

# DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH IN NEWMAN-STREET CONSIDERED.

---

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

IN considering the Doctrines which have been promulgated through Newman-Street, it is important to remember that Mr. Irving's teaching, respecting the human nature of our Lord, had the distinct sanction of that which they believe to be the Spirit of God. Mr. Irving himself declares, in a letter to Mr. Baxter, that three several testimonies, "in power," were given by Mrs. C. and Miss E. C. to the general correctness of Mr. Irving's statements respecting the human nature of our Lord: and in consequence of Mr. Baxter's opposition to those statements, Mr. Irving was called upon "to maintain them more firmly than ever." (Baxter's Narrative, p. 104, 105.) Moreover, in the very same letter which contains this important fact, Mr. Irving says, concerning the flesh of Christ, that it had "a proclivity to the world and to Satan," and that "the law of the flesh was there all present." (Baxter, p. 107.)

In order to form a scriptural judgment on these things, it is needful to consider attentively the state in which we, as the descendants of Adam, are placed before God. There are three particulars which mark our condition as sinners before Him:—First, Original or vicarious guilt, imputed (or reckoned) to us on account of the transgression of our first parent, of which the 5th chapter of the Romans treats. Secondly, Original sin or indwelling corruption. And thirdly, Actual transgression.

The distinction between imputed transgression and indwelling corruption is often neglected. It may thus be illustrated:—The children of an exile in Siberia, though innocent of rebellion themselves, *might*

yet be involved in all the penalties of their parent and be punished for and on account of *him*. Even so the one transgression of Adam in the garden exposes all his posterity to be treated by God as transgressors on account of him. The penalty of death would still have impended over them even though they could have been born pure as angels in themselves.

But secondly, it soon became apparent that all the *natural* descendants of Adam were not only subject to the penalties which another's transgression had incurred, but that they had also derived from him a corrupted nature, even a law of sin in their members, which the 7th of Romans describes. With a view to manifest this evil, a law was proposed which was "holy, just, and good;" and it was promised that all who kept it should enter into life thereby. But this, instead of saving, worketh death in every one *naturally* born of Adam, so that the commandment ordained to life, is found to be unto death: for instead of delivering from the original penalty, or proving a corrective for indwelling corruption, it rouses into activity the sin that was dormant before, and therefore is ineffectual in leading unto life, (not from any defect in itself) but through the sinful weakness of those to whom it is addressed. Thirdly, we have multiplied personal transgressions—the foolish thought, and word, and action; and he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all.

Now it is written of the Lord Jesus Christ, that after the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made *under the law*. He was miraculously conceived; and "THEREFORE," though deriving His manhood from a sinful Mother, was born spotless and holy, even as it is written, "that *holy thing* which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God." Nothing can be more express than this declaration; and God could not call that *holy*, which standing by itself and unbefitted by mediation, had in itself "a proclivity to the world and to Satan, and the law of the flesh all there present."

There is no difficulty in discerning this.—Only let it be seen from the Scripture what sin is, and then exclude it from the person of Immanuel, and we have the sure basis of truth whereon to rest, believing where we cannot understand.

The Lord Jesus was as free from indwelling sin as from actual transgression: yet nevertheless He was a member (so to speak) of the exiled family, and was therefore born subject to their penalties. But He was made *under the law*; and being essentially *holy*, He was able to fulfil the law, and so to rise above the penalties to which He had become subject on account of Adam's guilt. He was able to enter into life by keeping the commandments, and the very same law, which hath been death to every other, was unto Him life, even as

it is written, "If there could have been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." On account of our sinful flesh to us the law was "weak" but strong unto Him, because He had no sinful flesh, but was essentially the Holy One. He learned obedience in the midst of suffering, and was proved to be the righteous One, who might have entered into life by Himself alone, but who preferred to lay down His life that He might take it again, that so through the knowledge of Him many might be justified.

All that the soul of a saint recognises as true in the writings of Mr. Irving, respecting Christ being in "that condition of being and region of existence which is proper to a sinner," will be found to be altogether comprised in the fact of His being born under the curse of the exiled family, vicariously incurred. But He rose out of this "region" through the power of His own inherent holiness, and therefore never would have come "into that experience into God's action which is proper for a sinner," unless He had chosen to abide it for the sake of others. And when He had chosen this, then it pleased the Lord to bruise Him and to lay upon Him iniquity : a burthen which He felt just as if it had been His own iniquity, without having any sin He was made to feel the consequences of sin, even so as to say, "Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of my head, therefore my heart faileth me." But this was not because He was, "in our region of existence," but because He was pleased, whilst being there, to become the sin-bearer for others.

Perhaps no text is more important in connexion with this subject than the 3rd verse of Rom. viii. "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." A Believer need not be told what "sin in the flesh" or indwelling corruption means. It is another name for his natural self, and God could do no otherwise than deal with it in judgment, but He judged it in His dear Son, as bearing it *representatively* for us. The word "Condemned" feebly conveys the meaning. God passed the sentence of death upon it; or (as it were) transfixed it with the nail of death when Christ was crucified, even as it is written, "Our old man was crucified with Him;" so that a Believer can rejoice over it as a crucified enemy, which, however it may struggle, shall not prevail. In this passage then, it is God who is said to inflict the punishment—Christ as the Mediator to receive it on account of our "sin in the flesh"—and we, as Believers, to know this enemy crucified with Him—i. e. virtually destroyed.

Mr. Irving frequently quotes this text, but unobserved he applies it as though it were Christ condemning sin in his own flesh instead of God

condemning it in the person of Christ, whereby Christ is exalted into the throne of judgment, and His humiliation as the sin-bearer set aside. And this is a just example of the manner in which mediation and atonement are overthrown by this evil system.\*

I will only add, that not only have none of the published statements been recalled, but the doctrines are still taught by the missionaries from Newman-Street, as any one who has an opportunity of probing them with pertinent questions will readily testify.—In a Tract written by their present missionary † in Dublin, the doctrine of imputed righteousness is called “a fiction,” and it is said that “Christ assumed our very fallen nature to expel sin therefrom.”

---

## DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH IN NEWMAN-STREET.

It must be manifest to all who know even a little of what is now passing in the Church of God, that the present is a time of perplexity and sorrow to very many; and that some have been shaken to the foundations of their faith. Indeed we might be discouraged very greatly, if we did not know that the Church, like the Bush which burned without being consumed, shall surely be preserved through every trial, because of the grace which was given it in Christ Jesus before the world was. In our time of weakness we have need more especially to remember the grace—to comfort the feeble-minded, and earnestly to resist the least departure from the doctrines of Christ.

The Church of God, as being preserved in Christ, have certain blessings, which time cannot alter, nor circumstances change. “They are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” It is true even of the little children, that “they know the Father.” “Sonship” has been, since the resurrection of our Lord, the characteristic distinction of the Household of Faith. The holy men of old who lived before the incarnation of the Lord, though sons as to God’s purpose, yet, as to their *felt* and *manifested* relationship to Him, differed nothing from servants. (Gal. iv.) But when the Son of God was sent forth and redemption had been effected by His death, the time of manifested adoption was come. The character of the Lord’s teaching to His disciples, which prospectively reached forward to the time when they

\* Irving’s Human Nature of Christ. Page 14.

† Hardman. p. 68, & 83.

should be able to understand and realize His instructions, clearly shows that they were henceforth to consider themselves as the family of a Father which was in heaven; and as soon as the perfectness of their redemption was proved by His resurrection from the dead, His first words refer to the blessed relationship which was now substantiated for ever:—"Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and *your* Father, and to my God and *your* God :" for God had sent forth His Son to redeem them, that they might *receive* the adoption of sons.

But the disciples, even after He had thus declared the consequence of His resurrection, were not yet able to realize the truth of this relationship; and they were commanded by the Lord to wait at Jerusalem for the promise of the Father, which, said He, ye have heard of me. What this promise was we learn from the 14th of John.—"And I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever." "The time cometh when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of the Father." They were to receive the Spirit of adoption. They had received the adoption of sons by the death and resurrection of Him IN WHOM they were adopted; and *because* they were sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, crying Abba, Father.—Here was the fulfilment of the promise. The 8th of Romans and the 4th of Galatians describe the eternal immutable heritage of all Believers in all possible circumstances, and they mark the possession of the Spirit of adoption as being a *distinctive characteristic* of this dispensation of Sonship; so that every one who has the Spirit of adoption, has received the promise of the Father—has the Comforter *dwelling in him*—is baptized with the Holy Spirit, even though there should be no other sign of His indwelling presence. It was on the day of Pentecost that the Apostles received that Spirit "who was to abide with them for ever," even the Spirit of adoption, who enabled them for the first time to say (what none before could say) "Abba, Father:" and whosoever has since been enabled to utter the same cry, has received a Pentecostal gift. The same may be said also of such passages as the following:—"He which establisheth us with you in Christ and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." (2 Cor. i. 21.) And again, "In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of our inheritance." (Eph. i. 14.)

We live the life of faith in proportion as we practically realize, according to the mind of God, the circumstances in which we are before Him; for faith seeth things as He seeth them. It is therefore of unspeakable importance to know "the things which have been

freely given to us" of Him, especially at the present time, when this endowment of the Church has been doubted and denied ; for it has been frequently said of late, (and perhaps more frequently imagined,) that the Church has ceased to possess the promise of the Father. Yet we could not feel that God was our Father nor know our union with the Lord without the Spirit. The experimental knowledge of these relationships, with all their practical consequences, depends entirely on the personal presence of the Spirit, of whom it was said that He should "abide for ever ;" so that if the Holy Spirit had been withdrawn as soon as what are usually called His *miraculous* manifestations ceased, the Church of God must for ages past have sunk back into bondage under the elements of the world, and known nothing of their adoption nor of the blessedness of their union with Christ. But the experience of true Believers, in every age since the day of Pentecost, sufficiently disproves this. They have rejoiced in their adoption as children, and have known that the Spirit helpeth their infirmities.

One of the chief blessings which flow from His presence is the gift of a spiritual understanding. It is very frequently mentioned in Scripture :—" I cease not to pray that ye might be filled with all spiritual understanding." (Col. i.) " The Lord give thee understanding in all things." (2 Tim. ii.) " The Son of God hath given us an understanding." (1 John, v.) " The eyes of your understanding being enlightened." (Eph. i.) " In understanding be ye men." (1 Cor. xx.) " Be ye not unwise but understanding what the will of the Lord is." (Ephes. v.) It is the precious gift of God to His children, in order that they may be enabled to " judge" and " prove" \* all things aright. Otherwise their judgment must be in the flesh ; but it is written, " the Son of God hath given us an understanding." And the measure of it will doubtless be suited to the requirements of the time, in the case of every one who really looks to Him, so that he may confidently prove all things and not walk in uncertainty ; for God hath not given the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind.

And if we do indeed believe that " many false spirits have gone out into the world," we may well understand the necessity of this gift. If God had not given a *spiritual* understanding whereby to judge, we must have received every thing untried, (for the natural mind could profit nothing) and so we must *necessarily* have been deceived whenever Satan transformed himself into an angel of light. And if we do not estimate our privileges, and refuse to obey the commandment to be men in understanding ;—if we mistrust our power

\* " Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." " The spiritual man judgeth all things."

when the Lord has spoken, what is this but unbelief?—It is not humility, but it is doubting the truth and faithfulness of God.

A Believer's knowledge may be limited; but every Believer possesses some *certain* knowledge. There may be mysteries which he cannot comprehend; but though unable to explain, he *understands* that God has revealed them, and therefore knows them to be true, and believes. He possesses *certain* knowledge, and this knowledge is as a test whereby he may prove other things. And therefore it is written, “though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.” “If any bring not this doctrine receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed.” The character of the claims which have lately been advanced in Newman-Street, has driven back many Believers from considering and judging them as they ought. Yet the very greatness of the claim makes it the more necessary that it should be judged; and though our right to judge has been denied, and although they have commanded us not to judge but to believe, yet in this we have to obey God rather than man.

The claim is this:—that an ordered Church has again been formed by the Lord, having not only Elders, Pastors, and Evangelists immediately appointed by the Spirit, but having Apostles also. Now if this were so, we surely might expect the signs of an Apostle: but supposing them to be withheld in judgment upon unbelief (though evidence has never been refused by the Lord, except when superfluous and unneeded) yet the moral signs could not be wanting, and they are these:—in doctrine, sound speech that could not be condemned; in practice, separation from the systems of this present evil age.

Infallible truth in doctrinal statement is the least we could expect from a Church under direct Apostolic government; even as the Church at Jerusalem was able to say—“It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us.” If the Lord were pleased to reconstitute an Apostolical Church, it would doubtless be found to be a sure witness of His mind in things in which His children might need instruction. It would give no uncertain, no erring testimony.—It would speak the things which become sound doctrine.

The doctrines of the Church in Newman-Street have been widely promulgated through the “Morning Watch” and the writings of Mr. Irving. We may therefore refer to these publications as affording a satisfactory criterion of judgment.

In a paper written by Mr. Irving in 1832,\* it is said that the truth according to his views has not been advanced for the last 1500 years. His doctrines therefore profess to be new. If they referred merely to some point of prophetic inquiry or scriptural information, such a

\* See Fraser's Magazine for March and April, 1832.

statement might possibly be true. At any rate it need not create alarm. But his statements do not refer to any point of secondary importance; they concern the vital and fundamental doctrines of the Gospel of Christ.

Perhaps there is nothing on which real Christians have in all ages been more entirely agreed, than in their sentiments respecting sin; that it consists not in the outward act, nor in the deliberate purpose of the soul only, but in the secret unseen propensity or bias of the human mind. It is a thing which the children of God daily know and feel to be *in itself* sin, though not imputed to those who believe *for Christ's sake*. It is their burden and their sorrow, for it lusteth against the Spirit, so that they cannot do the things that they would. "The concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good Spirit lusteth, is not only the punishment of sin and the cause of sin, but it is also sin." (Augustine.) "This infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in Greek φρονημα σαρκος (which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh,) is not subject to the law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." (English Articles.)

So also the French Protestant confession.—"We believe that this *taint* is *truly sin*, because it makes all and every man, not even those little ones excepted that lie hid in their mother's womb, guilty in the sight of God. We affirm also that this taint even after baptism is truly sin as far as refers to the fault of it." The confession than goes on to state that though sin, it is not imputed to them that believe.

So also the Lutheran confession.—"These defects and this concupiscence are a thing that is under condemnation, and in its own nature deserving of death. And this original taint is truly sin, bringing men under condemnation."

And lastly the confession of Saxony.—"This whole corruption we affirm to be sin, and not simply the punishment of sin, and a thing indifferent." *Ambiguities are to be avoided in the Church.* Therefore we expressly call these evils corruption, which is often called by antient writers "Evil concupiscence." This evil concupiscence we affirm to be sin; and we assert that this whole doctrine concerning sin, as it is set forth and determined in our Churches, is a doctrine which has had the perpetual consent of the true Church of God.

Here are the testimonies of many saints. But the testimony of the Scripture is conclusive: for it teaches us that this corruption both when resisted, and what is more, when so dormant as to be unknown even to ourselves, is sin in the sight of God. "I had not *known* sin but by

the law, for I had not *known* lust except the law had said thou shalt not covet." The law did not create the sin, it did not create the evil tendency, but it manifested its existence, and made the Apostle know that sin was in him. And therefore the very object of the chapter is to show that since restraint and resistance could effect no change in our bodies of sin, restraint and resistance could therefore open no way of deliverance or hope. It is this fact which is made by God the foundation of His scheme of mercy. The necessity of God's creating "A new thing in the earth," (for these are the words in which Scripture describes the miraculous generation of the Lord,) that so we might be made new creatures *in Him*, is grounded on this truth of the evil tendency's being in itself sin. But this is that which is denied in the following words:—"I deny that it is unholiness to be tempted through the mind, provided the will yield not to the evil suggestion, provided the will consent not to the evil consciousness." (Irving's Orthodox Doctrine, p. 153.)

If it had been said that the guilt of unholiness was not charged upon those who resisted the evil propensity, because Christ had borne the guilt instead of them, every Christian heart would joyfully have responded to the blessed truth. It is indeed true, to use the words of Mr. Carlile in the "Morning Watch," that "No sin is in the Scriptures imputed to the saints for having a law in their members warring against the law of their mind, so long as by the power of God's Spirit dwelling in them, they resist its influence." This is true, and more likewise. But why is it *not* imputed *to them*? only because it *was imputed* to Christ. But if Christ had had these sinful propensities, where was the Lamb provided for Him? He would have had no sin-bearer. And yet Mr. Carlile goes on to say that these evil passions did exist in our Lord's human nature. (p. 136. "Morning Watch," No. ix.)

The following are the words of Mr. Irving ("Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature.") respecting the human nature of our Lord *after* it was taken into personal union with Himself.\*

"Conceive every variety of human passion, every variety of human affection, every variety of human error, every variety of human wickedness which hath ever been realized inherent in the humanity, and combined against the holiness of Him who was not only a man but the Son of Man, the heir of all the infirmities which man entailleth upon his children." (p. 17.) "Was He conscious then to the motions of the flesh and of the fleshly mind? In so far as any regenerate man is conscious of them, when under the operation of the Holy Ghost."....."I hold it to be the surrender of the whole question to say that

\* I am hardly justified in using words which seem to give to Christ's human nature an abstract existence apart from Himself. He derived His human nature from his mother, but then it was her nature not His. There was no human nature which could be called His, until He was made flesh and dwelt among men as Immanuel.

he was not conscious of, engaged with, and troubled by every evil disposition which inhereth in the fallen manhood, which overpowreth every man that is not born of God; which overpowreth not Christ, only because He was born or generated of God." (p. 111.)

"Manhood after the fall broke out into sins of every name and aggravation, corrupt to the very heart's core, and from the centre of its inmost will sending forth streams black as hell. This is the human nature which every man is clothed upon withal, which the Son of Man was clothed upon withal, bristling thick and strong with sin, like the hairs upon the porcupine." . . . . "I stand forth and say, that the teeming fountain of the heart's vileness was opened on Him; and the Augean stable of human wickedness was given him to cleanse; and the furious wild-beasts of human passions were appointed Him to tame. This is the horrible pit and the miry clay out of which He was brought." (p. 126.) "I believe it to be most orthodox, and of the substance and essence of the orthodox faith to hold that Christ could say until His resurrection, 'not I, but sin that tempteth me in my flesh,' just as after the resurrection He could say, 'I am separate from sinners.' And moreover, I believe that the only difference between His body of humiliation and His body of resurrection, is in this very thing—that sin inhered in the human nature, making it mortal and corruptible till that very time that He rose from the dead." (p. 127.)

If Christ had been "troubled by every evil disposition which inhereth in the fallen manhood," and if He could have said, like the Believer, "not I, but sin that tempteth me in my flesh," how was not Christ personally a sinner? There are only two ways in which this question can be answered by those who maintain these doctrines.—They must either deny that the evil propensity is *in itself* sin; or, else consider the human nature of the Lord as something distinct from Himself *personally*. The last is very plainly the doctrine maintained in the "Treatise on the Human Nature." I suppose a hundred quotations might be made therefrom, in which the name Christ is given not to Jesus, as being God and Man in one person, but to the Word acting in and surrounded by the flesh as by a garment. The whole purport of the book appears to be this, to represent the Incarnation as the imprisonment (so to speak) of the Eternal Word in sinful flesh, against which He had continually to struggle just as the Holy Spirit in us is *separate* from, and struggles against our evil nature. The flesh of our Lord, to use Mr. Irving's illustration, stood to Him in the same relation as a pit to the person who is in it, or as a garment to the person whom it covers, and thus the true doctrine of the incarnation is denied.

For the true doctrine of the incarnation is this—that God and Man were ONE Person in Christ; that all His actions were not those of God *simply*, nor of Man *simply*, but of God and Man united in One Person, never to be divided. "Two whole and perfect natures, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in One Person, never to be divided, whereof is *one* Christ, very God and very Man." Let us not then be deluded by the repeated assertion, that He was "sin-

less in sinful flesh;" for the explanation of this either alters the definition of sin, or otherwise explains away the reality of the union of two natures in *one Person*. If there had been sin in either nature, it must have been sin in Immanuel.

But the distinctive characteristic of the Lord Jesus, in being the "Word made flesh," was little recognized by Mr. Irving. If any thing is plain from the Scripture, it is this.—that the Lord Jesus, from the moment of His birth, and long before, "He was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power," was, in virtue of His miraculous generation, the Holy One.—"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; THEREFORE also, that *Holy Thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." It was not until thirty years after this that He was baptized with the Spirit.\* But Mr. Irving denies that Christ's holiness was derived from an "extraordinary" work of the Holy Ghost different from that experienced by Believers, and traces His holiness to an "*anointing of the same kind*" (p. 140.) which Believers receive: otherwise, he continues, "the fruits of holiness in us cannot be after the same completeness." Here then there are two dangerous perversions of the truth: for first, the holiness of the Lord Jesus is made to depend, not upon His miraculous generation, but in His being "anointed"—i. e. baptized with the Holy Ghost and with power; and secondly, it is implied that the fruits of holiness in us can be equally complete with those of the Lord Jesus; whereas we know that His were perfect *in themselves*, and that ours are only acceptable *through Him*. "Ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God *through Jesus Christ*." Such is the testimony of Scripture; but the whole tendency of the paragraph from which I am quoting, as indeed of the whole work, is to bring down the Lord Jesus from the essential peculiarity of His position as Mediator, and to assign to Him the characteristics of those who are "adopted in Him." The two following passages supply sufficient evidence of this:—"It is an heretical doctrine that Christ's generation was any thing more than the implantation of that Holy Ghost life in the members of His human nature, which is implanted in us by regeneration." (p. 140.) And again, "He was conscious to the motions of the flesh and of the fleshly mind, in so far as any regenerate man, when under

\* The Holy Spirit when He descended and abode upon the Lord Jesus, became His guide in service, as it is written, "He was led by the Spirit into the wilderness" "Through the Spirit He gave commandment unto His Apostles." The truth of His being Emmanuel, God manifest in the flesh, was proved by His ability to follow perfectly and without any failure, the leadings of the Holy Spirit. What a Believer is able to do imperfectly (Gal. v. 17.) by regeneration, He was able to do perfectly without regeneration in the natural state, in which He was born into the world; naturally we live contrary to the Spirit; whereas His natural condition as Man was not contrary to the Spirit.

the operation of the Holy Ghost, is conscious of them." (p. 111.) May we look at these things with a holy humble jealousy for the preservation of the comforting and sanctifying truths of God; for there can be no false doctrine respecting the person of our Lord, which does not affect the very foundations of our salvation.

If Christ could say until His resurrection, "Not I, but sin that tempteth me in my flesh;" then not only would He have been unable to say, "I give *my flesh* for the life of the world," (for it would have been a *blemished* sacrifice) but He Himself would have become individually deserving of death; so that, to use the words of Mr. Irving, He "*must* have died." (p. 91.) Now the Lord's own words seem purposely intended to set aside such a doctrine.—"Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again. *No one* (*οὐδείς*) taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself, I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again.—This commandment have I received of my Father." "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and He would presently give me more than twelve legions of angels; but how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?"

Nothing can be more important than rightly to distinguish between Christ, in His own independent individual character, and as He is in His official relation to us. If we can conceive of Him, apart from the responsibilities which attached to Him as Head of the Church, we can understand how, as the Holy One, He was ever ready to enter into the Holy Place without paying any price for the remission of sin. But He did not enter thus: He entered as the High Priest, who had also become the Head and Representative of His body the Church; and in this character it was that He could not enter without blood, (Heb. ix. 12.) It was needful that He should die. —"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth *alone*." The unclean state into which a clean person was brought by touching, even unawares, the body of an unclean man or beast, very clearly indicates what the contracted defilement of our High Priest must have been. Without having any of the sin, He had every consequence of the sin, in trouble of mind as well as suffering of body. He felt as though the sins were His own, "so that He was not able to look up:" and it is in this respect only that the type of the goats in Leviticus xvi, falls short in illustrating the manner in which sin was imputed to the Holy Lamb of God.

But in the treatise above referred to, it is stated that these sufferings were not inflicted upon Him "because He was *considered* that which really He was not" viz. a sinner; in other words, that He was not punished exclusively for *our* sins, but because of that condition of being into which He had come. Now it is fully allowed, as has

been stated in the preface, that He was born into our "condition of being" in the sense of being born out of Paradise.\* And also that He exposed *Himself to the danger* of receiving all the punishment which followed upon the imputation of Adam's offence: but though exposed to it, yet He rose above it all, because He was by birth the Holy One, made under the law; who did not, as we, find it weak through the flesh, but effectually "ordained unto life," because His flesh was holy.—"This do and thou shalt live" was unto Him a word of delivering power. So far therefore from His having been punished on account of the condition of being into which He had come, He would not have been punished at all, unless He had freely chosen whilst standing as the "justified One," to offer atonement to the Father and to become the substitute and sin-bearer of all who believe in His name. But this is the blessed truth which Mr Irving thus denies.—"The man who will put a fiction, whether legal or theological—a make-believe into his idea of God, I have done with: he who will make God consider a person that which he is not, and act towards him as that which he is not, I have done with. Either Christ was in the condition of the sinner, was in that form of being towards which it is God's eternal law to act as He acted towards Christ, or He was not. If He was, then the point at issue is ceded, for that is what I am contending for. If He was not, and God treated Him as if He had been so;—if that is the meaning of their imputation and substitution, or by whatever name they call it, away with it from my theology for ever." (p. 116.)

Here again there is not the slightest appearance of the distinction being recognized between Christ, as He was *personally* and as He was *relatively* in connection with His Church.—By becoming responsible for His bride, He did bring Himself into a condition, in which it was according to God's eternal law, to act towards Him, as being what personally He was not—i. e. a sinner. "He died the Just for the unjust."—"God made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." If God's law allows not the substitution of the innocent for the guilty, it is quite plain that the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice is at an end, and so every foundation of a sinner's hope is swept away for ever.

It is vain to answer and say to an anxious soul earnest to find in the Scripture the warrant of its salvation, "That the sufferings of Christ procure me salvation by giving me an object of faith in God's love, in

\* Hunger, thirst, pain, &c. may fall on us, as men, in three ways. I.—As the mere consequence of being out of Paradise, and not having our natural wants properly supplied. This was experienced by the Lord Jesus. II.—The pain, &c. which is the naturally appointed result of transgression or the working of indwelling corruption. This was never experienced by the Lord. III.—Pain, &c. as a judicial infliction from God. This was experienced by the Lord, when He was bruised as the sin-bearer.

all extremities and under all conditions: and by giving me a proof that a person into my conditions brought, and in my conditions subsisting, may through faith, be brought out victorious in every conflict." (p. 106.) This may be true, but where is there hope in this? It is a just and reasonable thing for God to say of His Holy One, "Because He hath set His love upon me, *therefore* will I deliver Him, I will set Him on high, because He hath known my name;" but there is no such reason for His delivering a sinful wretch whose will is worse than his actions, and whose desires are worse than his will. The taint of corrupt earthly affections is the hindrance. Where is the atonement for them?

The Scripture answers that Christ paid, as an atoning price, His own blood, whereby all who believe are justified from all things, and have peace with God: for the work of the Lord Jesus has a two-fold aspect: first,—towards God, as necessarily *requiring expiation*, and secondly,—towards the worshipper, as *receiving reconciliation* thereby. But Mr. Irving answers in the very words, and with the very argument of Socinianism, grounded on the unchangeableness of God; for he says, "that atonement and redemption have no reference to God; they are the names for the bearing of Christ's work upon the sinner, and have no respect to its bearing upon the Godhead."

Now it is wonderful that any one who does not utterly reject the Old Testament Scriptures should think such a thought as this. When the Lord God smelleth the sweet savour of Noah's offering and says, that He will curse no more, what are we taught as to the *atoning* power of sacrifice? What are we taught by the High Priest entering within the veil and sprinkling, *not the people*, but the mercy-seat that *he might not die*? Surely in this act the blood had reference to God only. "Go quickly, said Moses, make atonement; for wrath is gone out." Indeed out of the many places in which the word "atonement" is used in the Old Testament, there is, I believe, not one instance in which it is not used in reference to God. The holiness of our God required *expiation*, it needed an atoning sacrifice. He is unchangeably holy, though it is quite true also that He is unchangeably love; and therefore His love freely provided\* what man was unable to procure, even a Lamb without blemish and without spot. He found the ransom. The atoning work of the Mediator was the result, and not the cause of His love. But the Scripture, while it testifies of the love of God in providing the sacrifice, testifies as plainly of its necessity in relation to His holiness;—"To declare I say at this time His righteousness, that He might be just and the

\* "And Isaac said unto his Father, behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering? And Abraham said, my Son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt-offering."

justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." The righteousness of the Father in having remitted past sins, as those of Abraham and the fathers, was vindicated by the atoning offering of the Son. It justified the exercise of love by Him who had said that He would by no means clear the guilty.

One part then of the work of the Lord Jesus is entirely set aside in this treatise; but if we inquire as to the result in reconciling those who believe, the answer is, "That it is no reconciliation of individuals, "but a reconciliation of human nature. It is not thine, it is not mine, "it is not Christ's, but it is the common unity of our being. Bare He "the sins of human nature? He bare the sins of all men. Bare He the "infirmities of human nature? He bare the infirmities of all men." (p. 95.) So, that if a sinner inquire respecting reconciliation with God, he must be told, not of the *blood* whereby ALL WHO BELIEVE are justified from all things, but of the reconciliation of human nature carried, by means of the incarnation of the Son, through suffering and through death, and so at length reconciled unto God.\*

The love of God towards the world, as declared in John iii. 16, is indeed a most precious truth: but the Scripture nowhere speaks of human nature being reconciled to God, nor of all mankind being reconciled in the sense of having their sins borne by Christ. It can be said of the Church only, that He bore their sins in His own body on the accursed tree. The scape-goat typifies His relation, not to the world, but to the Church, even to those who believe in His name; so that not only is the work of the Lord Jesus towards the Father set aside by Mr. Irving, but the result in blessing to the Church is done away, by its being represented as nothing more than the reconciliation of human nature; nor can I see that the value of the blood and the perfecting of the Church by the one sacrifice, is recognized even in name.

Indeed the distinctive *value* of Christ's blood is unequivocally denied. The Scriptures speak of it as the *precious* blood of Christ—the blood of the Son of God. But the following are the words of Mr. Irving, "The atonement upon this popular scheme is made to consist in suffering, and the amount of the suffering is cried up to infinity. "Well, let these preachers, for I will not call them divines or theologians, broker-like, cry up their article, it will not do; it is but the sufferings of a perfectly holy man, treated by God and by men as if "He were a transgressor." (Doctrine of Human Nature, 95, 96.)

\* It is obvious that Mr. Irving assumes that all mankind were united to the Lord Jesus because He had a common nature with them. But the possession of a common nature is not *union*. Two vines planted side by side have a *common nature*, for they are both vines, but there is no *union*, unless I could so insert the fibres of one into the other as for nourishment to be communicated between them. The Lord Jesus then has a common nature with all men; but is united, and that through the Spirit, with those only who believe, even His body, the Church.

I would make no remark on the language, but would only observe that there is clearly no recognition of the *value* of the blood as being the blood of Immanuel. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." And again, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which *we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled* of the Word of life: for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us," &c. This is the testimony of the Apostle John as to the nature of the Person who suffered and shed His blood. He saw in those sufferings something more than the sufferings merely of a perfectly holy man. But when the mind of any one has once been drawn to disbelieve or misconceive of the great mystery of the Incarnation, and to regard the Divine and Human nature as separate, in the same way in which the Holy Spirit is separate from the bodies of those in whom He dwells, we can easily see how such a mind would almost necessarily fall into such conclusions as these.\*

\* "It is an heretical doctrine that Christ's generation was something more than the implantation of that Holy Ghost life in the members of His human nature, which is implanted in us by regeneration." (Irving's Cath. Confession, p. 140.)

It has been observed by Mr. Goode, in a recent publication, that the real character of these doctrines is detected with the mere difficulty, on account of the use of ordinary terms in new senses. "Atonement," which is the work of Jesus as Son of Man towards the Father, whereby a power of salvation indefinitely extensible was left in the hands of the Father for Him to apply according to His own good-pleasure, is used as if necessarily equivalent to "reconciliation," which is only true of those who have been brought nigh by the foolishness of preaching, and made children of God by faith in Jesus; and "Redemption" in its relation to the saints who believe, is described by Mr. Irving as being, not the purchase of the whole man, in body, soul, and spirit unto God, and therefore unto holiness, and everlasting deliverance; but it is made to consist in the deliverance of the human will out of bondage, and the way it is said to be effected is this;—"he person of the Word did take a human will under these very bondages into union with Himself, and acting therein, did deliver it completely out of all these oppressions of the devil, the world, and the flesh; which, if it were true, would have caused the Lord Jesus to need redemption as we do, because this human will was included in, and not separate from His Person. *Substitution* is His human nature being considered as the substitute or representative of the whole human race, so that His human nature being brought in all things into a state of obedience to His divine nature, the whole human race were made *at one* with God." (pp. 113—117.) The *sacrifice* of Christ is the mortification of the evil propensities of His human nature, terminating in the death of that human nature. (18 14, &c. Orthodox Doctrine.) In connexion with Mr. I's. views of "Substitution," it is

These are the doctrines contained in the writings which (as never having been disowned) are identified with Newman-Street in the estimation of the Church at large. These are some of the things which, on the ground of the Holy Spirit's having departed from the Church, we are commanded not to judge. But we do judge them as utterly contrary to the word of God, our sure and blessed rule. The least that can be said of them is, that they virtually deny the reality of the Incarnation, whereby God and man were made One Person—that they set aside the work of the Son towards the Father—that they mis-state its aspect towards the world, and deny its efficient application to the Church,—that they identify the state of the Lord Jesus with that of a Believer, and the privileges of the Church, with those of the world.

One of the steps to these things has been a rash attempt to *explain*, where we ought to *believe*, because we know that God hath said it. It is written "Great is the mystery of Godliness, God was manifest in the flesh :" and again, "No one knoweth the Son but the Father." Let us ever remember this, if we are *obliged* in defence of the truth to write or speak of these things.

And why should we attempt to explain (when Scripture has not explained it) the manner of the union of God and man in one person, in whom two distinct natures were so marvellously combined as to render ONE Being only, even Immanuel, responsible for the actings of both alike. If we fancy that we have succeeded in explaining it satisfactorily to our foolish minds, it only proves that we have lost the truth. It is sufficient for us to receive by faith the stream of blessing which flows from knowing that unto us a Son is born, even a babe in a manger, whose name is called the everlasting Father. And it is our blessing also to learn practically, in comfort to our souls, that He was in all points tempted like as we are, *yet without sin*. This is written for us to *believe*, whether or not we are able to explain ; and the poor in spirit will receive the comfort of it, and at the same time believe what the Scriptures testify, that nothing which the Scriptures mark as

needful to remind the reader of what has been already said that, the possession of a common nature is not the same as *union*, and consequently that there is no union between *mankind* and the Lord Jesus in the flesh.

However much individuals in this party may differ from one another in their modes of expression, the same leading tenet is held by all of them. Mr. Campbell's expressions are, "Sinsful flesh, flesh requiring to be overcome, having in Christ the same nature and *tendency* as in us, which had to be stamped with condemnation on account of its condition of *enmity against God*, a foe difficult to contend with." Mr. Erskine's are, "The taint of the fall, the rebellious body, tendencies opposite to God's character," &c. and the Morning Watch teems with papers on this subject, upholding Mr. Irving's views. (Goode, p. 39.)

sinful, that no sinful desire was either known by Him or was in Him.\* "He *knew* no sin," (2 Cor. v. 21.) "Sin was not in Him." (1 John iii. 5.) He was the Holy One from His mother's womb; and when

\* The following are the observations of Mr. Goode, in a recent publication:—"But it is said that if this view of the matter be correct, Christ was not "in all points tempted like as we are," for He was not tempted by evil inclinations, and therefore that this view overthrows all the comfort and encouragement to be derived from the doctrine of the sympathy of Christ. Now observe the unavoidable consequence of this reasoning.—If it be necessary that Christ should have had evil inclinations to contend with, in order to know the strength of the temptations that assail us, then it is necessary that he should have committed actual sin; for it will not be denied, that the strength of the temptation to commit a sin which has been for some time habitually indulged, is much greater than such a temptation when the sin has never been indulged. Every *actual* sinner then must despair of obtaining the sympathy of Christ in the temptations that assail *Him*. He must say Christ cannot sympathise with me, for He has never committed sin, and therefore cannot know how strong my temptations are. To make out this doctrine then, that Christ could not sympathise with us, unless He had been in all respects circumstanced as we are, it must be affirmed that Christ had evil *habits*, as well as evil *inclinations*; for if this doctrine were true, He could not sympathise with a man, who after a long life of indulgence in sin, is tempted to repeat his sins, unless He had Himself committed sin in the same way."

"The assertion that temptations to sin are no temptations to one who has no propensity or inclinations to sin to second them, is contradicted by this one fact, that such persons have *fallen* under those temptations. The pressure of the besieging temptation is not less because there is nothing within to give it admission into the soul. The governor of a fortress (if I may be allowed the illustration) that had been fiercely besieged, but was prepared at every point of attack, and had none within to aid his assailants, would know full well how to sympathise with the commander of one, that, when similarly attacked, had no sufficient power of resistance, and also had a betrayer within its own walls."

A general assertion made by those who hold these doctrines, is, that *Incarnation and union is the principle of Justification, and that it is erroneous to hold that our completeness is through Substitution.*

It is quite plain that one who believes that justification comes by union with Jesus in the flesh through incarnation, cannot think that those who believe are *justified by His blood*. He deceives the world by saying, that those on whom, (according to the Scriptures,) the wrath of God abideth, are justified—i. e. cleared from all things by the Incarnation; and deprives the Church of its distinctive privilege of having died and risen with Christ. The circumcision, death, and resurrection of the elect in Him, as unfolded in the Ephesians and Colossians—i. e. the state of the Church, not in themselves, but in their Head, is either not regarded, or is denied by those who hold these doctrines; and thus the great instrument is lost whereby is wrought practical circumcision and death to the world, viz. the testimony to the past operation of God, whereby not only Jesus, but all who believe in Jesus, have died and have risen again **IN HIM.**

He was "anointed by the Holy Spirit." (Isaiah lxi.) it was not that He might be made holy or maintained in holiness, but that He might fulfil the work which the Father had given Him to do. And so it is written, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath *anointed me to preach* good tidings unto the meek." (Is. lxi.) "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, and *shall make Him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord.*" (Is. xi.) "He was *led by the Spirit* into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." (Matthew.) By the Holy Spirit He gave commandments to His Apostles whom He had chosen.

He was tempted of the devil; but the temptation was external, and the prince of this world could find nothing in Him. "It is no sin to be tempted;"—such was the temptation of our Lord. But there are temptations which *are* sinful, even those which arise from, or are combined with the easily excited evil in ourselves; and it is these of which the Apostle James speaks, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man; but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." Nevertheless, when resisted and mortified, through the Spirit, these temptations are not imputed as sin to those who believe, for Christ's sake. On the contrary, it is said, "Blessed is He that endureth temptation." With such temptations Believers have to struggle daily; and one reason why the writings above referred to, have taken so firm a hold on many minds, is, I believe, this,—that they draw so true a picture of the conflict with *internal* evil;—true when applied to ourselves, but utterly false when applied to the Lord the Mediator. Only let us find what the Scriptures pronounce to be sinful, and then we know what Jesus had NOT; and so, without exercising our minds upon things too hard for them, we shall walk in quiet decision of judgment because of the light of God's Word.

It is very needful that the attention of those who love the truth should be aroused to the real character of these doctrines. They have in them the power of much misapplied truth and profession of holiness, otherwise they would not deceive the saints: but we may be quite sure that the commandment of God can never be really kept by those who do not abide in the faith of Jesus, who "do not hold fast the faithful word." It is written, "Buy the truth and sell it not;" and I cannot but believe that they who have these doctrines clearly brought before their understandings, and then wilfully maintain them, are to be withheld to the face, "as those who are subverted and sin, being condemned of themselves." (Tit. iii.)

But on the other hand, let us beware of priding ourselves on our

orthodoxy, and making it our trust. The fallen state of the Church—its need of the Spirit—the destruction which awaits every system which has been or is being formed by the world—the personal coming of the Lord Jesus, when judgment shall begin at the house of God ;—these things are not the less true because they have been testified of by some in Newman-Street. They are true because they are the testimony of God's own word ; and blessed are they who have ears to hear and to obey.

---

### NOTE ON PROPHECIES.

THE following are a few of the instances of prophecies which have proved false :—

That at the end of three years and a half from the beginning of the prophecy of the witnesses, Satan should take to himself the sovereignty, and stand forth in all hideous power in the person of one man, to receive the worship of all the earth. The person who should be so energized of Satan, and be set up as his Christ, was at a subsequent period declared to be *young Napoleon*. (Baxter's Narrative of Facts, p. 31.)

At the time this latter point was prophesied, it was declared that within three years and a half, the saints would be caught up to the Lord, and the earth wholly given up to the days of vengeance.

The power came upon another at the same time, confirming the rapture of the saints within three years and a half.

The failure of this prediction is well known. The 14th of July last was the day on which the rapture of the saints should have taken place, and no such event occurred ; but those who believed the utterance, continued their expectation till the following month, but with no better success.

It was distinctly revealed in the power, and, says one who spoke in it, "I was made to utter, that the American Indians were the lost ten tribes, and that they should within the three years and a half, appointed for the spiritual ministry, be gathered back into their own land, and be settled there before the days of vengeance set in ; that the chief who was now [then] in London, was a chosen vessel of the Lord to lead them back ; that he should be endowed with power from on high, in all signs and mighty wonders, and should lead them back, though in unbelief—that he would receive his power here, and be speedily sent forth to them.

"On another evening, I was made in a most triumphant chant to address him as the vessel chosen of God, and to be endowed of God for the bringing back of his brethren. The chief went away an unbeliever in the work, and none of the powers have been manifested." (p. 81.)

"There followed an appalling utterance—that the Lord had set me apart for Himself—that, from the day I was called to the spiritual ministry, I must count forty days—that this was now well nigh expired—that for those forty days was it appointed that I should be tried—that the Lord had tried me and found me faithful, and having now proved in me the first sign of an apostle, "patience," (referring to 2 Cor. xii, 12.) He would give to me the fulness of them, in the gifts of "signs and wonders, and mighty deeds;"—that the Lord had called me to be an Apostle, and by the laying of my hands and the hands of the other Apostles whom the Lord should call, should the baptism of fire be bestowed. Then was added a repetition of the fearful oath given on the declaration of my call to the ministry. "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord:—by myself have I sworn, By myself have I sworn, that I will not fail you, I will never leave nor forsake you." I was commanded to go back to the Church, where my mouth was opened, and on the fortieth day, power should be given, the sick should be healed, the deaf should hear, the dead should be restored, and all the mighty signs and wonders should appear; Apostles and ministers should be ordained, endowed, and sent forth to the ends of the earth, to warn the world of the rapture of the saints, and make a people prepared for the Lord."

It is true that there are those in Newman-Street who claim the Apostolic office: but where are the signs of an Apostle? In Mr. Baxter's own case the whole proved false, and disappointment only ensued: he has seen the fearful delusion into which he fell; but no signs now seem to be required, as the office is held without them.

These are but a few instances of palpable failure in the prophecies uttered by the spirit in Newman-Street.—"How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him." (Deut. xviii. 21, 22.)

PRICE TWO-PENCE.