

**THE TRUE NATURE OF OUR
LORD'S HUMANITY AND
ATONEMENT; STATED IN REPLY
TO THE MISREPRESENTATIONS
AND UNSCRIPTURAL VIEWS**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649341078

The true nature of our Lord's humanity and atonement; stated in reply to the misrepresentations and unscriptural views by H. T. Burne & R. Meek

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

H. T. BURNE & R. MEEK

**THE TRUE NATURE OF OUR
LORD'S HUMANITY AND
ATONEMENT; STATED IN REPLY
TO THE MISREPRESENTATIONS
AND UNSCRIPTURAL VIEWS**

THE TRUE NATURE
OF
OUR LORD'S HUMANITY
AND
ATONEMENT.

THE TRUE NATURE -34
OF
OUR LORD'S HUMANITY
AND
ATONEMENT;

STATED IN REPLY TO
THE MISREPRESENTATIONS AND UNSCRIPTURAL VIEWS

OF
THE REV. H. T. BURNE,

ON
"THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON AND HU-
MANITY OF OUR DIVINE REDEEMER," &c.

BY

33
THE REV. R. MEEK,
CURATE OF YATTON, (NEAR CHIPPENHAM,) WILTS.



LONDON:

J. HATCHARD AND SON, 187, PICCADILLY;
NOYES, CHIPPENHAM; BINNS, BATH;
BRODIES, SALISBURY; RICHARDSON, BRISTOL.
1833.

137.

THE TRUE NATURE
OF
OUR LORD'S HUMANITY, &c.

I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

WHEN, a few weeks back, the writer of the following pages gave to the public a small tract, under the title, "*The Sinless Humanity of Christ Vindicated against THE IRVING HERESY,*" he had no wish or intention to provoke controversy among brethren. Religious controversy he most strongly deprecates, when not called for by manifest and urgent necessity. How far he was justified in stepping forward on the occasion already mentioned, the reader will be best able to judge, from the following statement:—"The Irving heresy," for so it is now in common parlance designated, which attributes to our Lord a *fallen* and *sinful* humanity, with a *proclivity* to moral evil, appeared to the writer a doctrine of the most awful character and tendency. The facts, that certain brethren in the ministry in his own immediate vicinity had embraced, and zealously advocated, this heresy, in

common with other novel opinions of Mr. Irving;—that their public advocacy of these doctrines had occasioned much talk and great uneasiness in certain connexions, made the writer (and to this he was urged by judicious brethren) feel it a duty to publish a plain tract on the subject, in the hope that, under the divine blessing, it might preserve the minds of some from the contagion of error. In doing this, care was taken that no expression should escape which could be considered either uncharitable towards the brethren in question, or which might be considered as holding *them* up to their neighbours as heretical in opinion. Their names were not once mentioned—their writings were not once quoted.

It was—and the reader is desired particularly to remark this—it was “*the Irving heresy*” which was attacked. Little was it to be expected that clergymen of the church of England would step forward as the defenders of the repudiated minister of the church of Scotland, as a “much injured man;” and least of all was it to be expected, that they would appear as the champions of that most obnoxious doctrine which that orthodox church had most scripturally condemned as *heresy*, and which the writer firmly believes to be a doctrine equally opposed to the word of God, and the recognized faith of the church of England. In doing so, they have identified themselves with the Irving heresy! It is but an evasion, after contending for the *orthodoxy* of Mr. Irving’s doctrine, as stated in the extracts given in my tract, (p. 11.) to say, “these are not our words and statements, and we are not bound by them;” since the heresy attacked, and which is stated in those extracts, is avowed and espoused by these gentlemen as “*the orthodox doctrine!*”

The publication to which I refer, and on which it is my intention to animadvert, (and I shall claim the liberty,

for the sake of convenience, of using the first person,) is entitled, "The Scripture Doctrine of the Person and Humanity of our Divine Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ: with some Remarks on a Publication by the Rev. R. Meek. By the Rev. H. T. Burne, &c." Though published in the name of Mr. Burne, it is avowed to be "a joint production." How many have engaged in this work I know not: that *one* neighbouring clergyman has more particularly united with Mr. B. in this joint production, is no secret, inasmuch as he has avowed it to me. However, as his name is not once mentioned in the pamphlet, I will not obtrude it on the public.

The following passage from Mr. Burne's publication will justify the notice which I feel called upon to take of this singular production:—

"The Rev. Mr. Meek, the curate of an adjoining parish, with whom we are on terms of friendly intercourse, has thought fit to print a little tract, attacking the ORTHODOX doctrine, under the name of the 'Irving heresy.' Having a different opinion as to the side on which the heresy lies, and fearing that Mr. M.'s FALSE DOCTRINE on this subject might be circulated among our flocks, and have currency given to it by the fact of our acquaintance-SHIP, we thought it incumbent upon us to lift up a testimony against it, and to put our people on their guard."

How far the serious charge here brought against me, of promulgating "false doctrine," can be substantiated, the tract which has given rise to this attack, and which is before the public, must decide. Should, however, the doctrine defended in my tract be found to be in accordance with holy Scripture, and the Articles of the church of England, which my opponents as well as myself have again and again subscribed,—then have they placed

themselves in the strange position of treating that as *heterodox*, which the church declares to be *orthodox*; and taken upon themselves to guard their flocks against that all-important truth, which they are under the most sacred vows to teach and uphold!

The tone of "*solemn rebukes*" held towards me in this publication, I leave with Mr. B., and those engaged with him, to justify. According to their own fair interpretation of 1 Tim. v. 1, I beg to suggest, that they are endued with no authority for this purpose. Is it possible that Mr. B. can imagine that the coalition he has formed with certain brethren holding peculiar doctrines, empowers them to deal out their "*solemn rebukes*" upon one who cautions plain people against errors as to the human nature of the Redeemer?

Mr. B. wishes his readers to remember that the pamphlet he has given to the public is not *aggressive*, but *defensive*. On this point a few remarks are necessary. Did I attack Mr. B. and his colleagues? It was not *them*, but "*the Irving heresy*," I attacked. If *their* opinions do not coincide with the Irving heresy, *they* are not attacked. But if they have promulgated the obnoxious doctrine from the pulpit, and from house to house, (and they now advocate it as "*the orthodox doctrine!*") and have given currency to books and tracts, not in their own parishes only, inculcating the *sinful* humanity of our Lord,—if, as is matter of notoriety, they speak degradingly of their brethren, yea, of their fathers in the ministry, who are opposed to this doctrine, and denounce to perdition those who do not teach it,—*the attack is on their part*. It was therefore right, yea, moreover, it was imperative, on me in defence, to point out the abominable nature, and the mischievous tendency

of those statements which are found in such books as "Irving on the Human Nature of our Lord."

Had the authors of the "joint production," to whose personal piety and zeal I cheerfully bear testimony, fairly examined and refuted the arguments of my tract, I should have had no just cause of complaint. Let them convince me by the word of God that I am on any point in error, and that opinion, however long held, or fondly cherished, I will readily renounce. My arguments are, however, overlooked and untouched. Unfair insinuations, strange misrepresentations of my meaning, irony, and sarcasm, supply the place of solid reasoning and convincing refutation. In this way error may be abetted; but in this way the cause of truth can never with dignity or consistency be defended.

Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
Tempus eget.

II.

MISREPRESENTATIONS IN MR. BURNE'S PAMPHLET.

THEY who engage in controversy, if *truth* be their object, are under sacred obligations, honestly and charitably to examine and state the opinions of their opponents. By a different procedure, christian charity is sacrificed, unchristian feelings are engendered, and the cause of truth is wounded. An opponent's real sentiments are