

REMARKS

BY

C. E. STUART, READING,

On "A LETTER by H. H. MCCARTHY on an Effort to exclude Fruits of the Cross from certain Scriptures which include them"; and a few lines of Introduction

BY

D. S., ABERDEEN.

A Copy can be obtained from Mrs. MACDONALD, 14 Thistle Street Aberdeen, on sending an addressed Half-penny Postal Wrapper.

INTRODUCTION.

MAJOR McCARTHY has written a letter to me and printed it. He has not, however, produced the question I asked him in the note written by me on 16th Jan^y. of this year.

I now print this note. In doing so I mention that in February of last year I pointed out to H. H. M. that in his paper entitled "The Cross, &c.," he had not seized Mr. Stuart's thought of "condition, or state." He wrote on page 8, "Then if one gets out of communion, his being 'in Christ' is gone." I received a reply from H. H. M. maintaining the statement I had called attention to.

Having given him extracts from the pamphlet de-claimed against, which plainly state the writer's meaning, I refused to have anything further to say to him until he owned the wrong he had done.

During the visit to which H. H. M. alludes, his attention was again drawn to this matter, and the note on Rom. v. 16 in Mr. Darby's "Translation of the New

Testament" was presented to him. He declined to look at the note, saying that he knew all about it. On the same occasion he stated that he did not understand the word "state" to have more than one meaning.

I then wrote the few lines to him which I now print. The question I ask is not met in simplicity. He states that "when Mr. Darby used the word '*state*' in a certain connection he did not exclude *status* or *standing* from this word."

I was not writing with regard to Mr. Darby, but in reply I say that Mr. Stuart does not *separate* our "condition in Christ" from our "standing before God" on the ground of what Christ has done for us. They are two different things, however, and are *distinguished* in "Christian Standing and Condition," and rightly so. Does my correspondent affirm that to "distinguish" is to "separate?"

In printed papers, and in private letters, doctrines not in the scope of the subject treated on have been enlarged upon as if Mr. Stuart denied them; and thus, as another has written, "a dishonest impression is often produced in the mind of the readers."

H. H. M. appeals to me at the close of his lengthy letter. I reply that it is in truth the purpose "not to be partaker of other men's sins" that has prevented

me from following him and others, who have on moral and doctrinal grounds condemned the innocent.

The following letter addressed to me by Mr. Stuart will be found to contain a suitable answer to the more serious parts of H. H. M.'s letter.

In addition to the erroneous statements as to the doctrine of the Trinity, the thought is painful that H. H. M. has been allowed to pen such a line as "I must still continue to believe that the Son is God, and that He is in the Father, &c.," in his letter to me. What he there states he "must continue to believe" is *not* the point Mr. Stuart remarked on in *Recent Utterances*, p. 50; and there seems an implication that those H. H. M. is writing against do not believe that *the Son is God*. The way he tries to explain this matter, and his reference to "My place I give unto you," are sad in the extreme.

I submit that if readers will carefully notice what H. H. M. writes in this letter under review, they will find that the "new and horrible doctrine" (p. 17), lies chargeable against him, and not Mr. Stuart.

DAVID SOUTER.

Copy of Letter, D. S. to Major McCarthy.

ABERDEEN, 16th Jan^r. 1886.

DEAR MAJOR McCARTHY,

You told me you could not understand the word "*state*" to have more than one meaning. I copy out the note from J. N. D.'s New Translation on Rom. v. 16—"Justification,' or 'judicial righteousness.' Here the Greek is more exact than English perhaps allows. *Dikaiōma* is the STATE of accomplished subsisting righteousness before *God*, in which justification places us."

This is the whole question in the contention with C. E. S. on this subject. Can we lose or be out of *this state*, when we get out of communion?

Yours truly in Christ,

DAVID SOUTER.

P.S.—On looking at your letter I find that you did *not* use the word I thought. Your words are "If C. E. S. had simply said 'state' as you do and stopped there, then one would have given him credit for meaning the status of a Christian."

I used the word "state" in the same way as Mr. S. does.

As to Eph. i. 6 Mr. Stuart carefully guards *against* "through the Beloved."* You suggest at p. 9 of "The Cross, &c.," that he would translate it "through the Beloved."

* See Introduction to Christian Standing and Condition, p. 19. 2nd Edition.

ADDINGTON HOUSE,

ADDINGTON ROAD,

READING, 19th March, 1886.

MY DEAR MR. SOUTER,

I have read H. H. M.'s printed letter to you of Feby. 1886, "On an Effort to exclude Fruits of the Cross from certain Scriptures which include them," and rise up from its perusal with the same impression (but only deepened) made on me by his private correspondence some eighteen months ago, viz., that he does not understand the question, which, if he would controvert it, he has to meet. I observe, and I dare say you did also, that there is no repudiation of the false doctrines of some with whom he is avowedly in full Christian fellowship. Are such matters of small concern; trivialities he can afford to treat with indifference? Nor is there any regret expressed for being himself the propagator of error touching the cardinal doctrine of the Trinity.

A lack, too, of carefulness when making his quotations is only too apparent, as well as a lack of precision in doctrinal statements. Of this last you will find proof on pp. 14, 15, where he reiterates some three or four times that we were "*dead in sin.*" Scripture affirms that we were *dead in sins* (Eph. ii. 1); and teaches that we are to reckon ourselves *dead to sin* (Rom. vi. 11).

Where will he find in Scripture his phrase "death in sin" (p. 14), or that which he prints in inverted commas on p. 15, presumably a quotation from some one, viz., "dead in sin"? One can understand reckoning one self dead *to* a nature, or a principle; but it is not easy to understand how one could be dead *in* a nature, or principle. A further illustration of his incorrectness is furnished us on pp. 4, 5, 6, 7, in which seven times over he seeks to impress upon you, that in Eph. i. 6 the Apostle wrote, "wherein he hath accepted us in grace in the Beloved." Now this is a mistake, and it is the less excusable, because he had previously quoted for your benefit on p. 2 of his letter a note of Mr. Darby's, which first states that "'accepted us' is too formal a doctrine here, not so general as *charitoo*"; and then gives us what is the best attested reading, and the right way of translating the verb *echaritosen* in consequence. Now if H. H. M. quarrels with that reading, he quarrels, I believe, with God, not with me. And certainly he has no right to build doctrine on a reading now generally rejected, and on a translation which few, if any, in these days would for one moment uphold. And how shall we characterise such a procedure, when the one resorting to it lets us know he is acquainted with the existence of another—the best attested reading, and its right translation? A remarkable announcement appears on p. 10, by which we are treated to a new interpretation of 1 Cor. i. 30—new, I say, but unfortunately for its author, not true. The Apostle wrote, "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus,

who has been made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." H. H. M. writes, "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom righteousness ('are ye in Christ Jesus') and sanctification and redemption." So wrote not, and taught not in this place, the great Apostle of the Gentiles. Christ made to us from God righteousness, is the doctrine of 1 Cor. i. 30. We become God's righteousness in Christ, is the doctrine of 2 Cor. v. 21—two really different things, which apparently your correspondent confounds, and thus misleads himself, and may mislead others.

Passing by his comments on what I have written, and in which I see nothing to retract, I would just say that Christian standing must be a poor and uncertain thing indeed, if the illustration of it by his journey from Edinburgh to Aberdeen (see p. 9) is to be accepted in seriousness.

Now for his attempted defence of Mr. Pinkerton and of Mr. Darby. It is unfortunate for himself, I think you will agree, that he should have entered the lists as champion of the above-named. Mr. Pinkerton's statements are clearly indefensible. Mr. Darby needs no defender. He has spoken for himself. But I take it, those pages 16-23 would for the most part never have been written, had H. H. M. really understood the matters in question.

I had called attention to the erroneousness of the statement, that the Lord entered heaven "in virtue of His own blood." Can Major McCarthy justify such

teaching from the Word? He has not done so. I presume he is aware he cannot. I also called attention to the statement, that "the whole work on which our souls rest with divine certainty was accomplished in this world, not in heaven"; and that this coupled with another sentence, "He entered there, as we know, by His own blood; but let us be aware of the thought that He did so to make atonement or propitiation," really denies the possibility of propitiation, which is an integral part of atonement, having been made. Mr. Pinkerton distinctly teaches it was not made in heaven. Scripture as plainly teaches it was made, and could be made no where else (Heb. ii. 17; viii. 4; ix. 11, 12). Has H. H. M. met and overturned this objection? He has not. I am sure he cannot. The statements to which I drew attention are *irreconcilable* with the Word of God.

As to Mr. Darby, it is surely more becoming to let him speak for himself. If this is allowed, all will see that in later years he distinctly and rightly rejected the assertion that sin has been put away. His words happily are too plain to be misunderstood. H. H. M. quotes from a passage in Coll. Writings, xxiii., p. 273, to which I had referred, but stops short of what he should have given you. Let me continue the quotation, "And this has been the case in the statement that sin has been put away by the sacrifice of Christ. This Scripture does not state. He appeared once, in the consummation of ages, for the putting away of sin (*eis athenēs*) by the sacrifice of Himself." Why

did your correspondent stop short of that which I have now given? Does it not fully bear out what I wrote? See too p. 559, "It is never said, Christ has put away sin in any sense. He came once in the end of the world to put away sin. But the result is not yet produced." See too vol. xxxi., p. 570, "It is never said sin is put away: I know the work is done, and am at rest." Let Mr. D. speak for himself, and this point is made plain.

Now for your correspondent's defence of himself. He has taught that which subverts the doctrine of the Trinity, for, if it is true, the Father Himself is not God. How does he meet this? "As for Mr. Stuart's inference from a sentence of mine in reference to Mr. Grant's doctrine, I can only say it carries its own refutation on the surface, therefore I must still continue to believe that the Son is God, and that He is in the Father, which no mere creature is ever said to be" (p. 19). But what had he written in his pamphlet on "The Reading Question"? "Mr. Stuart's speculative comparison between the 'essential condition of Godhead' (see 1 Tim. vi. 16) and that of the creature is, as I have told him, irreverent and not true, because, in the first place, no positive idea of infinity was ever, nor could be, conceived by a finite being; and no one could be in the Father but God Himself" (p. 13).

If the explanation H. H. M. here offers you satisfies himself, I feel sure it will not satisfy you. He tells you he was referring to Mr. Grant's doctrine. His own words given above show he was writing of mine. And

this is perfectly plain, because in the next paragraph to that which I quoted he begins to speak of Mr. Grant's doctrine, and does it in a way which shows he was introducing a new subject. H. H. M. is therefore in this matter a witness against himself. Then he would lead you to infer that he wrote of *the Son*. I must beg his pardon. He wrote of *God*. The Son is in the Father, and the Father is in the Son, being two distinct Persons, yet but one God. But God is not said to be in the Father. To affirm such a proposition, and this is what he has done, is to deny that the Father is Himself God. To say "no one could be in the Father but God Himself," is bald, unmistakeable heresy. And let me add, it is a much more serious matter than may appear at first sight. For if God is in the Father, the Father Himself is not God. Then His Son, begotten of Him from everlasting, cannot be the only begotten Son of God. He too then is not God. Nor, if the doctrine is true, can the Holy Ghost, who is sent by the Father, be God. For how could one, who is not God, send Him who is God? One cannot too stoutly resist such teaching, according to which God can be in the Persons of the Trinity, but the Persons in that case, viz., Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are none of them God.

Two questions might naturally here arise—one, how came the person to make such a statement? The other, what is really the bearing of that statement? You have doubtless observed that he tries, but most unsuccessfully, to meet the first. He slurs over the second. Now the doctrine of the Trinity is one on which for

a Christian there is no room for man's opinions. We must hold it, and cherish it, and not trifle with it. If any one teaches that which subverts it, even unintentionally, it becomes him to acknowledge it, and to correct it. This H. H. M. has not done. One's course then towards such an one is plain, viz., to decline all Christian intercourse with him till the error, whether intentional or not, is confessed and judged. Such a statement as this puts a person off Christian ground, as long as it is not distinctly repudiated, for no amount of ingenuity can explain it away. Nor will his attempt to shield himself behind another avail him, or be any excuse for putting into the Lord's mouth, words which Scripture makes plain He never could have used, viz., "My place I give unto you." * The Lord's answer to James and John and their mother, Matt. xx. 20-23, shows that, and the way in which He speaks of Himself in John xvii. 5, 24 confirms it. We shall be with Him where He is. We shall have a place with Him. But no creature can have His place. He never uttered, or taught such a doctrine, as "My place I give unto you," if Scripture is to guide us.

Believe me,

Affectionately yours in Christ,

C. E. STUART.

* NOTE.—You will observe, he tells you, he quoted the words, "My place I give unto you." But whence? Certainly not from the paper in Notes and Comments.

*This is an example of how the
Bible made much of what was
a mere hypothetical question*