &c'. That is, if the obnoxious passage may not be found in Mr. McIntosh, the Plymouth Brother, whom it was intended to crush, the same views in substance may be found almost anywhere in the writings of Mr. Inglis, the Baptist, or in the 'Way of Peace' by the Rev. H. Bonar, who is a Scotch Presbyterian. In other words, a most abominable passage is quoted, as from the noted Plymouth Brother, Mr. McIntosh, which is all that 'any Antinomian negro could desire to encourage him in his foulest hypocrisy and most fanatical joys'; and yet, as the accuser himself is constrained to confess, it is not from Mr. McIntosh at all! It is only from some anonymous writer!! But, then, the same passage, in substance, may be found in the writings of a Baptist, or in those of a Scotch Presbyterian!!! But does all this justify Dr. Dabney, in the act of selecting, from some unknown writer, a passage which teaches Antinomianism in its grossest and most disgusting form, and setting it forth as a quotation from the writings of the well-known and distinguished C. H. McIntosh? Who does not blush for Dr. Dabney, and hang his head for shame? For our part, we would not be caught in the perpetration of such an act, for ten thousand times ten thousand worlds.

'A fair construction of that paragraph', says Dr. Dabney, 'will show, that I quote this *extreme sentiment*, from that outspoken Irishman', &c. Now, he has not one word about 'that outspoken Irishman', or writer of the anonymous 'little book'. Not one word about any one but Mr. C. H. McIntosh; and, for five long years, every reader of the article by Dr. Dabney, has imputed the horrible sentiment of the anonymous writer to Mr. McIntosh. No confiding reader of his article, ever doubted, for a moment, that Dr. Dabney had convicted Mr. McIntosh of the horrible heresy of Antinomianism, and exposed him, impaled, to the contemptuous gaze of the Christian world. But now, after Dr. Dabney has been cornered, and compelled to confess the truth, he begins to speak about 'a fair construction', &c. Alas! for the pride and glory of the Union Theological Seminary!