





**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

15 28 25
12 32
10 22
8 20
6 18

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**

10



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions

Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

1980

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:




Nova Scotia Public Archives

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Nova Scotia Public Archives

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

errata
to

pelure,
on à



32X



REMARKS
ON
JOHN NELSON DARBY'S
CHURCH FELLOWSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

ALSO HIS
HERETICAL DOCTRINES ON THE PERSON OF THE SAVIOUR
EXAMINED AND EXPOSED BY SEVERAL OF HIS FOR-
MER ASSOCIATES AND FELLOW LABORERS.

BY S. F. KENDALL.

"Cease ^{ye} from man whose breath is in his nostrills, for wherein is he to
be accounted of." *Isaiah li: 22.*

"One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." *Jesus Christ.*

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I. :
GEORGE BREMNER, PRINTER, PRINCE STREET.

1871.

AK
B12
K33

[Faint, illegible text covering the majority of the page]

b
f
(
l
c
h
h
t
y
v
v
y
h
h
s
r
o
a
o
n
d
v

PREFACE.

I WOULD offer a few words of explanation to my beloved brethren in Christ in Great Britain, etc., who will doubtless feel pained that any thing further should be written on this (to them, as to myself) most painful subject. And truly, had I consulted my own personal feelings in the matter, nothing could have been less acceptable than assuming the responsibility of the present task. Yet even these revered and honored brethren will appreciate my position, when realizing the fact, that *all their sad experience at home for so many years*, connected with the spirit of defamation, etc., together with the bald and bold assumption,—“We are the People,” with “judging the question,” “judging the evil,” “Have you judged the question?” etc., etc.—old, stereotyped, and hateful phrases; utterly unmeaning and untruthful as used by the party in question; yet used unblushingly and constantly, to beguile and mislead the unwary, are being re-enacted on this side the Atlantic, with perhaps an infusion of *young blood* under the direction of elders; and that these are prosecuting their course with a zeal generally characteristic of the *human element in fierce partizanship* on religious matters; many no doubt unconscious of what they are really doing, viz:—violence to the truth; and thus dishonoring God whom they think in their blind ignorance they are serving.

It has been felt by some brethren weighing the matter before the Lord, that it would be for the interest of truth to give *extracts*, condensed as far as may be, from the pages of several brethren, who, long associated with Mr. Darby and party, have been at length, since 1866, obliged in faithfulness to the Lord, and their own well matured convictions of duty. to leave the party and give their reasons for so doing. It will be seen therefore that a united testimony from several brethren for many years in the closest fellowship with Mr. D., is borne with melancholy unanimity to the fact of the very serious errors into which he has been allowed of God to fall,—errors almost identical with those of Mr. B. W. Newton, his opponent originally on prophetic subjects; together with my own experience, and facts relating to the unhappy divisions from 1845, to the present time.

S. F. K.

SYDNEY, CAPE BRETON. B. N. A.,
October 1st, 1871.

“SEA
WHIO
WHIO
page
emin
the p
of G
but
Sove
of a
In
to H
godl
shor
pain
love
unh
of
The
—t
for
pro
out
du

matter
truth to
ages of
by and
fulness
of duty.
It will
brethren
s borne
serious
errors
is op-
th my
visions

REMARKS, &c.

HISTORY repeats itself. This is true, whether regarded from a political, moral, or religious point of view.

JEROME, one of the early Fathers of the Christian Church, writing with relation to the latter, says,—

“SEARCHING THE ANCIENT HISTORIES, I CAN FIND NONE WHO HAVE MORE RENT THE CHURCH OF GOD THAN THOSE WHO SUSTAINED THE OFFICE OF MINISTERS.” The following pages will but too sorrowfully shew that this has been pre-eminently the case with reference to certain gifted men of the present day, who once met *together as brethren* beloved of God around one common centre, professedly acknowledging but *one Master*, even Jesus! and the Holy Spirit as their Sovereign Teacher, testifying, through sanctified channels, of and for Christ in the midst of assembled worshippers.

Impelled by concurrent circumstances over which we seem to have no control, and in deference to the judgment of godly brethren who feel the urgent necessity that something should be done, we reluctantly address ourselves to the very painful duty imposed on us by those whom we would still love as brethren of one common Lord; but who have unhappily, sadly, and sinfully we believe, entered the arena of controversy and unhallowed strife with their brethren. *They say*, (as all separatists plead) “for the glory of God” (?) —*they may think themselves sincere!* WE believe, however, for “PARTY PURPOSES;” which, alas, can be but too sadly proved as regards them in a multiplicity of instances.

The present pressing necessity for these pages has grown out of a visit by the author to Canada and the United States, during the autumn of 1870; and more recently and especially,

by the visit of Mr. Oldright, senior, of Halifax, to Charlottetown; and still more recently by that of Mr. Buchanan, an Evangelist from England, via Halifax, accompanied by a christian brother, Mr. Hill. Mr. Buchanan presented a letter of introduction from Mr. Oldright, junior, of Halifax, to Mr. Bremner, of Charlottetown; the purport of which letter shewed plainly the object of the visit, viz: to influence Mr. Bremner and christians meeting with him injuriously against assemblies of christians with whom they were in direct fellowship, and to draw them within their own party, if possible. Mr. Buchanan, a comparatively young man, with *a certain training*, it would appear, and knowing little beyond *that training*,—for I will not allow myself to charge him with deliberate or intentional misrepresentation,—entered upon the work assigned him by his elders with an assiduity worthy a better cause. I ought to observe, Mr. Oldright, senior, commenced this work last fall, and left certain controversial pamphlets behind him for the enlightening of those intended to be specially influenced thereby. Mr. Bremner wrote to me on the subject, asking for light; and in reply I sent him the following letter:—

“Sydney, C. B., April 26, 1871.

“DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST;

* * * * *

“As regards the visit of Major Oldright—I can quite understand the nature of it, and the *old old charges* of that party against brethren who could not, as God-fearing men, and responsible before and to God, recognise Mr. J. N. Darby's action, and first schism at Plymouth, in 1845. I saw Mr. Trotter's pamphlet 17 years ago, while staying a few days the guest of Mr. W. Kelly, in Guernsey. From Mr. Trotter's pamphlet, together with Mr. Darby's, Mr. Wigram's, and Mr. Deck's, all on the one side, in connection with close questioning of Mr. Kelly, one of Mr. Darby's most active men,—I was constrained to ask him ‘whether, with his extensive knowledge of the order and actings of the Jesuits from the first to the [then] present time, he had ever found amongst that order anything more *morally dishonest* than were to be found in the actings and writings of the men above named?’ I then was compelled to ‘judge of their evil’ from the lips of one of themselves, and the writings of others named. Mr. Kelly bowed his head, when I put this question, apparently in deep and painful thought. I was obliged to appeal to him a second time for an answer, when he

said, 'I cannot certainly justify very much that has been done and said and written on the subject.' 'Then why,' I rejoined, in substance, 'attempt to profess, and thus delude people, as you have professed to me, that you and your party have the glory of God at heart and only this? Does God require duplicity, and must I say, fraud, that is, deception, to build up His cause and maintain His truth in the world?' This is but a sample of much that transpired between us during the week or more I was with him. I might explain, we had been old friends and fellow-labourers a few years before, and I had only just returned from abroad in 1854, knowing almost nothing, really, of the 'Bethesda question' which had occurred during my absence from England.

"On my way to Guernsey, I had spent a Lord's day in London, and broken bread with a company of believers, many of whom I had known many years before at Rawstorne Street Meeting (which had been broken up in the meantime by the divisions which had taken place); these Christians having no sympathy whatever with Mr. Newton, and being *very decided in their testimony against his evil doctrine!* They could not, however, endorse Mr. Darby's actings, which was their great crime in his estimation, and others. For breaking bread with them, I was shut out from communion in Guernsey. While in Guernsey, Mr. Kelly brought the 'Bethesda question' before me in different phases. (You must understand that this was he *second act at division* on the part of Mr. Darby). I was always opposed to his first act of division, *knowing it to have been brought about on account of a personal quarrel between himself and Mr. Newton on prophetic questions*—the two men violently opposed to each other on these questions, and both of them—as is well known—endeavouring and determined to break up each other's influence in Plymouth and elsewhere; and, of course, on the ruins of one, build up a system for SELF!

"This will in a measure explain Mr. Trotter's pamphlet (not Captain Trotter's—they are different men, both now deceased), about 'Sectarian,' 'Clerical,' etc. actings. This was in 1845. Mr. Groves had written a letter to Mr. Darby in 1836, I think, complaining of the same tendency in him, and warning him against the spirit he then exhibited, shewing that it could only lead to evil results. The truth is, both these gifted men were undoubtedly influenced by a sectarian spirit, and determined to break down each other, to build up around themselves individually. The proofs are abundant on this head. It was *not then a question of heresy in doctrine* on the part of Mr. Newton at all. His evil doctrine had not been brought to light, and was not till more than a year after Mr. Darby had established a divided party around himself, and set up a *schismatic table*. Mr. J. L. Harris was the person who eventually exposed Mr. Newton's evil doctrine; after which, Mr. Darby took hold of it and made capital for himself out of it, to build up his position and strengthen his party ground. He now attempted to gain over to him on this new charge, many who had

x, to Char-
Buchanan,
panied by a
presented a
of Halifax,
t of which
to influence
injuriously
y were in
own party,
man, with
ttle beyond
harge him
—entered
n assiduity
Oldright,
ertain con-
g of those
Bremner
in reply I

1871.

*
erstand the
st brethren
ore and to
Plymouth,
e staying a
r. Trotter's
r. Deck's,
Mr. Kelly,
o ask him
actings of
ever found
ere to be
I then
of them-
his head,
ought. I
when he

opposed his action in the first division. Some were drawn to him—others, seeing the working of his system, opposed his efforts, saying, ‘he was not the person, being himself excommunicated by his own act of division, to lead in the matter.’ This led to a strife of tongues, and from this point *all* who would not accept his stand-point and dictum in the matter have been characteristically defamed, both by tongue and pen. With my knowledge of facts, I do not believe more bitterness of spirit or more determined effort at untruthfulness has ever existed in any of the unhappy divisions of the church since the apostles days (save perhaps only in Rome and in the days of the nonconformists), than through Mr. Darby and his party of zealots.

“I should have said, I knew nothing of Mr. Muller personally, or of ‘Bethesda,’ till I left Guernsey at the above date, 1854, when I told Mr. Kelly, after hearing all he had to say, and reading all he had to offer, on the one side, that I should pass through Bristol on my return to London, and seek an interview with Mr. Muller and Mr. Craik, and gain such information on the other side of the question as I could, and seek guidance from the Lord for my future course. Mr. K. appeared agitated when he heard this, and said, ‘Oh then you are lost,—I have no hope for you.’ ‘I said, if your cause is a good one it will bear examination, if not, it will not, and deserves to be rejected.’ So we parted.

“My interviews with these two godly men, and the perfectly open manner in which they replied to all my questions, *pro* and *con*, satisfied me that they had been greatly misrepresented and abused, because they had rejected Mr. Darby’s dictum and overbearing manner towards themselves and finally towards the Bethesda meeting. *They distinctly told me that no person or persons holding, or sympathizing with Mr. Newton’s errors, were admitted at Bethesda. Mr. Muller told me personally he was utterly opposed to Mr. Newton’s views—he considered they were dangerous.* I could write much more, but I will only add—Mr. Darby now stands before the Church and the world charged in his writings with the same errors he charged upon Mr. Newton; arrived at, however, from different points of thought. Many of his old and strong helpers have left him on this account, *e. g.*—Messrs. Dorman, Hall, Gilpin, and several others. They charge him with errors equally pernicious with anything from the pen of Mr. Newton. In this I see the hand of God.

* * * * *

“I am quite prepared to meet Mr. Oldright in public or otherwise, in P. E. Island or Halifax to discuss the question.”

Mr. Bremner read this letter to Mr. Buchanan, who, after hearing it, desired to read it alone at his leisure. At this point I would fain still be charitable—for *perhaps* unused to certain proprieties he, *without permission*, copied the letter, or parts of it; and still oblivious of the position he had

now placed himself in, told Mr. Bremner that "God had put a sword in his hand to use for Him, *through this letter.*" How far he has used this *sword*—must we say, *surreptitiously obtained?*—he is the best judge. On my arrival in Charlottetown, and finding how matters stood, I desired Mr. Bremner to call on Mr. Buchanan, and offer him an opportunity to meet me and the brethren interested in his visit; when he would be free to offer all he had to say on this unhappy subject—I reserving the right to reply and rebut all statements where truth demanded it. To this offer he utterly refused compliance, or to meet me at all on the subject. Mr. Hill had gone into the country: I now proposed to him, through Mr. Bremner, to meet Messrs. Oldwright, Hill, and such others of their party as they deemed proper, either in a private or more public manner, with christians, either in Halifax or Charlottetown, at such time and place as they should decide upon. This was also refused by a *singular* statement as coming from such a source, viz:—"That they (*i.e.* their body or people) had given up answering all controversial subjects—they left the matter in the hands of God—they *knew they were right,*" etc. This was the purport, if not the precise words used—the latter, Mr. Buchanan did use for himself at least, with an emphatic motion of the hand,—so Mr. Bremner informs me. Yet in the face of this statement these people were then, by male and female agency, industriously engaged giving or lending publications to the prejudice of christians, the representative of whom they dared not now meet in a truthful manner for discussion, though on the spot to meet them friendly, yet truthfully and faithfully as a servant of God. One other irregularity I may mention. Of course Mr. Buchanan's right to be at the public meeting on Lord's day morning, if he felt so disposed, is unquestioned; and I knew not till after its close that a stranger (to me at least) present, who appeared interested, and noted one remark of the speaker in his *pocket book*, was really Mr. B., so it transpired however; but that he should wish to obtrude at an afternoon private meeting that had been suggested, *simply as a stranger*, to listen to what we might say relative

to the points with which he stood so intimately connected, after having refused to meet me and the brethren on the subject, is passing strange. The meeting at first contemplated, however, was not held, it being judged better to spend Monday and Tuesday evenings together, of which fact he was, I believe, apprised, though not officially.

Before going into the main facts of this most sorrowful controversy, I may present extracts from other letters to christians who desired information. The first is to an elderly lady whose mind had been disturbed by misrepresentations.

"Let me say then, dear sister in Christ, however sorrowful it may be for me to write, I do write of what I personally know; being conversant with the facts at the time. The *first* very sorrowful and unhappy schism was consummated by Mr. J. N. Darby. * * Messrs. Darby and Newton had established schools of thought diverse the one to the other for some time, and had succeeded in measure to draw away minds from the simplicity of truth, and establish themselves as centres of attraction on prophetic subjects. This, then, was the first great evil, culminating in final division in the fall of 1845. Mr. Darby was urgently admonished and entreated with tears, by many truly godly men of position and education, not to cause a division; he would not hearken to counsel or reason; and, utterly ignoring much of his previous teaching, finding he could not carry the body of believers with him, he, in *self will* it is to be feared, thrust himself out from the assembly at Plymouth, and established a meeting on HIS OWN CHOSEN GROUND OUTSIDE THE MEETINGS of 'Brethren,' as then designated.

"A year later, when Mr. Newton's evil doctrine about the *person* of the Lord was brought to light by Mr. J. L. Harris, Mr. Darby took this as a favorable opportunity to incorporate it with the old quarrel, and thus together make a strong case for himself and against Mr. Newton. Some brethren were won over to him; others would not recognise in him a *Leader*, and still condemned his first action in schism, and told him plainly that 'he was *not* the person to act in the matter, *seeing he himself was already outside the meetings of Brethren by his own rash act of SELF-EXCOMMUNICATION!*' This plain dealing did not suit him, and he could not brook it; and from this point—now over *twenty-two years*, viz: from 1848-9—all the evils of 'sitting in judgment' upon brethren who would not, and *could not*, as godly men, acting in the fear of God, receive his action and dictum, commenced. Honored names, such as George Muller, Henry Craik, and hundreds of others: men of grace, of recognised position and power as servants of Christ in the Church of God, have been, since the above date, characteristically and systematically *misrepresented* in a manner calculated to make angels weep over sins of brethren *against* brethren;

yea, 'because the Master tarried,' servants smiting fellow-servants with the tongue and breath of calumny in the most unlovely and unchristian manner, accompanied with a Jehu-like zeal, well worthy (if under sanctified influence) a better cause

"This state of things still continues, and is transmitted in all its characteristic spirit wherever Mr. Darby's influence extends. Finding, as he must, *his cause* failing on the Continent of Europe, in England, and elsewhere, he has, it would appear, selected the American Continent, together with the West Indies, for special efforts. I met this influence in Canada during the past summer, bearing with it its bitter fruit, viz:—'biting and devouring.' Young converts (we will trust) to Christ have had their first and dawning aspirations heavenward cramped and chained to a party which must of necessity, judging from past experiences, weaken their christian sensibilities, injure their souls' spiritual growth, and bring them finally into a state of spiritual bondage far more terrible than they can at present comprehend. A true brother in Christ,—though never with 'brethren,' so called,—Dr. Stow, of Boston,—now with Jesus,—in his admirable book on 'Christian Brotherhood,' writes,—'The sectarian spirit reduces the great mind—it would the mind of an angel—to narrow dimensions, by restricting its contemplations, its solitudes, its aims, its efforts to insignificant matters, often microscopic points, unbefitting the dignity of its nature and the glory of its destiny.'

"I could write much more, and relate what is too painful, of hearts smitten with grief; of intellects ruined for life; and death mercifully coming to the relief of others: but I forbear. I cannot doubt for myself at least, that Mr. Darby—deluded, at first, by that terrible tyrant, '*Intellectual Pride!*' together with an innate *love of power*, and led on by a naturally strong will—is now, in his old age, *driven*, as poor Edward Irving of sorrowful celebrity was, before the force of his own violent faction; and has also, undoubtedly, been allowed of God, whom he has so grievously dishonored (unwittingly, we will hope) by dividing God's flock for *party purposes*, to fall into speculations too, equally obnoxious with those of B. W. Newton, or Edward Irving, about the *blessed person* of the Lord Jesus Christ; speculations which every wise and truly enlightened christian must recoil from with just horror and reprobation."

The above has been somewhat amplified beyond the original.

One other extract written eight years ago may, perhaps, suffice to throw light upon a disputed point not generally understood. Mr. Darby had been represented in print as "THE FOUNDER of 'the Brethren'"—hence the following error by a leading editor of a christian journal: "Be it understood then, that Mr. Muller belongs to that class of Baptists called 'Darbyites' or 'Plymouth Brethren.'" My answer to this was as follows:—

“John Nelson Darby was a Clergyman in the Church of England (he might have been a lawyer originally). Having seceded from the ‘Establishment,’ he visited many places as an evangelist, and met frequently with christians who recognized that scriptural name alone, in many parts of England, Ireland, etc. He was received by them on the scriptural basis—‘Receive ye one another as Christ also received us to the glory of God.’ (*Rom. xv. 7*); and as a professed and known teacher of evangelical truths, permitted to exercise his gifts for the good of others as opportunity offered. Being, however, a man of great force of character, constitutionally so, (like his godfather, Lord Nelson, only differently directed) he soon became conspicuous as a teacher, both at Plymouth and elsewhere—and in different religious communions—for a time. Frequently crossing the British Channel on evangelistic tours, he occasionally passed through Bristol, and was received at such times by the Church meeting at Bethesda Chapel, as a brother in the Lord, on the common ground of christian brotherhood of all true christians; and was also invited to preach the gospel as a servant of Jesus Christ. Beyond this, THERE NEVER WAS ANYTHING LIKE PARTY-FELLOWSHIP WHATEVER; on the contrary, when he shewed symptoms of THE RULER! and a schismatic tendency to *force his rule* upon the consciences of others, the Church meeting at Bethesda, with hundreds of other assemblies, protested against and utterly repudiated his assumption to authority. Probably from this well known fact, may be found the reason *why* those acting under his guidance should inveigh, in the manner ascribed to them in the *Belfast Covenant*, against Mr. Muller and his work at the orphan houses on Ashley Down.

“As respects Mr. B. W. Newton, he stands, relatively so, pretty much in the same position as Mr. Darby. Both these undoubtedly gifted men have strayed—sadly strayed—from the right path. They *have sought* ‘to draw away disciples after them,’ instead of drawing to and uniting in Christ as servants of God and brethren in common in Christ; and as such, living and laboring with power, as they might have done, for the good of the Church universal in its scriptural union to HIM who bought her with HIS own blood, who is the only Head—Jesus our Lord! And as a certain result, they have both been allowed of God to fall into fatal error, almost identical, though arrived at from different points of thought; and now they stand as beacons of warning before the entire church of God. ‘Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.’ (*1 Cor. x: 12.*)”

In simple justice, however, to Mr. Newton, it should be said: he, finding himself shut out from the brethren, morally so, at least, though not formally excluded, at an early period of the troubles, withdrew from any further association with them, and has for very many years occupied the position of an independant minister in Palace Gardens Chapel, London—

so I have been informed. Had Mr. Darby acted with similar consideration for his own best interest, and, must we say, with like moral honesty too?—when he *first* thrust himself outside the brethren and established “A SECT” around himself (hence the natural appellation, “Darbyism,” which now, and for many years past, has been attached to that party), he would have saved himself many unhappy reflections, and an accumulation of sorrows, which I should suppose, even for him, with large powers for endurance, must well nigh crush him at times, the brethren would certainly have been relieved from a world of affliction, and a common christianity saved from a dark blot and a great scandal on its name. It is in vain, however, to moralize. The schism was effected by him, and has been continued in the *name* of “Brethren”; hence the all sorts of confusion existing on the minds of those who have written, on the subject, not intentionally wrong statements; but by implication, they have in their writings (not aware of facts) attached errors in doctrine, and in practice too, to a company of christians who have no more to do with said errors (otherwise than to condemn them) than the writers themselves.

Preparatory to giving extracts of false doctrines into which these two able men, B. W. Newton and J. N. Darby, have respectively fallen, I will refer to a circumstance which occurred in Jersey, in 1855, illustrating as it does, *progress* in a wrong course.

Passing over many months of bitter trial and sorrow to the assembly in Jersey, because they had been led to act rightly before God in bursting the bonds of a spiritual tyranny, by receiving a brother to communion who was conscientiously opposed to Mr. Darby’s course of action: I was returning from the Lord’s Day morning meeting in company with this brother, the Hon. C. Paget, and F. Naylor; both being servants of Jesus. We were met by Mr. A. Stewart, the [then] active agent of Mr. Darby and party in Jersey. I had not seen Mr. Stewart for some years; he having left Guernsey on a difficulty with Mr. Kelly; I had also been abroad. I was a principal opponent of his in his first difficulty with Mr. K.;

now, however, after six years' absence, I found them both united in close action on the Darby question. We were therefore still opposed on the latter ground. He professed surprise to find me "in such company" as the above; and especially so, as "having been such a close friend of Mr. Kelly." I rejoined, "I was the friend of Mr. K. in a righteous cause; I am still so in kindly feelings, but I cannot be with him in a wrong course." "Oh," said he, "I see where you are,—from this time then we must be strangers if we meet—I now leave you to your own day dreams." (!) Poor man, my answer might now be considered prophetic—though disclaiming the power of prescience: "Mr. Stewart," I rejoined, "the day is fast approaching when Mr. Darby and all his active agents will find they have been digging pits for others into which they will themselves fall. *They know* they are falsifying their brethren, who are as free from Mr. Newton's fearful errors as themselves,—or of tolerating them in others. But judging from the unholy spirit manifested by your party—for I must use this term—I fear it is only a question of time, when God will, in righteous judgment, allow Mr. Darby and his supporters to fall into the same, or similar errors, or even worse, than are charged against Mr. Newton with too much truth." What has followed? Messrs. Kelly and Stewart (both men of ability: the former, once a diligent student at Oxford under Dr. Pusey, and intended for the Episcopal Ministry; the latter, for some years a popular Presbyterian Minister, but subsequently met with "brethren") have been separated by a most painful course of procedure (a second difficulty with the two men); resulting too, finally, in Mr. Stewart's utter severance from the party he sought so effectually to serve, in, I am bound to say, a most God-dishonoring course in Jersey.

Where do Mr. Darby and his supporters stand to-day? Charged, and the charges brought home with fearful and most damaging proof which cannot be gainsayed, by some of the most able, learned, and leading men of his party for very many years, with holding errors almost identical with those of B. W. Newton, and equally subversive of the teachings of the word of God.

These men, *e. g.*—Mr. W. H. Dorman, Mr. P. F. Hall, Mr. Guinand of Lausanne, Mr. Gilpin, and several others, will speak for themselves in extracts from their published pamphlets:

1st. Mr. Dorman, in his pamphlet of 67 pages, viz. :
 "The close of twenty-eight years of Association with J. N. D. : and of Fellowship and Ministry amongst those who adopt his Doctrines concerning the Sufferings of Christ."

"*Belle Vue, March 2nd, 1866.*

"Beloved Brother,—I little thought when I expressed to you my feelings of satisfaction at the close of our recent correspondence, that I should so soon be obliged to trouble you again upon the subject. But I find, strange to say it, that up to that time I had been reading your papers on the sufferings of Christ, under a perfect illusion of mind, which was only dispelled by my sitting down again quietly to mark what expressions in them I thought might be corrected. I can account for this only by my having come to their perusal with the full impression on my mind of your doctrine on the subject, derived especially from your comments on "The Books of the Bible," as they appeared originally in 'The Present Testimony.' Since the publication of the 1st Volume of your 'Synopsis' I have been able to read but little in that way, nor indeed in any other, until lately; and then my studies, if I may call them so, have been in another direction. It has utterly passed from my mind, as to any practical effect—though I must have known it generally—that you had adopted an almost entirely *new principle* in your interpretation of the Psalms as they appear in the 2d Volume of the 'Synopsis.' But I was familiar only with that which is applied to their interpretation, as they came out at *first*, in 'The Present Testimony.' Until since I wrote to you in my last, I had not the least adequate conception of the extent of the change of your views on the sufferings of Christ. I may refer as an example, to Psalm lxi, and cii. as they were written at first and as they are given now. Consequently, as you would perceive by my private notes, and by the way I wrote to you, that I fancied your *words* were perpetually at war with your meaning. Other considerations, you will of course think, ought to have corrected such a notion. Perhaps so :—I can however, now only say that, so it was. Further than this, I may add, there reigned in my mind up to this time, a kind of absolute confidence that it was next to impossible you should really *hold* any thing that was wrong. And I dare say I am not alone in this conviction.

"However, the effect upon my mind now is to make me think that, in all probability, your terms are more carefully selected to express what you mean, and are more accurately weighed, than they could have been by any but the originating mind of the doctrine. Of

course there are limitations existing in your mind, and modifying considerations, and an accurate perception of the delicate nature of the ground you were traversing, that it is next to impossible another mind, learning it only from you, should possess. But without these, if any one else were to attempt to give a just view of your thoughts, it is likely enough that he would do it in the language of bald and revolting heresy.

"It is at this point my increased difficulty begins. If I objected so strongly before, when I thought it only a question of the employment of terms; you will understand at once that my objections are not weakened by a transfer of them from the terms in which the doctrine is expressed to what I think is, the doctrine itself. If the question had been only about what *you* have written on the sufferings of Christ, taken by itself, I might in my condition of health have been well content to leave it alone, whatever my thoughts might have been upon the subject. But it is not so. It is implicated now, since Newton's writings about it were condemned as heretical, with the fundamental principle of our *special* association—a principle which over-rules and over-rides every other, when the consideration arises of who shall, and who shall not, be received to fellowship. This changes the whole aspect of things in regard to it.

"It must be a strange principle of moral righteousness that will allow a man from day to day to go on repelling with unrelenting severity the most distant connection with an evil, whilst he is at the same time conscious of being in the very closest association with what he suspects to be but a modification of the same thing. This is no hypothetical case; and I must say that no upright conscience can long bear the strain which is thus put upon it.

"This then is, as I apprehend it, my exact case; I cannot any longer be exposed, by the exigency of my position, to be called upon to refuse solicited fellowship to christians, in other respects upright and blameless, not because they hold Mr. Newton's doctrine, or have the least leaning towards it, but because they cannot abjure all association with those who at some time or other have received into fellowship persons, who in some way or other have been connected with Mr. Newton's doctrine:—while I at the same time more than fear that there is such an approximation of your own doctrine towards it as would lead nineteen persons out of twenty, of ordinary minds, if they duly considered it, to pronounce it to be mainly the same thing.

"Such severity may have been necessary heretofore—I do not pronounce upon it—but I do not feel myself able, as things are, any longer to carry it out.

"I write this in all brotherly affection and confidence, and I trust to your christian candour to put a right construction upon it. It is not for me to say what you *ought* to do, because I cannot put myself in your position; I only suggest that I think you might, very consistently, accord to Hall his desire, that you should withdraw the papers on '*The Sufferings of Christ*:' at least that

part of them in which the doctrines inculcated are treated. This would be acknowledged by us both as a fruit of God's gracious mercy to us in our distress, and would set his mind and my own at rest upon the subject.

"By your own shewing, it has nothing to do with the faith of a christian directly. These are your words, in answer to the question whether the first two kinds of suffering explain all that the Psalms contain in reference to the sufferings of Christ: "They do give all that we have to say to as christians, and hence the difficulty many christians find in entering into anything further.' As to your explanations I have heard and read them again and again, without removing in the least degree the real difficulty of the doctrine, as presented in your published statements. I read most carefully your explanations to correspondents in the '*Bible Treasury*,' before I wrote to you in the beginning of February, and I have read them equally attentively since, especially to see if I could find any relief from the pressure of your statements as to Christ's being under wrath from God not atoningly, (for this you have certainly stated, as well as that he was smitten of God not atoningly,) and also as to his entering into the exercises (having the *experience* as I think) of persons imperfectly instructed in grace and at a moral distance from God—but I have found I think the pressure rather increased. I know that you have not said *in terms*—that 'Christ was at a moral distance from God in order to learn the feelings of men who are.' I speak only of what I think the terms in which you have expressed yourself involve."—p. 6-9.

"My difficulty lies in your having put the Son of God under 'wrath and indignation,' and 'smiting from God,' and confession of sins too, not in atonement—not vicariously—not as a substitute—but I must say *personally*—albeit it was what you call 'governmental wrath.' Still it was wrath that the Son of God was under, and 'a wrath that but for atonement would have coalesced in final wrath.' I don't urge the consequences of this putting of this solemn matter; but I do ask what am I to do with this doctrine which your language unequivocally teaches? Is this right about Christ? Far as your intentions and thoughts may be from re-producing a modification of Newton's doctrine, I ask what is this but the *penalty* of connection with the 'exiled family?'"—p. 12-13.

"The link of connection between your doctrine and Newton's, you yourself have forged, so that you need not resort to 'the devil' to put the thought into my head. You have done it thus: You make your doctrine and his distinctive of a true and a false Christ. You take the worst features of his (not unjustly), and the best features of your own (not designedly), to show it; and then you bring the whole force of this distinction to bear upon the severest course of discipline that I think was ever pursued in the church of God. Now if the

necessity of the one's position, and the *voluntariness* of the other's had been only used as a general distinction between the two to guide the judgment of people, I for one should not have reclaimed. But when it is made the sole basis of our differential communion, the sole ground of an unyielding and unsparing discipline, it becomes the conscience, it forces it, to look a little more deeply into the matter. And further, if your doctrine has given any ground of a suspected approach to the other, it is all the more imperative. It will be necessary to bring into the balance, on the one side, every one of your inculcated expressions, as giving the sum of what you teach; and on the other side to give a place to any mitigating expressions (if there be any) on the part of Mr. Newton: Let any one in his civil capacity imagine the action of a law that compelled him to separate himself in every possible way from a black man because he was black; and at the same time compelled his association with a colored man, and to pronounce him to be *white*. The hardship would not be in thinking the black man black—about that all are agreed, but in thinking the colored man to be absolutely white; and it would be aggravated still further if one had to enforce this judgment upon other people under severe penalties, in spite of their remonstrances.

“If you throw off all responsibility as to this on the brethren and say ‘it is their discipline,’ I can only say it recalls a passage in ‘*Gibbon’s Decline and Fall*,’ which I read in my youth—‘The Roman Cæsars surrounded their throne with clouds and darkness humbly professing themselves the accountable ministers of the senate, whose decrees they at the same time *dictated* and *obeyed*.’ Now I believe most thoroughly, as you say, that your feelings and desires are to be the servant of all, and to be yourself anything or nothing so they may be helped on their heavenly road. But this is only one side of the actual truth. Your circular letter did inaugurate our present position and discipline—and on the very point of the doctrine in question. But I need not say more on this. The history is patent. As to people being delivered from connection with ‘Bethesda’—and ‘loose principles’ (I am afraid of these phrases, so ambiguous and undefined)—I can rejoice heartily when it is by the power of your ministry. It stamps no currency on the abstract principle in question. If you had been on ‘the other side’—provided always people are not indifferent to Christ and holiness and true doctrine—they would have had to speak of their deliverances too. God would have blessed your single-hearted desire for Christ’s glory amongst them in spite of the professed, and in some respects important, differences of ecclesiastical principles.”
—p. 16-17.

“That there *is* a doctrine spread over the pages you have written on the sufferings of Christ, that, in the fair construction of sentences, when gathered up, is equivalent to what I have stated in the extract from my letter which you have quoted, is to me *demonstrable*; and that you *hold* a doctrine on the sufferings of Christ, which if you reject in

the terms of its statement by others, you do not care to state in more than the half-enigmatical terms I have referred to, as employed by yourself, it is impossible for me not to believe.

"However, it may shorten debate if I say at once, that my convictions compel me to reject your whole premises as a valid ground for your conclusions concerning the sufferings of Christ, as presented in your third division of that solemn subject. I object, *in limine*, that a whole class of the sufferings of Christ based wholly on the theory of a non-existent, future prophetic Jewish remnant, should be forced upon me as divinely taught in Scripture; while the author of them at the same time acknowledges that they have nothing to do with the grounds of the common christian faith, as taught by the apostles. I object to it as the doctrine of *development*, on the most sacred subject, and in the most mischievous form. It is development, no doubt, from professedly Old Testament sources:—but still it is *development*, and that of Christ; and I must hold it on that ground to be self-judged, according to the apostolic canon, 'let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father.'

"Your doctrine is not that which we have heard from the beginning.

"You may not have heard of it, but your doctrine is already bearing its bitter fruits. In one gathering Christ's position under God's governmental dealings, was presented in terms so correspondent to those of Mr. Newton, that the doctrine would have been imputed to that source, only the young man who unconsciously was treading this ground, was known not to have read Mr. N.'s writings, nor to have been ever associated with those who had. And I know for certain also, that some younger brethren in a meeting for their mutual edification lately, in reading the history of the crucifixion, were apportioning out carefully the sufferings of Gethsemane to the Jewish remnant—and those of the Cross to the Church. I know that this will be as great a sorrow to you as it is to me."—p. 20-21.

"A great deal may be conceded to Mr. D. I have been willing all along to concede much to him. But will he ask me, or will those who in London have stood godfathers to his doctrine, ask me to concede that an argument may be good at one time for the *rejection* of a doctrine, and at another time (ten years after) make nothing against its *reception*? I leave them and him to settle the consistency of this, while I pass to another point of my examination.

"If there be one thing clearer than another it is this, that the revelation which God has given us in the Scriptures addresses itself to people of common understandings, and not to the subtle-minded and the erudite. Erudition and metaphysical subtlety may have their place in the explication of the divine word, but it is *prima facie* argument against the truth of any doctrine when the grounds of it are invested with clouds and mystery. That is not a true scriptural

doctrine the basis of which in scripture cannot be made plain to the apprehensions of plain people. But Mr. D. has said that "not one in a hundred of the brethren understands my doctrine." I know not whether he says this in commendation of it or not, but from all I have met with I am disposed to think that his verdict is perfectly true.

"But then there results a double injury from enforcing this doctrine as true—an injury to the *consciences* of those who understand, and reject it; and an injury to the *souls* of those who without understanding adopt it."—p. 24-25.

"These doctrines, as I have shown, are the doctrines of 'development,' by which they are in the outset self-judged, and self-condemned. But they are much more than this. They have come to be in *fact*—I do not say in *purpose*—the distinctive ground of communion with all those that are especially associated with Mr. D. [I do not like to say 'the Darbyites,' though it might save circumlocution, and I think that they have fairly earned the title]. The case is this:—One teacher amongst the brethren brought in an array of doctrines concerning the sufferings and experiences of the Lord Jesus Christ, derived, as we have learned, from his study of the Psalms; and demanded for them a reception as presenting a fuller development of Christ than the New Testament contains. Another teacher, from his counter-study of the Psalms, has brought in *also* an array of doctrines on precisely the same subjects—viz: the sufferings and experiences of our Lord— which he demands shall be received as the presentation of 'a true Christ,' in opposition to the other, who is declared to have presented 'a false one.' As a matter of history the present *distinctive* communion of Mr. D.'s followers commenced by the rejection of the one system of doctrines, eighteen years ago, and the rejection of the congregation of Bethesda Chapel, Bristol, on account of these doctrines; and it has been carried on ever since on the basis of the same continued opposition. And now, as it seems, there is to be added the reception, and enforcement as far as is dared, of the other system, which is brought in with the greater inconsistency by its author because it is based upon grounds, which when opposing his former antagonist, he utterly condemned. How far the one approximates to the other, it will be the work of subsequent pages to show. What I ask here is:— Amidst all this puzzle of contending systems, about this most solemn of all subjects, why should I not as 'a little child' of John's Epistle, earnestly refuse to receive either? Is it not enough that they are alike opposed to that which has been 'heard from the beginning'?

* * * * *

"As to these doctrines, however, it might be replied, Why do you not let them alone, and content yourself by the individual reputation of them? I would gladly have done this, and so have avoided the thorny path I am now pursuing, if such liberty had been granted to me. But it was not. Mr. D., it is true, has urged as a reason for quietness on the subject, that he is not understood by the brethren,

made plain to the
l that "not one
me." I know not
at from all I have
perfectly true.
ing this doctrine
understand, and
hout understand-

nes of 'develop-
d self-condemned.
e to be in *fact*—
ommunion with
[I do not like to
ion, and I think
is:—One teacher
is concerning the
, derived, as we
manded for them
rist than the New
nter-study of the
on precisely the
s of our Lord—
tation of 'a true
o have presented
ctive communion
the one system
the congregation
doctrines; and it
same continued
ed the reception,
system, which is
or because it is
r antagonist, he
to the other, it
I ask here is:—
his most solemn
John's Epistle,
h that they are
the beginning?'

* * *
ed, Why do you
individual repu-
so have avoided
d been granted
d as a reason for
y the brethren,

and that he does not *teach* the doctrines. But has he not sternly refused to withdraw them? and has he, in the course of eight years, done any thing but reassert and reprint them? Besides, he is unable to impart his own discretion to his followers, or to impose on them his own rules of caution. The seeds which he has sown broadcast in such a soil are ripening on every side, where the special influence of his piety and genius and labours and name prevail. His seconds may indeed be driven to say, when met by opposition to these doctrines, that 'they are but Mr. Darby's views, and not to be contended for as vital truth.' [Did any one ever hear that they were '*only Mr. Newton's views*,' when his doctrines were being examined and condemned?] But whenever they find a willing ear instead of opposition, objections are anticipated, obnoxious features are softened down, analogies are suggested, and no explanation is spared, nor gloss withheld, which is calculated to give them the character of 'vital truth' to unsuspecting minds. If I had found these doctrines latent and inert, it would have been my wisdom to leave them so, whatever mischief I might forebode they would work another day. But this was far from being the case. Mr. D. acknowledges they have no ground in the New Testament, and says they have nothing to do with the common faith of Christians; and yet with a fatuity, as it seems to me, that is perfectly unaccountable, insists on there being received as affording the sole ground and direction for the administration of the most active course of discipline that is being carried on by the brethren as a Christian community.

"I think in this I do not assert too much. For it must be remembered that since these writings gave occasion for their author to be charged with holding a modification of Mr. Newton's error, the position of those who are associated with him has been a very painful and a very anomalous one. It has of necessity kept the two systems constantly in view—especially on the part of the leaders—except in cases where the fiat of authority was felt to be enough as a ground of action, and the dictum of a leader, once pronounced, a sufficient guide for the judgment in every possible case. So that now, if the brethren continue the stringency of their discipline on this point, I can conceive of their doing so only on two grounds. They may either have fairly examined the two systems, and satisfied themselves that there is nothing in common between them, but that the one presented perfect truth and the other perfect error; or failing this, they may think it enough that one of the writers has himself said, the one system presents 'a false Christ,' and the other 'a true one;' and so act on this authority. Either way my position is made out that this doctrine, in the one form or the other, implicates itself with the whole ground of the communion of Mr. D.'s followers, and is the only rule of discipline—or exclusion from fellowship—in cases that are of everyday occurrence.

"It is surely an extraordinary position for a Christian Teacher to find himself in, or to be allowed by others to assume—that after having acknowledged that the system of doctrines he has presented, in a special division of *Christ's Sufferings*, has nothing to do with the com-

mon faith of Christians, should nevertheless refuse to withdraw these doctrines, or modify the statement of them, though he is told, in the deepest sorrow, that his refusal to do so will occasion still further divisions, on the score of a refused complicity with error—but that they should still remain as the distinctive ground of Christian communion, and, as I have said, the only ground of a discipline that has reached hundreds of Christians in the most painful form, who it must be acknowledged abhor the doctrines which this discipline was intended to guard against, equally with those by whom it is enforced! I confess that it is a position which—from whatever motives maintained—whether from a determination that no one shall dispute his will, or from a sense of what is demanded by his own consistency, or from the fear of shaking those notions of infallibility with which his followers have invested him—is utterly irreconcilable with any principles of Christianity that I have ever found presented in the Divine Word. I am satisfied that there cannot be two conclusions on this point amongst Christians who exercise their judgment in the fear of God and in reference to the authority of His Word, and whose minds the obliquities of a false system have not warped.

“But to the doctrines themselves. First of all it must be considered what was their origin. They took their rise, not from any direct Divine revelation containing them at all, though this is the only admissible ground of any doctrine. But this is not even pretended as their basis. They were originated simply to meet an *intellectual necessity*. An adopted prophetic theory, and an interpretation of the Psalms in consistency with that theory, alike in the case of B. W. N. and of J. N. D. originated the respective doctrines. But for a prophetic theory and the exegesis of the Psalms, in neither case would they have been ever thought of. Mr. N. first in order of time attempted to meet this necessity, and with what results we have sorrowfully seen. Mr. D., following in his wake, has also attempted to meet it, and with what results we are beginning to see.

“This perhaps may be the proper place for the introduction of an extract from a well-known Christian writer, which may be thought to throw some light on this particular point:

“The principal errors that have disturbed the church may, no doubt, fairly be attributed to motives springing from the pride or perverse dispositions of the human heart; but often a mere intellectual enthusiasm has been the real source of false doctrine.

“Errors generated in this manner possess, commonly, some aspect of beauty, or of greatness, or of philosophical simplicity to recommend them; for as they were framed amid a pleasurable excitement of the mind, so they will have power to convey a kindred delight to others. And such exorbitances of doctrine, when advanced by men of powerful or richly furnished minds, conceal their deformity and evil tendency beneath the attractions of intelligence. But the very same extravagances and showy paradoxes, when caught up by inferior spirits,

presently lose their garb, not only of beauty, but of decency, and show themselves in the loathsome nakedness of error. The mischief of heresy is often more active and conspicuous in second hands than in those of its authors; and the reason is that it is usually the child of intellectualists—an inoffensive order of men; but no sooner has it been brought forth and reared, than it joins itself, as by instinct, to minds of vulgar quality, and in that society soon learns the dialect of impiety and licentiousness. The heresiarch, though he may be more blameworthy, is often much less audacious, and less corrupted, than his followers; for he perhaps, is only an enthusiast; they have become fanatics.'

“The heresy that is now being introduced (for heresy it has become in the legitimate application of the term) will be no exception to the generic character which this writer has given of it. I do not for special reasons here turn aside to the way in which it has already expanded and exfoliated in the second hands who are in Mr. D.'s absence seeking to give it currency. It is only required to wait a little and its character will become apparent.

“Together then with his special prophetic theory Mr. D. has adopted a new principle in the interpretation of the Psalms—new to himself as well as new to other interpreters—which demands that Christ should be viewed as smitten by God, *not in atonement*: and even cut off by the hand of God in governmental wrath, and in suffering on the cross—not in substitution, not in atonement.”—p. 27-32.

“It was his prophetic theory, and its accompanying principle of interpretation of the Psalms, which led Mr. B. W. N. through a *terra-incognita* of Christ's sufferings, that issued in his revolting christian minds generally from him, and his getting the brand-mark of heresy attached to his doctrine, and obloquy to his name. Mr. D.'s theory of prophecy, though different from Mr. N.'s, with its accompanying principle of interpretation of the Psalms, led him also through this same *terra-incognita* of Christ's sufferings, and the result to him is, that many Christians who have hitherto been helped and profited by his writings have become, through his new doctrines, startled and alarmed. And if it may be thought that, through higher abilities and greater wariness, he has escaped the melancholy fate of his predecessor, one thing is certain, that he has thrown up no causeway on which it will be safe for any Christian to travel after him—and he has left no map of the road which would not lead into infinite perils if attempted to be followed. Every effort of man's mind to analyse the person of Christ, of necessity ends in the same result. ‘No man knoweth the Son but the Father!’

“Any comparison of the two systems, I know, is greatly resented by Mr. D., who publicly declared that those who instituted it were ‘fools or knaves.’ But this aside. It will be thought by Christians, who *do* think, that those two systems are not so very wide apart, which

both commenced in a prophetic theory; are both based on a peculiar interpretation of the Psalms; have both their distinctive remnants; and have both led to a common result, viz., that of each author having been led by his system to give a kind of *fifth gospel*—a gospel supplementary to the gospels of the four Evangelists—a gospel of the inner-sufferings of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nobody can deny that these are common characteristics of the two systems; however dissimilar in some other respects they may be.”—p. 34-35.

“I am not at present arguing the point whether Mr. D.’s doctrine concerning the sufferings of Christ is false and heretical or not. I am not called upon to do so. I have only to do with one point, as I have already said once and again, namely, its approximation to Mr. Newton’s doctrine so far as to make it impossible for *me*—whatever others may do—to take the one doctrine as the exposition of ‘a true Christ,’ and the other of ‘a false one.’ But this is the reception for both the one and the other which Mr. D. demands. This doctrine, whatever its character may be proved to be, is no barren metaphysical dogma: Mr. D. knows it well. The living, inexorable law of discipline which guards the grounds of fellowship of all who are especially associated with him, took its rise eighteen years ago in the rigid exclusion of the one doctrine; and it will be hard to show how it can be righteously maintained, in conjunction with the acceptance and maintenance of the other. At any rate it is impossible for *me* to regard any longer this law of exclusion as having anything whatever to do with the maintenance of *purity of doctrine*: on which ground it was at first ostensibly inaugurated.”—p. 36-37.

“I had no notion when I wrote the last sentence how readily the followers of Mr. D. could vault over what seemed to me an insuperable difficulty, and a contradiction to the force of every passage in which the cross is doctrinally used in the New Testament. I am told that there were three hours on the cross during which our Lord was bearing sufferings *not atoning*. There were also three hours in which he was enduring *atoning* sufferings, viz., from the sixth to the ninth hour. He then emerged from these sufferings, and dismissed his soul in peace. In terms, this was expressed to me by a young gentleman fresh from Mr. D.’s inspirations, and who assured me that his own views and Mr. D.’s perfectly coincided. To my sorrow I have since learned it from Christians of unquestioned piety and intelligence, and have heard it also in all simplicity avowed by the uninstructed poor. If there were nothing else, the prevalence of this doctrine alone would utterly debar me from sitting down at the Lord’s table where by possibility all my spiritual sensibilities and reverence for my Lord’s adorable sufferings, which none but God can fathom, would be in danger of being outraged by its announcement. I make no farther comment on the profanity of these abhorred speculations, where every heart should wonder and adore. But I ask any Christian person to

based on a peculiar
distinctive remnants;
each author having
—a gospel supple-
gospel of the inner-
denity that these are
ever dissimilar in

Mr. D.'s doctrine
etical or not. I am
one point, as I have
to Mr. Newton's
whatever others may
a true Christ,' and
n for both the one
trine, whatever its
staphysical dogma:
of discipline which
pecially associated
id exclusion of the
can be righteously
nd maintenance of
regard any longer
er to do with the
nd it was at first

he how readily the
me an insuperable
passage in which
I am told that
Lord was bearing
s in which he was
he ninth hour. He
his soul in peace.
leman fresh from
his own views and
e since learned it
igence, and have
structed poor. If
trine alone would
e table where by
ce for my Lord's
om, would be in
make no farther
ions, where every
ristian person to

consider what is involved in this pretended accuracy and refinement in dealing with the cross. First, atonement is not simply by the cross—though it is always used by the New Testament writers as the very symbol of atonement. It is wrought only by three hours of specific suffering upon the cross. Next, it was accomplished without *Christ's death*;—communion, as it is said, having been restored before Christ dismissed his spirit, which was suspended during the period of his bearing wrath. Next, we have atonement without blood-shedding, [but 'without the shedding of blood is no remission'] for Christ's blood was not shed until after his death, and from his pierced side 'forthwith came there out blood and water.' Let the brethren see to it in what these fatal speculations, so glibly and flippantly uttered, as I have heard them, will assuredly land them!

"Here, by this system, people are taught—and not in vain—to divide the cross. Under its influence they give away to a future Jewish remnant under Antichrist the sufferings of Gethsemane. Perhaps they have assigned to the slain remnant the three hours of Christ's non-atonement sufferings, to shew that he can sympathize with them in death, too, because his death in atonement was not sufficient. But I will not pursue these unhallowed speculations any further. Infinitely more near to the emotions awakened by the reading of this history in the gospels is the language of the 'Litany':—'By thine agony and bloody sweat; by thy cross and passion; by thy precious death and burial; by thy glorious resurrection and ascension,' &c. At least we have no refinement here, and all is left in its integrity. But this system stops not at the dividing of the cross. It divides also the person of Him who hung upon it. If not, what is the meaning of the following passage? 'Christ took human life in grace; and in this life he took sin upon him. Sin belongs, so to speak, to this life in which Christ knew no sin. But he dies—he quits this life. He is dead to sin, he has done with sin in having done with the life to which sin belonged. Raised up again by the power of God, he lives in a new condition, into which sin cannot enter, being left behind with *the life he left behind*.'—*Synopsis*, Vol. III., p. 454. This is not the way Scripture speaks of Christ's death, or of Christ's life. It never, so far as I know, speaks of '*a life he left behind*.' It could not, for he was 'the eternal life which was manifested unto us.' Moreover, he himself says in the prospect of his death—his death for sin, and his 'death to sin' also—'I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man 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.' That is it is asserted that the life which he laid down was the life that he took again; and not that he 'left one life behind,' and took another. The life in which the Lord Jesus lived on earth, he lives in heaven. There was no '*life that he left behind*.' He lived on earth once, and he lives in heaven now—and, however different the conditions, it is the same life. To say that it is not, is to say that he was not always '*the eternal life*,' or to divide the person of the Lord. Such reasonings,

I am satisfied, can only lead souls, that are not specially kept of God, either to socinianism, or a subtle infidelity, or to seek repose for their thoughts in the infallibility of faith which Rome professes to present.

“But this is a digression, which I should not have made except for the conviction that both points arise from that excessive theorizing on the Word of God which it is my object, as strongly as I can, to condemn.

“I now resume. To the extract given above on the 69th Psalm, Mr. D. adds, ‘Here *the difficulty presents itself fully!*’ I cannot but add it is a difficulty which ought to have led him not only to pause, but to suspect the soundness of his hypothesis, when it required him to demand that Christ’s confession of sins, and the cross itself, should be distinguished from his atoning work! If it required all Mr. D.’s power of abstraction to master this difficulty for himself, what of the mass of his readers? And on what ground does he demand that it shall be received as the basis of a new doctrine about the sufferings of Christ, if it be not on the ground of his own infallibility? It is plain that he *was* arrested at this point. And it is equally plain that this is the point of his divergence.

“In proceeding with his remarks on this psalm, he says, ‘We read verse 26, they persecute him whom thou hast smitten, and speak to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.’ Here we have evidently more than man’s persecutions. They take advantage of God’s hand upon the sorrowing one to add to his burden and grief. *This is not atonement, but there is sorrow and smiting from God.* Hence we find the sense of sins (ver. 5) though of course in the case of Christ they were not his own personally but specially the nation’s—in a certain sense we may say ours, but especially the nation’s sin. But we have the clear proof that they are not atoning sufferings; because instead of suffering in the place of others, so that they should not have one drop of that cup of wrath to drink, others are associated with the Lord here in them. ‘They persecute him whom thou hast smitten, and speak to the grief of *those** whom thou hast wounded.’ When men are wounded, too—when Christ is the companion with them—not a substitute for them—then atonement is not wrought, nor the wrath of condemnation endured. Yet *God has smitten and wounded.* It is not merely that man has caused suffering.—‘*Sufferings,*’ p. 36.

“Now here, in the first place, it is to be observed that we have not Christ’s association with the remnant at all, but with the nation. Mr. D. says we have here ‘especially the nation’s sin.’ But what has become of the speciality of the sufferings and experiences of a future remnant, to meet which these sufferings and experiences of Christ have been with so much labour invented? They have vanished entirely; and we are told that these sufferings of Christ which are not atoning, are for sins, which ‘in a certain sense are *our sins*, but

*The Septuagint version, which the Latin Vulgate literally follows, gives an entirely different turn to the passage, taking away every shadow of the thought of *others* being associated with Christ in the psalm.

especially kept of God, seek repose for their professes to present. have made except for excessive theorizing on strongly as I can, to

on the 69th Psalm, 'Ally!' I cannot but not only to pause, when it required him to cross itself, should required all Mr. D.'s himself, what of the he demand that it about the sufferings infallibility? It is equally plain that

, he says, 'We read written, and speak to we have evidently stage of God's hand grief. *This is not God.* Hence we find case of Christ they tion's—in a certain sin. But we have us; because instead should not have one associated with the thou hast smitten, wounded.' When tion with them—not ht, nor the wrath of wounded. It is not s,' p. 36.

ed that we have not th the nation. Mr. in.' But what has eriences of a future periences of Christ ey have vanished Christ which are not e are *our sins*, but

llows, gives an entirely thought of others being

especially the nation's sin.' Then, after all, this 'sorrow and smiting from God which is not atonement,' is for our sins, but especially the sins of the Jewish nation. Need I proceed any further? There is nothing lacking in this elaborate system but *truth*; and it is therefore a vain thing to seek in it the *consistency* of truth."—p. 40-44.

"Mr. Newton said that Christ had the experiences of what an unconverted elect person ought to have, if he felt justly. But this, whatever absurdity there may be in the proposition, does not come up, by far, to the passage I have just cited. It may be said that it is impossible Mr. D. should hold a doctrine so monstrous as this. I trust it is. But that it is what he has written, both as to its terms and its connexions, any one may satisfy himself by reading the paper referred to in '*The Bible Treasury*':—a paper which if Mr. D. did not actually write, he adopts as his own, and says '*the truth*' is mere clearly stated in it than elsewhere. Now when some of Mr. D.'s oldest fellow-labourers have tried their utmost with him to get these expressions corrected, or withdrawn, but in vain, it will readily be conceded by all whom devotion to a party has not blinded that, if he does not hold these doctrines, there must be something dreadfully wrong and out-of-joint somewhere.

'I must here, for Mr. D's own sake, return to a point which I have already noticed in my letters to him. He says (p. 59 of '*The Sufferings of Christ*,') 'I got one paper stating that my *language* is to the effect that Christ suffered from God apart from atonement. This surprised me somewhat, and I looked at the papers and I found, 'But the moment he (Christ) is suffering from God because of atonement for sin, it is exactly the contrary.' The sophism contained in this reply has already been pointed out in my letters. It is here noticed solely as to the question of fact. The objector had said 'your *language* is to the effect that Christ suffered from God apart from atonement.' Now this is Mr. D's *language*, 'This is not atonement, but there is sorrow and smiting from God.' Now if it were a doctrine that he intended at that time to maintain, why does he say, 'It surprised me somewhat,' when it was imputed to him? But if he thought it wrong, why did he not fairly confess that he had stated in '*language*' what he did not mean, instead of mystifying so plain a matter by quoting from one paper, language that is utterly contradicted by the language of another? Even an Apostle's course was not so transcendental that he could not stoop to so common a point of morality as to show that his word toward the Corinthians was 'not yea and nay.'—p. 46-47.

"Now let any Christian look into these details of the Gospels, or even as they are amplified in Mr. D's pages as referred to, and let him say how much he finds of 'such suffering for example as is seen in the case of Job'—a man under the discipline of God for his good!

And let him ask what consonance he finds between these sufferings of our blessed Lord, and the sufferings of a Jewish remnant judged by God and chastened for their sin, under Antichrist for their rejection of their Messiah? And let him ask especially, in what way or at what point is Christ here presented as suffering under God's government, so that 'to Him government became wrath'? I confess, that turning to the Gospels for the instruction of my spirit in the real sufferings of Christ, I have not only been instructed and humbled in adoring wonder, but I have found it the most effectual way to the entire dispossession of my mind of all this system of imaginary and factitious sufferings, by which these simple and affecting accounts of God's Spirit have been overlaid. To me this dissection and mutilation of the Cross is what my whole spiritual nature shrinks back from, as alike contrary to Scripture, and fatal to the reverence which becomes the soul in contemplating this profoundest mystery of Divine, redeeming love.

1 "But this kind of speculation has especial attractions for the pruriency of the human mind, though prejudicial in the highest degree to the simplicity of faith. From what I have already seen I am satisfied, that if God's special mercy do not interpose to prevent it, these doctrines will soon become the distinguishing dogma of the followers of Mr. D. They are held forth and defended mainly on the ground of his superior intelligence in Scripture. Already their reception is looked upon as a proof of higher illumination. In this way there is a premium offered to the vain and immature to profess them. In some instances they are boasted in as 'new and glorious truths?' But this is common to every heresy, which presents its esoteric truths for the illuminated. It seems as if every feature that accompanied the reception of Mr. Newton's doctrine at first, must needs attend the resuscitation of it in its present form. Mr. McAdam's preface to a tract exposing Mr. Newton's doctrine, as quoted by Captain Hall in his pamphlet entitled "*Grief upon Grief*," might for its appositeness have been written but yesterday, instead of near twenty years ago. Human nature repeats itself. The precise laudations of the one doctrine have been revived in order to be applied to the other; and the very same denials and evasions in its defenders have also painfully reappeared.

"But let me say to my younger brethren especially, for whom I am bound to care, that profound intelligence and superior illumination show themselves, in connection with divine truth, in superior ability to present the grounds in Scripture for whatever doctrines are sought to be enforced. Archbishop Usher once said to his clergy, 'You see, my brethren, how much learning is needful to make these things plain.' The profoundest truths of *theology* are capable of being presented in the simplest and most colloquial style; however different it may be in writings on human science. The Scriptures generally are an example of this, and the writings of the Apostle John are a special instance. In nothing perhaps has Mr. D. in his long life of

n these sufferings of
remnant judged by
t for their rejection
in what way or at
nder God's govern-
'? I confess, that
y spirit in the real
ted and humbled in
ffectual way to the
m of imaginary and
affecting accounts of
ection and mutilation
rinks back from, as
e reverence which
t mystery of Divine,

attractions for the
n the highest degree
already seen I am
erpose to prevent it,
shing dogma of the
ended mainly on the
ure. Already their
lumination. In this
immature to profess
'new and glorious
which presents its
f every feature that
ctrine at first, must
m. Mr. McAdam's
rine, as quoted by
n *Grief*," might for
stead of near twenty
recise laudations of
plied to the other;
efenders have also

ally, for whom I am
uperior illumination
in superior ability
doctrines are sought
is clergy. 'You see,
make these things
capable of being
, however different
riptures generally
postle John are a
in his long life of

religious controversy, been more distinguished than by his ability in bringing the plain Scripture testimony to bear against what he is opposing. It is this peculiarity, when he has had Scripture with him, that has brought him off victorious in most of the conflicts in which he has been engaged. But in the maintenance of his present doctrines it is exactly the reverse. No one can deny that these are based on some *occult* meaning of Scripture which no one hitherto but himself has been able to penetrate. Consequently when proof from Scripture is demanded for them, there is none to offer, but such as assumes the whole question, and instead of being a proof, needs itself to be proved. I know of no ground for the reception of these doctrines but that of Mr. D's alleged deeper insight into the divine word. If I were prepared to commit myself to such a principle as this, of course I must be prepared, irrespective of what Scripture appears to teach, to go all lengths to which his superior genius will engage to carry me. I am not prepared to travel this road with even Mr. D. as my guide. How can I tell what further developments of doctrine his active mind may make in the next ten years, contradictory to what he now announces; as his present speculations are contradictory to what went before?

"I have not felt myself particularly called upon in this examination to prove that these doctrines are false and heretical. It is enough if I have shown that they make any approach to those formerly held by Mr. Newton. Mr. D. has long ago settled for himself, and for others I imagine, what character he thinks attaches to *them*. Consequently it would be the extreme of perversity to conclude that, because I have receded at all costs from what Mr. D. has taught concerning the sufferings of Christ, I have made any advance toward that which was propagated by Mr. N. Though in justice I am bound to say, that amidst all the apparent confusion and contradictions of *his* statements about the position and experiences of the Lord Jesus in connection with Israel, his care to guard against imputing to Christ the presence or possibility of actual sin is a plain proof that, however wrong his doctrines, it was no part of his intention to defame Christ. And there is this redeeming feature in his system—which is absent from the one I am examining—he has at least *left the Cross alone*. But his system was a repetition of what was exhibited in Irvingism. The sincerity of Irving could not be questioned. Nor could it be questioned that it was his purpose to exalt Christ by his doctrines. But his effort—as is the case with all such—was like that of Uzzah in stretching forth his hands to support the ark. In other words, he attempted to travel through the same *terra-incognita* of Christ's sufferings that I have already noticed, where he became lost and engulfed; while he gave notoriety to his pitiable fall by eminent powers of mind, and many shining accomplishments. I need not add that I have no thought of its being the intention of Mr. D. to do anything but honour Christ by what he has written, any more than I have in its examination. But he has undertaken to analyse the person and sufferings of the Son of God, and there is no wonder at his having utterly faltered in the attempt."—p. 53-56.

“My object has not been to create a faction against Mr. D., or to attempt to stop him in his work. With him I have been perfectly open; and he was the first to know of my difficulties, however indifferent he may have been about their removal. But I have read the apostolic injunction, ‘Keep thyself pure.’ I look to no one on earth to countenance or support me in my act. I count upon the goodness of God to give me some measure of fellowship with His people, and an opportunity to minister to them, in which my whole life has been spent. Where and in what circumstances that may be, I know not. I only know this—that if at all, it must be, as I have said, where I shall have Christ as my only Lord, and His word alone as my guide. I have no controversy with the principles on which I have acted during the greater portion of my life: much less have I anything to bring against those Christians with whom I have been so long in unbroken brotherly affection. How should I? Neither with Mr. D. is it any personal question. As a servant of Christ I esteem and honour him, and ever shall. Like many others, I am greatly his debtor in the truth; and it is with no grudging spirit that I make the acknowledgment. If his present position amongst brethren is such as I believe no Apostle would ever assume, this may be the fault of his followers rather than his own. Still he is not lord of my conscience, and mine is the clearest case of conscience. I cannot any longer pursue to ‘the tenth generation’ people who have no more to do with Mr. Newton’s doctrine than I have, nor any more leaning towards it—merely because they cannot endorse Mr. D.’s decree, issued eighteen years ago, as to the way in which the evil must be dealt with if they would maintain themselves in his association. My heart has been withered by the necessity of schooling Christians—young and old, ignorant and well-informed—in the mysteries of an act of discipline of eighteen years standing, and in endeavouring to show the present bearings of ‘the Bethesda question’ and ‘the neutral party’—hateful phrases as they have become. At first, of course, all this was pursued as necessary to the maintenance of purity of doctrine and of ‘a true Christ’ amongst those who took part with Mr. D. in his position, and principles, and acts; and I honestly thought it so myself. But this guise is now utterly and rudely stripped away.”—p. 58-59.

2nd. Mr. P. F. Hall,—one of Mr. Darby’s oldest and most efficient helpers, and for many years known as an able minister of Christ, ere any troubles commenced—in his Dialogue of 50 pages, entitled “Grief upon Grief.”

“M——. F., I hear a report that the ties which have so long bound you to others in worship and service, have been weakening for some time, and are now broken. Is this true?”

against Mr. D., or to have been perfectly just, however indifferent I have read the fact to no one on earth, but upon the goodness of His people, and whose whole life has been a witness to what may be, I know not. I have said, where I stand alone as my guide, and I have acted during my life, I have done nothing to bring me so long in unbroken fellowship with Mr. D. is it any dishonour to them and honour himself, and only his debtor in the same way as I take the acknowledgment of such as I believe to be the fault of his followers, and mine, and conscience, and mine, and longer pursue to 'the glory of Mr. Newton's doctrine'—merely because I have said, sixteen years ago, as to what they would maintain, and been withered by the ignorant and well-meaning of eighteen years, and the bearing of 'the useful phrases as they are pursued as necessary to the true Christ' amongst us, and principles, and not in this guise is not

Darby's oldest and most known as an abolitionist commenced—in his own Grief."

"*F*— It is quite true, though you must not confound things at the very outset of your enquiries. Whatever may have enfeebled these ties, is quite distinct from that which has now broken them. In sadness indeed, and with the oppressive conviction that my great theory of subjection to the Holy Spirit, as dwelling in the church on earth, was practically abandoned, I yet should have gone on in my grief, had it not been that very false and injurious doctrines, as I think them to be, were taught and generally received as truth—and not as truth only, but as truth specially disclosed to them, and alike deep and wonderful. Nor is this all. So like are they to Mr. N.'s doctrines, that even had they not been as bad in themselves as I judge them to be, I should be quite unable to maintain the place of what is called testimony against Mr. N., while connected with those who hold what I think to be as bad.

"*M*. But your association with others was not merely for a testimony against Mr. N.?"

"*F*. Certainly not for that merely; but all ecclesiastical union—i.e. union in worship and service, was maintained on the understanding that while all other Christians might be admitted, any one, however remotely connected with him, or even indifferent to the danger of his doctrines, must be excluded as defiling.

"*M*. And did you not think this to be right and act as others did?"

"*F*. I do not admit the thought of defiling, but I do entirely that where there is false doctrine, or complicity with it, strong ground of censure should be maintained, even to separation if necessary; and it is just because I so think, that I now dare not remain in alliance with those who I believe teach doctrines which are quite as bad.

"*M*. Tell me then what these doctrines are which so offend you?"

"*F*. There are three to which I give the first place, and which are more than enough (if there were no others) to awaken grief and distress in the hearts of all Christians, and to justify—even to force me to the step I have taken.

"*First*:—That after Gethsemane and before the cross, our Lord was smitten by Jehovah as the shepherd of Israel (*Zec. xiii. 7*). That He had been lifted up by Jehovah to be Messiah, but that then, as 'identified' (see *Ps. lxxix.* in '*Present Testimony*') with the remnant of Israel (as Messiah), He was cast down, and cut off by the same divine hand, while meeting His indignation and wrath. That this wrath, which is called governmental, and which met Him then, went with Him to the cross, and there smote Him again, while it coalesced again with a deeper wrath, though of the same character, &c., &c.

* * * * *

"The *Second* deplorable error, as a necessary consequence of the first, is—That the throne of God, i.e. God acting in government or judicially, is made unrighteous—so that 'the righteous God who

which have so long been weakening for

loveth righteousness,' and to whom unjust balances are an abomination, is made to express indignation and wrath to one who was guiltless, and to cast down the throne and person of Messiah, and to cut off the one who was entitled to every throne and to all honour.

“*M.* But of course, as an atoning victim, and then it becomes righteous.

“*F.* No, *not atoningly*, or as a sin-bearer, but as suffering what was due to guilty Israel, as part of it; and in this way rendering Him unfit to be an atonement for that nation, or for any one else, by placing Him, *with others*, under divine inflictions and penalties, and so confounding all right and wrong by a governmental act.

“And *Thirdly*:—Giving our Lord the exercises of soul of the converted, or half-converted remnant of Israel—exercises which none but a sinner could have, though in some sort converted—making Him ‘enter into,’ or ‘pass through’ those painful and penitential exercises arising from a personal sense (on their part) of sin and wrong; and, further, giving Him to ‘enter into’ and share the sinful experiences of unbelief and distrust of God’s mercy—*i. e.*, to feel what they felt as penitent and only half-trusting sinners.

“*M.* Enough. If you can prove that this is taught, you have reason enough for what you do. Tell me where?

“*F.* The passages I quote to you are from the ‘*Synopsis*,’ and a Pamphlet on the ‘*Sufferings of Christ*,’ and ‘*The Present Testimony*,’—and from these but in part—though enough I should think to alarm and convince you.

“*M.* But there are many beautiful and true to set against them—are there not?

“*F.* Indeed there are. The first two classes of our Lord’s sufferings are admirably given, and there are beautiful contradictions and not a little confusion in the last, or third class. Still, the bad part is not like something fallen in accidentally and as out of place, and which may be taken away without danger. On the contrary, it is the living part and argument for the defence and proof of this comprehensive third class of our Lord’s sufferings—never heard of, I believe, till propounded, though in a different way, by Mr. N at Plymouth, and opposed at that time, as alike false and useless, by those who now teach it. It is a system, and a coherent system, formed out of a prophetic dogma, and interpretation of the Psalms, the lamentations of Jeremiah and one New Testament scripture to fit the dogma. And you will soon see that these are no careless, fragmentary statements, easily put aside; but the vital parts and proofs of a system—elaborate and well related in all its parts, and which does, as I think, what the old one Mr. N. did—destroy the meaning and value of our Lord’s expiator sacrifice, to maintain itself.

“Listen, then, to my first quotation, and weigh it well. It is from Psalm cii. in the ‘*Synopsis*.’ The verses in the Psalm itself are as follows:

are an abomination,
who was guiltless,
and to cut off the
honour.

and then it becomes

as suffering what
way rendering Him
one else, by placing
penalties, and so con-
act.

ercises of soul of the
exercises which none
verted—making Him
penitential exercises
sin and wrong; and
ne sinful experiences
o feel what they felt

is taught, you have

the 'Synopsis,' and
'Present Testimony,'—
ould think to alarm

to set against them

of our Lord's suffer-
l contradictions and
Still, the bad part is

ut of place, and which
rbitrary, it is the living

f this comprehensive
rd of, I believe, till
N at Plymouth, and

y those who now teach
ed out of a prophetic
ntations of Jeremiah

gma. And you will
statements, easily put
—elaborate and well

k, what the old one
our Lord's expiator

h it well. It is from
power of Satan in it; that which is used of God as the means of our
Psalm itself are asarning the difference between good and evil.' Again (p. 30):—

follow:—'I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with weeping, because of *Thine* indignation and *Thy* wrath: for *Thou* hast lifted me up, and cast me down. My days are like a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass. *He* weakened my strength in the way; he shortened my days. I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days,' &c. The 'Synopsis' says of this:—*The time is the immediate approach of the cross.* He looks to Jehovah, who casts Him down, whom He called to the place of the Messiah, but who now meets indignation and wrath. This is far beyond looking at suffering as coming from the hand of man. *Nor is it His expiatory work, though that which wrought it is here—the indignation and wrath. It is Himself, His own being cut off as a man.* In the original French Synopsis, it is, "Abandonne sous la Colere de Dieu,"—abandoned under the wrath of God. Again, in p. 66, of '*The Sufferings of Christ*':—'Though government and atonement for sin, are two distinct things, yet that government, and the wrath borne in atonement, would coalesce necessarily if atonement were not already made; for what can finally the government of God as to a sinner and his sins be?' Again, in Psalm xxxi. in '*Present Testimony*':—'I do not think v. 10 is expiatory, but as enduring in fact the consequences belonging to it according to the just government of God. It appears to me that *it is not in the aspect of atonement* that His sufferings are here viewed, but rather as *His own personal sufferings*, as taking part in the actual position of the remnant, being Himself this remnant in the perfection of the thoughts that became them, consequently exposed to the attacks of the wicked, of the enemy, and at the same time acknowledging all this as the just result of Israel's ways, the PENALTY of which He was bearing in grace. . . . His heart recognised the just hand of God in this state of things.' Verse 10 is, 'My life is spent with grief and my years with sighing. My strength faileth because of mine iniquity, and my bones are consumed.'—p. 5-10.

"But I will now go on, and quote to you the passages from the '*Sufferings of Christ*' (p. 26) on this last question, as a prominent feature in the third class of suffering.—'The third condition in which a man may be looked at morally, is 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 [that is, I suppose, a sinner not knowing the grace of God in his 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 seen in the case of Job. *Christ has passed through all these kinds of suffering*, only the last, of course, as a perfect being to learn it for others.' Again (p. 25):—This is the fruit of sin, under the government of God, in this world, and connected with the power of Satan in it; that which is used of God as the means of our Psalm itself are asarning the difference between good and evil.' Again (p. 30):—

‘Profitably learned in the knowledge of our wretchedness, guilt, sin, powerlessness against evil, even when we would what is good, &c. &c. Man might be made to ‘pass through’ it under the government of God, to learn what he was, what sin is, and what the power of evil, under which he has been lying, is.’

“These, then, are the exercises of soul which the remnant will ‘pass through.’ The expression, ‘passed through,’ is the same as given to our Lord. ‘Christ has passed through all these kinds of suffering.’

“*M.* I instinctively shrink from such thoughts, and I have seen others do so, but I can hardly explain why: but as to Job as an illustration of the remnant’s sufferings, and our Lord’s participation in them, I reply in the words of Mr. D. to Mr. N. in 1847:—‘But what were Job’s sorrows? Were they not personal discipline—Satan let loose at himself—his was no suffering on account of others—he was the occasion of his own sorrows (I do not speak of any type now) and confessed himself, when he saw God, to be a sinner, and repented in dust and ashes.’ And, of course, if Mr. N. is so strongly condemned by these words, they fall back with all their force on those who condemned him.”—p. 14-15.

“At the risk of tediousness I beg you to recal this argument. A sinless and Divine Person is to be seen on the cross, in company with or the associate of others under God’s wrath. In this association, or as ‘identified’ with them, He is smitten in a common desert,—not apart from them in His Personal dignity as a Sin-bearer, but *with* them, and therefore, *because* with them, not atoningly—‘suffering in distress which, however deep, has a character wholly contrasted with atonement’—BECAUSE He is in company with, and sharing the lot of others. Of course all are under God’s wrath because they deserve it—how else could they be?—and yet his was not imputed sin. What was it then, but that He shared the sin of His companions, and was smitten as they were and for the same reasons? Are you bold enough to attempt to evade or palliate the force of such plain words? His position with others, or association, brought the smiting—He was in the same moral relation to God as they were—not entirely and infinitely separate, as we have always believed, and smitten only for His people. However, do not forget that the argument—such as it is—asserts that He was actually smitten by God’s hand with others, and *because* with others not atoningly—and we come again to Mr. D.’s solemn reproof to Mr. N., that he taught the ‘pure unmingled heresy of wrath on Christ which was not vicarious.’ (‘Observations,’ p. 9). —p. 32-33.

“In the language of Mr. D. about Mr. N.’s errors—‘All this is very distinct as a system, it is not a casual expression, liable to be misconceived, but a matured system.’ A system, I add, which some

erete. *ess, guilt, sin,* how puts our Lord into relation with sin, and not as a sin-bearer for what is good, &c. &c. others, *for how could He suffer wrath from God but for sin?* A system which affronts God's righteous government 'causing it (says another) to inflict its wrathful strength on its only righteous subject.'

"*M.* You have said enough: I cannot answer you, but bad as all this may be, are you justified in saying, as I hear you do, that it is the same doctrine as Mr. N.'s?

"*P.* I have not said as much as that, for the differences are considerable, but the great feature, or moral bearings of these doctrines are identical, as I see them—*i. e.* they both put the hound of God in wrathful penalties upon our Lord, and not as an atonement for sin. Mr. N. puts our Lord under these inflictions at His birth, and because by birth He becomes related to the people who deserve them; Mr. D. not by birth (though he is Messiah by birth), but at a later period, yet in some way not so easily explained, puts Him in relation with Israel, or its remnant, as 'identified' with it, and in 'that position' brings the wrath of God on Himself as a man and Messiah; neither for a moment admit that He suffered on his own account, both say He was exempt personally from any possible penalty, both assert He took of His own accord, and relatively (I don't know how), the consequences, at God's hand, proper to the position He had elected to share. I am told I do not understand the differences, perhaps I do not, for there is no end to the contradictions one meets with in them."—*p.* 34-35.

"The new doctrines differ from this, inasmuch as they say He felt partly what a converted man ought to feel—*i. e.* contrition, fear, &c.; and partly what He ought not to feel—*i. e.* distrust, unbelief, &c. Both declare that these different and yet somewhat similar exercises were not proper to Himself, that He was always personally perfect, that they were the exercises of others, into which He entered, and that while Mr. N. makes Him do so from His birth, Mr. D. fixes the period of His doing so, much later."—*p.* 37.

"*M.* What then gives you such a vehement repugnance to Mr. N.'s doctrines?

"*P.* Just that which makes me shrink from the new ones. I am not careful to enquire (though important at another time) *how* our Lord reached a certain position, and accepted its consequences, or if the way of doing so was exactly the opposite of another, inasmuch as if the position is a wrong one, the mode and time of reaching it, and being in it when reached, become of little moment, comparatively, especially if it be a free choice on his part in both cases. It becomes merely a question of time and measure, and so apart from many of

Mr. N.'s expressions, which contradict and confound one another, and which fall so dismally on the ear as to frighten even when not in the least understood, *I refuse and condemn them entirely, because they make our Lord, while sinless Himself, share Israel's penalties at God's hand,*

errors—'All this is a confession, liable to be added, which some

and not atoningly. Had he taught that all His sufferings from the manger to the cross were atoning or vicarious, though I should have thought him in grave error, yet it would not have made him heretical. The great truth of our Lord's death as a sacrifice for our sins, would have remained untouched, and as to the question of time, Mr. D. says himself—"Error as to the *period* of vicariousness, has nothing to do with the fundamental error, as to the position of Christ Himself."

"*M.* Then you reduce the agreement or the difference between the two doctrines to the one great and vital untruth, as you think it, of our Lord's being made to suffer under divine penalties, or both wrath and penalties, and not atoningly.

"*F.* Just so; and I am glad you have made a distinction between the emotions of righteous wrath, and its consequent inflictions on its object; for our Lord is made to be the object of both—and not atoningly. The difference between them, however, on this point—the point which I find their agreement—is that Mr. N. (if I understand him aright) says our Lord suffered these penalties all His life (the penalties of governmental wrath on Israel), up to a period that is not clearly marked; but he leaves Him at that period to bear the separate and awful judgment of expiation due to His people's sins.

"Mr. D. puts Him under this governmental wrath at a much later period, and makes this wrath coalesce with atoning wrath (though he says the indignation and wrath are the same) on the cross. Some of his followers say the hour in which these inflictions coalesced was at noonday; the governmental wrath alone smiting up to that time; then both uniting in terror, and both inflicting death on Him. There are thus differences as you say; *but they both (and it is in this only I assert that they are the same,) they both make the righteous government of God smite the wrong person; they both make our Lord smitten by that government, and not atoningly.*—p. 38-39.

"*F.* One word more, then I have done. Try and present to yourself the picture of a sufferer beyond all sufferers, in the following distressingly touching words:—"My days are consumed like smoke and my bones are burned as an hearth. My heart is smitten, and withered like grass; so that I forget to eat my bread. By reason of the voice of my groaning my bones cleave to my skin. For I have eaten ashes like bread, and mingled my drink with weeping, because of Thine indignation and wrath: for Thou hast lifted me up, and cast me down. My days are like a shadow that declineth; and I am withered like grass." (Psalms ciii.) 'Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. I am weary of my crying: my throat is dried: mine eyes fail while I wait for my God.' (Psalm lxxix.) Will you yield to the thought that these are not the cries of our Sin-bearer, that they are not atoning sufferings while they are thus wrought by God's hand, by God's

sufferings from the indignation and wrath, but that they are only descriptive of a new third class of suffering from which atonement is excluded, and which, made him heretical. *deep as is the distress, has a character wholly and entirely contrasted for our sins, would with atonement?*

of time, Mr. D. says "M. It is all too clear to me: and what have you done? Have you been to the writers to expostulate, and to try to get these Christ Himself." doctrines recalled?

difference between "F. For three years I have kept my distress very much to myself, truth, as you think it, perhaps wrongly, but in the hope that as I had heard of others being the penalties, or both in trouble too, their remonstrances might have been effectual. During the most part of last year, I have again and again remonstrated, and a distinction between myself entreated by letter, to no purpose, and my correspondence frequent inflictions on it closed with the request that he would print some paper which I could both—and not atonement show, to the effect—that he did not hold, or mean to teach that our Lord was ever smitten by God's hand, save atoningly, but that he N. (if I understand thought such a statement 'false and heretical.' I asked this only all His life (the because he told me in his last letter that he did not hold any such doctrine, and I very much wished to believe this, and thought such a to a period that is not statement might clear the way for something better; he would not d to bear the separate consent to do this, and so I am forced to explain my reasons in this ple's sins. form.

wrath at a much later "M. But ought you not, before leaving those with whom you have being wrath (though he been so long a fellow-worshipper, to call them together, and explain in the cross. Some of yourself to them? sions coalesced was a

g up to that time; then "F. If I make them well acquainted with my reasons, as shown in on Him. There are this dialogue with you, will not this meet the spirit of the course you l it is in this only think fair, and demanded of me? Meetings for the purpose are too righteous government hasty, and often passionate, and I have seen so many end in disgrace, our Lord smitten by that I could not readily encounter any more—for the sake of truth and charity I could not. This paper can be read quietly, and with reflection, and fairly weighed; and as to leaving, if the doctrines were

Try and present refused anywhere, I should hasten back, and this is practically ers, in the following sufficient, is it not?

consumed like smoke "M. But are you not afraid of controversy, or of all the wrath, and heart is smitten, and perhaps worse, that your opposition to these doctrines, will bring on bread. By reason of you? Do you not call to mind the threat in the preface to the skin. For I have sufferings of Christ?—'If I have to take my adversaries up, because with weeping, because they still carry on their warfare, and Satan is using them for mischief, I st lifted me up, and ere declare I will not spare them.' !!!

declineth; and I am "F. I cannot think of myself in any sense as an adversary—at God; for the water east if I am so, it is to the doctrines only, not to those who teach re, where there is neast if I am so, it is to the doctrines only, not to those who teach e floods overflow me them; and I am not anxious about results. If this brings conviction mine eyes fail while to any, above all to him who is the author of these doctrines, my joy to the thought that will be great: if not I can bear my grief apart. I seek, though in a they are not atoning our way indeed, to get the truth clearly discerned and followed by od's hand, by God those who love it, and commit myself and my ways to Him by whom

all things are justly weighed. Tired with strife after strife who had hoped to have met, not truth only, but a sensitive champion of its sacredness, and surrounded by broken and withered hope hold down my head and turn to Him whose grace is sufficient for everything, with an earnest cry that He will enable me to bear, with an unruffled spirit, and an unquenched love, the 'hard speeches,' harder accusations, that may be cast, either on my motives, conduct, or my faith."

3rd. "Translation of a letter from Mr. Guinand, Lausanne, to Mr. J. N. Darby."

* * * * *

"My dear Mr. Darby, these are not suppositions—they are facts. See what has been the result ever since 1848, wherever your authority has prevailed. I am myself, for the crime of resistance, of the number of your 100,000 excommunicated ones. Ever since 1848, this pretended thought of God, which is to be read nowhere but under your pen, which has for its sanction neither the example of the apostles nor any text of Scripture, leads you to discords, to separations, to excommunications which cease not to multiply themselves. It has induced you to exercise, in a matter of discipline, the most absolute despotism. When speaking of it respecting any one, this fatal sentence flows from your pen or falls from your mouth, '*He is a Bethesdite!*' That is enough. Without any other enquiry, the accused person is declared guilty, and your adherents are constrained to excommunicate him with the whole assembly of which he is a member; and more than that, in every assembly where that sentence would not be put in execution, so that the only liberty which remains to your adherents is to be in the yoke in silence, and in order to conceal from themselves how much their conscience is smothered under this pressure, they attempt to see in it *God's thought*—a light refused to their blind victims, 'progress in spirituality,' a zeal necessary for the maintenance of the *Unity of the Body!*

"It is not easy to see in this state of things a Biblical picture, impossible not to see in it a picture worthy of the Vatican. The Pope would laugh in his sleeve at your proceedings, whilst recognizing his own in them; he founds his edifice upon tradition, whilst your aerial scaffolding rests suspended in space, where, making up for the silence of Scripture, *the thought of God* recommences tradition under a name made for the purpose of avoiding offence.

* * * * *

"In 1858 you published in England (I had the good fortune to be ignorant of it for four years) that towards the close of His life, the Lord Jesus was subjected to the wrath of God, and endured the rage of Satan, as the Jews will endure them under Antichrist.

strife after strife when
sensitive champions
and withered hopes,
the grace is sufficient for
enable me to bear, with
the 'hard speeches,'
er on my motives, and

om Mr. Guinand,

* *
positions—they are fact
, wherever your authorit
resistance, of the numb
since 1848, this pretende
ere but under your pe
e of the apostles nor at
o separations, to excom
selves. It has induc
most absolute d
fatal sentence fle
a Bethesdite!' That
eused person is declar
excommunicate him w
per; and more than the
ot be put in executio
ur adherents is to be
al from themselves h
s pressure, they atten
to their blind victims
for the maintenance
ings a Biblical pictur
the Vatican. The Pot
is, whilst recognizing
ition, whilst your aer
aking up for the silen
tradition under a nar
*
the good fortune to
e close of His life, t
, and endured the ra
Antichrist.

"This was, by a dash of the pen, to embellish the Gospel account with an event of which neither the Apostles nor the whole Church have ever had the least suspicion. The date, even, of this event does not escape you. Without hesitation you place it *after* the Transfiguration. One guesses *why*;—the Transfiguration of the Lord, and the voice which was addressed to Him from the midst of the excellent glory, scarcely denote that until that moment God had turned His wrath against the Beloved Son of whom He says, 'Hear ye Him!' "You urge very particularly that this wrath of God against Christ had no connection at all with atonement.

"In 1852 you had, in your 'Observations on the 88th Psalm,' already spoken of 'a governmental wrath of God to which Israel was subjected,' and into which the soul of Jesus entered, according to the full force of that which *this wrath was from God.*

"In London, before printing, I took the liberty of personally presenting to you some observations, which have remained without result. It was at that time but a sentence risked in a whole volume. From that moment you made progress, and this '*leaven*' has had time to '*leaven the whole lump.*'

"In England, the Brethren have not all seen therein a 'progress of spirituality.' Objections, protests, have made themselves heard. It has been written, 'This is B. W. Newton's doctrine.'

"The case was perplexing; for when B. W. N. had taught that Christ had been the object of the wrath of God, apart from atonement, anteriorly to the Cross, you cried out, and not without reason,—'Heresy! Blasphemy!' You excommunicated and caused persons to excommunicate—God knows how much.

"When it is *yourself* that teaches that Christ had been the object of the wrath of God, apart from atonement, anteriorly to the cross, is it to be a truth, a *precious* truth? Or else, to be consistent, ought you not to exclaim, 'Heresy! Blasphemy!' and excommunicate *yourself*?

"If, in this respect, your language is similar to that of B. W. N., you arrived at it, I know, by a different path. The one places this *fabulous* wrath of God *before the baptism of John*—the other, *after the transfiguration*: a question of *time*. The one sees Jesus exposed to *sympathy* for Israel—a question of *mode*. But, in the issue, it is, either way, the wrath of God against Jesus, anteriorly to the Cross, apart from all atonement.

"Is it enough that that which is heresy and blasphemy in the mouth of one should be truth, precious truth in the mouth of another? What! circumstances excepted, a mere question of whose mouth it is! How are you to get out of that? Hearken—this language never proceeded at all out of the mouth of God: who, then, suggested it to a human mouth?

* * * * *

“In your book upon the Psalms, printed at Vevay in 1862, we read at p. 12, that which to my great regret I am going to transcribe: ‘It is in the act of death that the sufferings of Christ for the sake of righteousness, and that to which He exposed Himself in order to be able to sympathize with the faithful remnant, when it suffers under the governmental hand of God and expiation for sin, meet. Christ suffered unto death. Then He made ALSO atonement for sin.’ (J. N. D.)

“Have I been able to reproduce these lines without the pen falling from my hands?

“What! in order to save this fable of the wrath of God against Christ apart from atonement—a fable which you at first transferred from the Transfiguration to Gethsemane (assuredly *before* the Cross you have yet had the hardihood to dissect the death of Christ—separate from it a non-expiatory part, let us utter the sentence as your disciples have uttered it) a non-expiatory death, and ALSO an expiatory part, an expiatory death. In order that no one may possibly be mistaken, you have written, ‘Christ has suffered unto death: He the ALSO made atonement for sin.’

“This ‘ALSO’—did it proceed from the mouth of God? If not, what placed it under your pen and in your mouth?

“That which I transcribe is not (you know it well) a solitary phrase, maliciously extracted from a volume. No: it is the favorite subject of the whole book. The Psalms never lead any one astray but we may be led astray in the Psalms.

“That which astonishes me is not that Christians reject these novelties; it is that, making all allowances for the infatuation for *depths*, for the vaunt of progress in spirituality, for the care with which persons have succeeded in powdering this bitter pill with the sugar of the *sympathies of Jesus*, for the irresistible impulse of party spirit, for even the fear which you inspire—there should be found men capable of overcoming *their repugnance* (I know what I am saying) to such an extent as at length to admit them, and, perhaps to admire them.

* * * * *

“At the foot of the Cross, the soldiers of Pilate, who had just crucified Jesus—Romans—Idolators—avoided rending the robe of the Lord to distribute the fragments. They drew lots for it; and you, Mr. Darby, paying less respect to His death than these idolators did to His robe, by one stroke—I was going to say with a sacrilegious hand—you rend the death of our Lord into a fragment *non-expiatory* and also into a fragment *expiatory*.

* * * * *

“I would not at all blame you for having covered, and not set forth your doctrines, if I could believe in your coming back to theologic modesty. Would to God that you had not only veiled them, but buried them forever! This is what would have allayed fears once for all, and would have done you honor in the sight of God.

Vevey in 1862, we read
 going to transcribe
 of Christ for the sake of
 Himself in order to be
 t, when it suffers under
 for sin, meet. Christ
 atonement for sin

without the pen falling

wrath of God against
 you at first transferred
 edly before the Cross
 the death of Christ—
 ter the sentence as you
 n, and ALSO an expiator
 one may possibly be
 ed unto death: He the

h of God? If not, wh

ow it, well) a solitar
 No: it is the favorit
 er lead any one astray

Christians reject these
 for the infatuation fo
 lity, for the care wit
 his bitter pill with th
 able impulse of party
 here should be found
 (I know what I am
 nit them, and, perhaps

* *

Pilate, who had ju
 rending the robe
 drew lots for it; an
 th than these idolator
 say with a sacrilegion
 fragment non-expiator

* * *

ered, and not set for
 ing back to theologic
 uly veiled them, but
 allayed fears once
 t of God.

“Alas! we are not yet come to that. If you condescend to admit that you have possibly ‘expressed yourself wrong upon similar subjects,’ it is for the purpose of affirming so much the more categorically, —‘I do not see *any thing at all* to withdraw from the teachings themselves.’—you wish to say, ‘nothing whatever to retract,’ otherwise we shall agree upon this point, viz.: That there is nothing at all, no good especially, to be reaped from them.

“And since there is nothing to retract, will you tell me if it is in Gethsemane, *i. e.*, before the Cross, that Jesus was exposed to the wrath of God, apart from atonement, or whether upon the Cross? For the one of necessity shuts out the other.

“My dear Mr. Darby, how critical is your position! Besides the necessity of allaying just fears, you have a cogent reason for veiling your new doctrines, viz.—the danger of seeing your own thunderbolts fall back upon yourself, or of witnessing the crumbling to pieces of that fatal discipline, to whose triumph you are incessantly immolating fresh victims.

“Will the day ever arrive, when, the veil being rent, your partizans will be obliged to confess to themselves that, as to the point of the wrath of God against Christ apart from atonement, you have fallen into the same error as B. W. Newton, and that if it be a heresy, a blasphemy, in the mouth of the one, it is a heresy, a blasphemy, in the mouth of the other?

“Then comes one of two things:—

“Either, finding yourself guilty of the same delinquency as B. W. N., people will judge you as worthy of suffering the same penalty, and the blows of your inexorable discipline will fall violently on your own head:—

“Or else, in order to spare you so humiliating a shipwreck, they will throw overboard this discipline as an invidious freight which sinks the ship into an inevitable abyss.

“When in November, 1862, (I was quite ignorant up to that moment) on reading your English work upon ‘The Sufferings of Christ,’ having tried to convince myself that you were contending against B. W. N., from an anxiety to keep one of his more revolting errors from finding an entrance amongst your adherents, when, by correspondence and conversation, I made the withering discovery that (thanks to your teachings) a certain number of leaders of meetings were infatuated about this wrath of God against Christ apart from atonement; when at last I read in your volume upon the Psalms, published as a sort of New Year’s gift for 1862, that the death of our Lord Jesus Christ was *for this and that* and ALSO for atonement—it remained with me, as a mere matter of duty, to warn the Brethren against it, and to induce them to reflect.

“This is the duty which I discharged in writing my ‘Letter to the Brethren,’ and by a consequence which will astonish no one, I have, allayed fears once it deserves, rejected this discipline against which I have for a long time, but in vain, made representations to you.

“You are, then, under the necessity of covering with a veil the essential points of your doctrine, and of exacting a blind obedience without allowing either hope or means of coming back to Scripture, or to the rules which it marks out for us; or else, you are in danger of seeing the rigours of your discipline fall upon your own self, or, (a vexation not less great, perhaps, in your eyes) you will see this discipline, for the support of which you have to this moment sacrificed everything, fall to pieces.

“When the veil shall drop . . . what confusion!

“I asked for a Conference in which, Bible in hand, we might examine your discipline and your novel doctrines.

“In order to grant something to me, or in order to deliver the Brethren from my troublesome opposition, you then, for the purpose of chastising my disrespect for your discipline, caused a sentence of excommunication to be passed upon me.

“Excommunication is your summary proceeding. It is the *thought of God*, smiting whoever protests against your discipline and against your doctrines.

“It is written, ‘Hear the word of the Lord, ye who tremble at His word: Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my Name’s sake, said, ‘Let the Lord be glorified;’ but He shall appear to you ‘joy, and they shall be ashamed.’ (Is. lxvi. 5.)

“Now that you have, by means of your Pamphlet, entered the lists I no more *ask* for a Conference—I *propose* one to you, and I invite you to it.

“We will discuss at it the points which form the subject of this letter, and any others besides, if it may be agreeable to you, but anything which may be advanced which has not the sanction of a direct text of Scripture, shall be considered as going for nothing.

“This is a weapon which you will do well to procure for yourself. If the Bible is on your side, it will be very easy for you to reduce me to silence.

“I propose to you this Conference at Lausanne, for Tuesday, the 18th of next September. It shall be, at your option, either limited or public.

“By a limited Conference, I mean a meeting of persons whom, on either side, we will request to be present. In order to fix a number, let us say 50 persons—25 of your choosing, 25 mine. Let us invite to it some individuals to whom the Hebrew and Greek text are familiar.

“If you prefer a Conference entirely public, we will hire at our common expense, a room sufficiently large for admitting some hundred persons.

“I beg you to let me know, before the end of the month, if possible whether you consent to this Conference.

“Believe me, it should be time to cast a glance into the future.

bring with a veil the
 a blind obedience
 g back to Scripture, or
 you are in danger of
 your own self, or, (a
 es) you will see this
 his moment sacrificed

onfusion!

a hand, we might ex

order to deliver the
 then, for the purpose
 caused a sentence of

ing. It is the *thought*
 discipline and agains

ye who tremble at His
 you out for my Name's
 e shall appear to you

ohlet, entered the lists
 to you, and I invite

m the subject of this
 agreeable to you, but
 the sanction of a direc
 or nothing.

o procure for yourself
 for you to reduce me

ne, for Tuesday, the
 tion, either limited or

of persons whom, or
 order to fix a number
 mine. Let us invite
 reek text are familiar
 , we will hire at our
 nitting some hundred

the month, if possible

ce into the future.

Our heads are growing grey. You are a few years short of 70; the term of life is at hand. Soon you will be in Heaven. Will you magnify yourself there in the presence of that multitude of brethren, who, less happy than I, will have scarcely known you but by your anathemas and your excommunications? Think you that in Heaven the Lord ratifies them, and that he would make for you there a title of glory for this noxious zeal displayed here below, at the expense of peace, of love, of truth? at the cost even of the full efficacy of the death of the Saviour?"

4th. "Divers and strange Doctrines stated and examined. By Tertius."

"For a full, and as appears to me, a just also and convincing estimate of what is held and taught by Mr. J. N. Darby and some of his adherents, respecting both a certain class of non-atoning sufferings ascribed to the Lord Jesus, and also the doctrine of the Cross, the reader is referred to the two pamphlets whose titles are given below.*

"But there has also emanated from the same school a further class of teaching, not less new and peculiar than the former, and bearing not less closely upon fundamental truth. These two branches of doctrine are in close moral relation to each other, inasmuch as both alike affect the Person and work of our blessed Lord; but specifically they are widely separate, as will be seen. Meanwhile the fact of their existence, and their wide acceptance also as a higher order of evangetic teaching, demands imperatively a calm investigation of their character. I shall now set forth briefly the grounds of my own conviction that the authors of the papers presently to be noticed, stand committed to statements which involve—

"I. A dividing of Christ's Person.

"II. A heterodox estimate of the Incarnation, as expressed in certain remarks on the life and nature of the Lord.

"III. A contradiction of the Scriptural doctrine of His enduring Messiahship.

"IV. A new and untenable theory respecting the dying of the Lord 'to sin'; and

"V. A false description of his risen life, and in immediate connection with this, an erroneous statement of the same doctrine in its application to the believer.

* * * * *

"Now although my immediate object is to prove only that these writers divide in their teaching the sacred person of the Lord, I cannot

* * * "The Close of Twenty-eight Years of Association with J. N. D., &c., by W. H. D., and 'Grief upon Grief, by P. F. H.' London: Houlston & Wright."

but feel that in these two passages alone, I am confronted by a cloud of errors all at once. For first, we have the Lord set, without any limitation or reserve, 'in the place or condition of the first Adam' and 'dying there.' But if such expressions are to be taken in their simple force, they teach (as Mr. Newton taught) that the Lord was *obnoxious* or *liable* to death, because woman-born; *i. e.*, that death was the natural sequel of His birth—a mere variety of Irving's heresies. For Adam the first knew death only as a *sinner*; to live therefore and to die *in his condition*, is (may the words be forgiven, for assuredly the thought is far from the heart of Mr. D.) to live and die *in sin*; and that this is no unfair deduction from the writer's words is evident since besides the assumption of the first Adam's place and condition he ascribes to the Lord that very nature which, he says, the believer has to judge—'I see Christ taking *it* for me,' &c. Taking *what* The reader must determine by the context.

"Again, the doctrine of sin and its removal by atonement, is here stated in a manner quite at variance with the testimony of Scripture. For whereas in the words of God we read such precious assurances as these: 'He hath laid on *Him* the iniquity of us all;' 'Himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree;' 'By the which will we are sanctified by the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ once for all,' &c., the teaching of this and similar passages in these writings is, that sin is 'attached' or 'belonged' to a certain 'life' which Christ took, and the quitting of which life the work of atonement is made to consist; and that this life being once laid down is 'left' for ever—or in other words, the instrument of our deliverance is broken and abandoned by Him who used it, and a part of *Himself* is, as it were, forfeited and left in the hand of the enemy, as the price of His thus diminishing honor as the Captain of our Salvation!

"Nor is this cast of teaching peculiar to Mr. D.: it appears to have been extensively adopted and often repeated, though not always in the same terms. One further example is here added, from another writing of the same school. 'In giving up His life He gave up also the *sin* attached thereto, so that it is effectually put away, having been left in the grave, from which He arose triumphant in the power of a *new life* to which righteousness as distinctly attaches itself as did sin to the life which He gave up on the cross.'* These writers differ in details but are essentially agreed. Both leave the life which Jesus laid down in the *dust*. Mr. M., however, confers upon the Lord a *new life* (whether human or divine he does not say) while on the hypothesis of Mr. D. that which is gone has no successor. As to the dismal attenuation of sound doctrine (if indeed so mild a term is adequate in such a case) which speaks of either 'sin' or 'righteousness' attaching to 'a life' of our Lord, instead of *Himself* bearing sin and expiating by His precious death, and *Himself* being essentially the Lord of Righteousness, it is left to the spiritual judgment of the reader.

* * Mackintosh's Notes on Genesis. Fourth Edition, p. 64."

confronted by a cloud
 Lord set, without any
 tion of the first Adam
 re to be taken in their
 ght) that, the Lord was
 -born; *i. e.*, that death
 riety of Irving's heresy
 er; to live therefore an
 rgiven, for assuredly th
 live and die *in sin*; an
 riter's words is eviden
 n's place and condition
 h, he says, the believe
 e, &c. Taking what

val by atonement, is her
 testimony of Scripture
 h precious assurances
 is all; 'Himself bare
 ch will we are sanctified
 st once for all,' &c., th
 ese writings is, that s
 hich Christ took, and
 ment is made to consis
 ft' for ever—or in oth
 roken and abandoned b
 s it were, forfeited at
 of His thus diminish

r. D.: it appears to have
 though not always in the
 ded, from another writ
 He gave up also the s
 way, having been left
 the power of a *new lif*
 tself as did sin to th
 e writers differ in deta
 hich Jesus laid down.
 the Lord a *new lif*
 hile on the hypothesis
 As to the dismal atten
 term is adequate in sus
 teousness' attaching
 ing sin and expiating
 essentially the Lord
 ent of the reader.

"How different the Lord's thoughts were as to the giving and resuming of His life, the simple reader may gather from such Scriptures as John x. 18, and Acts ii. 27, 31; in which latter passage the word 'soul' is the same as that translated 'life' in the former.*" 3-7.

"For a moment let us turn to contemplate a self-drawn portrait of inspired apostolic zeal and devotedness. Paul had a charge committed to him, and a course to run, and to finish that course with joy was the goal of his ambition, as a minister of God and a divinely furnished champion of the faith. As to the limit of that course, his own words tell us explicitly that it was 'to testify the gospel of the grace of God;' while as respects the attainment of his aim, and the fulfilment of his trust, we have the deep-drawn utterance of his calm and solemn joy, in his parting words to his dearly beloved son: 'I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith.'†

But with respect to the special class of sufferings which this writer ascribes to our Lord, and in the delineation of which he has incurred the charge of heresy, it is by his own admission *not contained* in the gospel of the grace of God, † *i. e.*, it lies outside the sphere of apostolic testimony; yet by him, and his more devoted followers, it is contended for as part of 'the truth,' and opposition to it is avowed to be no better than resistance to the Spirit, and an instigation of the devil. Plainly then the author and persistent maintainer of this view occupies one of two positions; either he has a divine commission and authority to extend the ancient limits of true testimony, or he is an innovator in a guilty sense. But the former of these suppositions is precluded for the true disciple, by the fore-gone declarations of the Spirit: the faith to be contended for has long since been delivered in completeness to the saints. Any additions therefore to the teaching of God's messengers is not development of divine thought, but a departure from the faith.

Nor is this sad but necessary reasoning less applicable to the points of new doctrine which form the subject of this paper. For of the five positions which have been examined, not one receives the slightest countenance from apostolic teaching, while some, as has been shown, contradict the Lord himself, as well as His inspired scribes, in *verms*. Yet denunciatory language has been levelled by their defenders against those who question these positions as strong, or even stronger than those directed against the opposers of the 'sufferings.' The alternative is fairly and plainly open to the reader, to be determined according to his conscience in the sight of God.

* *Ψχῆ* His proper human life or soul, as distinguished from *ζωή* which He actually has and is. In the divinely-permitted taking of this life consists His *pass*; though it was *Christ*, and not a part of Him, who *died* (they killed the Prince of life), and its resumption, according to His word, declares Him to be in fact what the truth of His person He ever was: 'the Resurrection and the Life.'—John xi. 25; Romans i. 4."

† 2 Tim. iv. 7."

† See the quotation at p. 8 of Mr. Dorman's pamphlet."

"It is needful now to consider for a little space, this strange but sadly interesting phenomenon on its moral side. A richly gifted and once highly honoured servant of Christ, and who holds still a large place in the affectionate remembrance of many who once learned from his lips, in happier days, a sounder gospel than his later writings teach is found, at the latter end of his career, teaching things which he ought not, and in danger, as a consequence of his far extended influence, to become the founder of a school of doctrine which threatens more and more widely, to diverge from the standard of apostolic testimony. For of the readiness of some at least of his adherents to embrace and give currency to his opinions (with the rash amplifications and recklessness of expression which usually mark those who dispense erroneously teaching at second hand) we have already some alarming proofs. And is there nothing to account for this heavy token of the Lord's displeasure? I feel that such a question is superfluous to the godly and thoughtful reader; yet it may not be amiss for a fool to give his explanation of the stroke from which he is smarting in the company of wiser men. I would say then briefly, first, that there has been an attempt to perfect in the flesh what was begun in the Spirit, and with the usual result; and secondly, that what is now making so many ears to tingle is but an avenging by the Lord of His own neglected warnings to us all."—p. 24-26.

"In the *Bible Treasury** for August, 1866, it is said with reference to the Lord Jesus, 'before He left Gethsemane the whole power Satan was *totally* destroyed.'† Then it must be asked (without stopping to speak of his power over others), how came the Lord to *die*? Had Satan then nothing in the *cross*? Did the Serpent *not* 'bruise the heel,' as well as tempt the Spirit of the 'woman's seed'? The simple believer who treasures in his heart the Apostle's assurance that it was 'by means (not of His anticipative agony in the garden, but) of death that the Deliverer destroyed 'him that had the power of death, that is, the devil,' may well feel staggered by this statement; which is, however, but a natural fruit of the theory propounded in the writings 'the sufferings of Christ.' But here, as in other cases, human ideas contradict the Word of God."—p. 31-32.

* The publication in which the papers on 'The Sufferings of Christ' originally appeared.

† Since this paper left my hands I have learnt that the editor of B. T. ascribes the word 'totally' to an error of the press: it should, he says, be 'morally.'

"Accepting, as I am bound to do, this emendation, what meaning, I must ask, are to attach to such a statement? For it is certain that the 'power of darkness,' distinct and visible in all that passed from the moment when Judas and his followers appeared, attained its *acme* in the crucifixion scene. If the writer only means that when the devotion of the Just One had been finally resolved, and he set His face definitely towards Calvary, the Adversary's power was as good as gone, because presently to be destroyed (as it respects God's saints) through his own last effort against Christ, every believer will agree with him. But in suggesting this interpretation I feel by no means sure that I correctly represent the writer's mind.

"It is the (as I judge) *false* prominence assigned to Satan at Gethsemane which has given rise to this assertion, and others of a still more questionable kind."

space, this strange but "Teaching of this kind, if received into the soul, will affect its disciples in one of two ways: it will unsettle and distress them through the felt impossibility of attaining an adequate conception of the Lord's personal sufferings, on which atonement according to this view, specifically depends, and hinder indefinitely their true peace (for solid peace cannot rest on what is in itself unknown), or it will puff up the natural imaginations of those who easily adopt it, with the flattering which threatens more that they are enjoying a more elevated species of gospel than that which nourishes the faith of ordinary christians. It is the very herents to embrace an nature of Esoteric doctrines to foster spiritual pride; and that the complications and recipi- cular views of this school are of this description is evident both who dispense erroneo- from the acknowledgment of its leader that not one christian in a alarming proofs. A hundred apprehends his teaching on the Lord's sufferings, and from ken of the Lord's dis- commiserating tone in which the writer of the article now under fluons to the godly and notice speaks of the dullness of those who find a difficulty in for a fool to give his recognizing and accepting these later and (as he imagines) more exact parting in the compar- and faithful expositions of the Gospel.

that there has been a "I will borrow, however, from this paper one very just reflection, in the Spirit, and with which shall be given in the writer's own words, with reference to the w making so many ear- boastfulness of Peter on the eve of his denial of his Master: own neglected warning. Alas! in divine things there is no more certain forerunner of a fall than self-reliance.' Even so, my brother, and well it becomes us all

it is said with refer- "I will borrow, however, from this paper one very just reflection, ence the *whole* power which shall be given in the writer's own words, with reference to the asked (without stopp- boastfulness of Peter on the eve of his denial of his Master: the Lord to die? He Alas! in divine things there is no more certain forerunner of a fall than self-reliance.' Even so, my brother, and well it becomes us all Serpent *not* 'bruise the true representative of the unity of Christ's body, the Church, and an's seed'? The sim- mirror of sound doctrine in a day of blasphemy and rebuke. Your e's assurance that it w- present creed contains, among other forms of doctrine, e garden, but) of death 1. A Christ who is said to have known the subjective experiences e power of death, that of a Saint ignorant of grace, who suffered wrath and indignation at e statement; which is, ho- the hand of God apart from atonement, and who therefore, on this unded in the writings few, could not suffer atoningly for others.

other cases, human ide 2. A Christ whose 'act of death' does '*not properly*' constitute he work of expiation or atonement.

ings of Christ' originally 3. A Christ whose 'death to sin' is something distinct from that which 'was necessary' to the work of atonement (though, as we have een, they say atonement *depends* on 'something else'), and who was, he editor of B. T. ascribes moreover, death-smitten 'as Messiah, as a man,' apart from his atoning work.

meaning, I must ask, are 4. A Christ who takes the first Adam's place and dies in it; who power of darkness,' distin- naturally responsible for sin, having taken for us that *nature* which and his followers appear-ly means that when the s-aints *we have to judge*, so that a convicted felon under sentence is d he set His face definitely considered an appropriate figure of the Word made flesh.

gone, because presently to 5. A Christ whose work of redemption consists, not in laying st effort against Christ, ev- down His life and taking it again, but in quitting a life and nature epretation I feel by no me-

can at Gethsemane which estionable kind."

to which sin 'attached,' or 'belonged,' or 'applied,' and having done with it.

"6. A Christ now risen, but whose 'human life' and proper 'Messiahship as the seed of David' are alike 'over' and 'gone' and 'non-existent; and

"7. A Church of Christ which now lives, not in Christ personally as the Scriptures teach, but in the 'transferred divine life' of Christ

"Beloved brethren, your present glorying surely 'is not good. The Lord whose eyes are as a flame of fire, is examining this new house of your building, and smiting it with many a breach. But He is the refuge and reward of those who hearken to the Spirit's word unto the churches, and hold fast what they have received from Him. Unsanctified *theology* may 'take away the heart' no less than 'whoredom and new wine; * and we must have wandered far from Him for such things to happen as now are. May the spirit of gracious supplication be bestowed upon us all, that with our faces towards Zion we may turn again to Him. He has suffered much at our hands, and has truly again been wounded in the house of His own friends. Yet He is evermore *the same*, and even now is waiting to restore and comfort such as feel and say that they have sinned."—p. 35-37.

"When, in the following section, you say: '*Every christian believe that which I teach*, although all do not apply it to the remnant of Israel,' you make an assertion much more bold than wise. For if so whence the present controversy? But, not to dwell longer on the inconsistency of this strange statement with existing facts, do you indeed regard it as a point of the 'common faith,' that God smote Christ, in indignation and wrath, on His own account as Messiah, a man, and *apart* from His atoning sacrificial work? Did ever such a view of Christ appear in any christian creed? or that the Holy One 'went through' what sinners feel when shut out by a sense of their iniquity from the comfort of God's favour, or, to speak more concisely, that he felt like one with an unhappy conscience before God, and that too apart from His atoning work? But these are specimens of what you *teach*; and stranger than all else, this 'wrath on Christ which was not vicarious,' a doctrine which when it appeared in Mr. Newton's tracts, you promptly denounced as a 'pure unmingled heresy,' but now become in your eyes only a part of what 'every christian believe

* * * * *

"We are now at the last page of this ill-timed paper, and the repetition of sound and undisputed christian doctrine which fills a part of it calls only for a further protest against its irrelevancy to the point in hand: but when the writer, disclaiming 'controversy,' says, 'it seems to me that what I have said will be received by every true christian,' that his object is 'to present the truth which is found in the word, in such a manner that the weakest christian may see that w

died,' and having done
 man life' and prop
 'over' and 'gone' us
 not in Christ personall
 'divine life' of Christ
 surely 'is not good
 is examining this ne
 any a breach. But H
 ken to the Spirit's wor
 ve received from Him
 rt' no less than 'whor
 ndered far from Him f
 spirit of gracious suppl
 r faces towards Zion
 h at our hands, and ha
 is own friends. Yet H
 g to restore and comfort
 -p. 35-37.

'Every christian believ
 ly it to the remnant
 ld than wise. For if
 to dwell longer on th
 h existing facts, do y
 h faith,' that God sm
 account as Messiah, f
 l work? Did ever su
 id? or that the Holy O
 t by a sense of their i
 to speak more concis
 nce before God, and th
 e are specimens of wh
 rath on Christ which w
 eared in Mr. Newto
 unmingled heresy,'
 every christian believ

* *
 med paper, and the re
 ine which fills a part
 relevancy to the point
 controversy,' says, 'it see
 by every true christia
 which is found in
 istian may see that w

say is scriptural,' and that 'the church of God ought not to be de-
 prived of the virtue of these *precious facts*,' it is necessary to reply
 that, by his own admission, the third class of Christ's sufferings is a
 subject of 'difficulty,' that few comparatively, of his readers compre-
 hend his views; that, so from being plain and scriptural, they are not
 only 'new to most,' but 'in many cases new' to his own mind also; *
 that none of this peculiar teaching is comprised in 'what we, as chris-
 tians, have to say to,' or that, in other words, *the entire scheme is*
speculative, and beside the gospel of God. Now it is my comfort to
 believe that few christians, strong or weak, will perceive that 'facts'
 relating to the Lord Jesus Christ, of which His own apostles plainly
 had no cognizance, are 'precious' to those whose chief praise must
 ever be to continue in the things which they have heard."—p. 39-42.

Since engaged on this painful task, a pamphlet by Mr.
 Kelly has come to hand, headed, "Brethren and their Tra-
 ducers."

I pass over the controversy with the Rev. F. Whitfield, as
 apart from our present object, but cannot forbear a noteworthy
 bearing on my own position while in Guernsey, in 1869,
 and the heading of said pamphlet. Passing an evening with
 friends who had in the lapse of years been converted to God,
 and were now in association with Mr. K., they asked "what
 led me to leave the brethren?"—and "had I joined a body
 of people holding grave errors, etc.?" I saw at a glance by
 their unsophisticated simplicity that an imposition had been
 practised on them. They knew not the real facts; and so
 as possible were kept in ignorance, as indeed many, very
 many persons have been, and are at the present time, in that
 system. I replied in substance thus: "No, I have not left
 the brethren." "But," said they inquiringly, "you are not
 with the brethren here—you are not with Mr. Kelly and
 others?" "No," I again replied, "that is true, but the simple
 reason is, that while I occupy the original ground on which
 brethren met in Guernsey, Mr. K. and others with him, have
 established a *party-fellowship on Mr. J. N. Darby's plat-*
form; and are therefore no longer what they once were, but
 in fact, a *faction*, with whom I could not meet and retain
 the same time a truthful and consistent course before

God!" They were greatly surprised; and with farther questions on their part, and the still farther evidence of the being mystified and deceived, I was obliged finally to say in a few words: "The truth is, you have been greatly imposed upon by some one. Messrs. Darby and Kelly and others of that party know well that they are 'traducing their brethren' that they have done so for years; and God has judged them for it; for Mr. Darby and his party now stand convicted by the plainest possible proofs of having fallen into errors of doctrine equally pernicious with those of B. W. Newton, and from which errors, those against whom they have waged such a cruel and bitter war of words for years, have been happily and graciously kept by a loving and just God."

Mr. Kelly, in this pamphlet, enters upon the "Newtonian and Bethesda question" with his usual ability; and I must add, sophisticated reasoning in measure [see p. 23-7]. He very justly indeed denounces B. W. Newton's heresy; and reasons logically and presently enough upon the errors, etc. I will present a few facts, but must refer my reader to the pamphlet itself for the whole. He says, p. 24:

"If comment were needed on this evidence of strange and poisonous doctrine about our Lord, I would point (not to those who were exposures of it, but) to the printed confessions of at least three well known men (Messrs. B., D., and S.; ministerially associated in the closest way with Mr. N.),* who owned publicly, and in the most solemn manner, that the doctrine was an elaborate system, permeating the view of a very large part of scripture, and quite as deadly, if more so, than had been charged. One of them warned people affectingly, that those who rested on what they had taught for years could not be saved."

Again, on receiving or rejecting brethren, he says, p. 25:

"Now we have always excepted cases of real ignorance. But we could not justify receiving persons of intelligence who came straight from his party, eulogising and circulating the very tracts which contained the anti-christian doctrine already described? Bethesda received them in the most determined manner," etc.

[To this strong and unwarranted statement we oppose the following: "Persons known as holding Mr. Newton's errors"]

* Messrs. Batten, Dyer, and Soltau separated from Mr. Newton at an early date of controversy, on the ground of his deep and dangerous errors. Mr. Batten joined Mr. Darby—the others opposed his unscriptural position. [S. F. K.]

; and with further evidence of their being finally convicted, stand convicted fallen into errors of B. W. Newton, and in they have waged wars, have been happily st God." upon the "Newtonian" ability; and I must refer my readers to He says, p. 24 :

But to proceed. An unrighteous course persisted in, is necessarily followed by deeper moral obliquity : accordingly, as early as 1848, attention had been drawn to false teachings of Mr. Darby ; also, in 1858-9, and reproduced in 1863, in the *Bible Treasury*, of which publication I believe Mr. Kelly is editor ! and therefore in the same year that Mr. K. wrote his pamphlet—"Brethren and their Traducers." !!

Thus then, it will be interesting and deeply melancholy too to see, that at the very time he published his tractate (and years before indeed), the same evil doctrines in another form had made headway in his accepted party-fellowship ; by which many godly minds therein were greatly disturbed and distressed ; and thus things continued till 1866, when, after long and bitter sorrow endured, and every proper means exhausted to meet the erroneous teachings of their leader and others ; several able, and for many years close and warm friends and active supporters of J. N. Darby and his system, were forced outside his communion, with the solemn charge, unhappily, but too truly made ; that " he was teaching errors equally dangerous and deadly as were those of his old antagonist, B. W. Newton." These errors have been clearly and distinctly stated and presented to Mr. D. and his party. **HOW HAVE THEY BEEN MET?** We will again refer to Mr. Kelly's pamphlet. He says, p. 21, on this very subject :

" Further, 2 John is decisive that it is not enough to be personally sound in the faith. Even a woman, the elect lady, is instructed by the Apostle as to her direct responsibility, if any one sought her house or fellowship who brought false doctrine about Christ. ' If any man come straight unto you, and bring not this doctrine [of Christ], receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed : for he that receiveth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.' That is to say, the principle is distinctly laid down, that the person who religiously countenances those who confess not the Christ of God, becomes a partaker of the evil deeds of the deceiver, even without necessarily imbibing the evil doctrine. Indeed a spiritual mind would feel that dreadful it is to be misled for a time into such heresy, he is incomparably more guilty who, professing to hold the true doctrine of Christ, consents to fellowship with the man who denies it. ' Now ye say, we see,

Newton at an early date of errors. Mr. Batten joined [S. F. K.]

therefore your sin remaineth.' Now this is the attitude of 'Brethren towards the alleged blasphemer and his partizans. *If we suppose for moment that the blasphemy is a fact,* 2 John not only vindicates the course complained of, but shews that it is an imperative duty, which admits of neither hesitation nor compromise. Had the elect lady, in spite of the Apostolic warning, deliberately received one who brought not the doctrine of Christ, she would have at once become identified with the guilt of the deceiver, and its consequences. In vain the plea that she was herself a godly christian, and sound in the faith: still the word pronounces—a 'partaker of his evil deeds.' She would, knowingly in this case, for her own ease have committed herself to an act of high treason against the Lord; she would have yielded to over communion with that which to the last degree dishonored His person and thus till she had cleared herself from the sin, in the sight of God and man, she would have sunk morally to the level of an accomplice. If she had better light, so much the worse to behave as if she had none. To receive her, under such circumstances, would be to participate in similar wickedness; it would be receiving her not to the glory of God, but to His shame, because it would be barefaced indifference to the affront put upon His Son. And 'whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.' 'He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent him.' 'Brethren' have given pretty strong proof that they do not make light of ecclesiastical evil, by separating from all associations which involve departure from God's word; but they refuse to put such questions on the same plain form with deep, damnable, fundamental denial of Christ. The Word of God, not any theory or rule of ours, is the warrant for both. Do we follow our thoughts or our natural wishes, it is folly to suppose that we should pursue a course which separates us from hundreds of thousands, who would desire to be with us on condition of our letting them tamper with this treason against the Lord."*

Again then we ask, with deep sorrow of heart—"Hallowed be thy name" have these charges of heresy—of error in doctrine equally as bad and dangerous as B. W. Newton's (*taught, alas! by Mr. Darby for years*) been met by THE AUTHOR of the above extracts—and those who, *with him*, have for very many years been identified with J. N. Darby in his determined course of flagrant hostility to his fellow-christians, who, preferred righteousness, grace, and truth to his unholy dictations and untruthful ways? Let another of Mr. Darby's associates and partizans answer the question. MR. GILBERT had been greatly grieved by the errors of Mr. D., and sought under great difficulties to bring the facts and the errors

*The last clause is entirely gratuitous, and utterly untruthful. [S. F. I.]

attitude of 'Brethren' before the consciences of the leading members of the London Meeting; or, "the one Assembly of God in London." (??) His efforts were quite unsuccessful. Finally he received the following letter:—

"May 25th, 1866,
14, COLLEGE TERRACE, ISLINGTON,
LONDON, N.

from E. Cronin; Geo. Owen; C. McAdam; Butler Stoney; W. Kelly; E. Denny; Andrew Miller; H. McCarthey; and G. V. Wigram.

DEAR BROTHER IN THE LORD,
"We have read and considered your letter to our brother Mr. J. N. Darby, and his letters to you. We are not aware 'that the subject of the sufferings of Christ is everywhere rife, or at least in many places and in many minds.' So far as we know, this statement is unwarranted, and the state of things is the very contrary, and we cannot be content to allow our brother, J. N. D., to withdraw himself from us under such plea, to us not true in the place where we are. We know not of any consciences so troubled, nor is there anything in the writings referred to which has affected our own consciences.

"Signed for the above nine,
"G. V. W., C. McA.

"I am, dear Brother,
"Faithfully yours, in Christ,
"GEORGE OWEN.

Mr. G. B. Gilpin,
"Droitwich.
"(P. S. I write for myself only.)"

Mr. Gilpin then wrote another letter to the London Brethren, as follows:

"TO THE LONDON BRETHERN.

"October 18th, 1866.

DEAR BRETHERN,
"Since I wrote the former letter to you, I have heard from a brother, who says, 'I know of no expression of judgment, nor of any allowance having been given respecting Mr. Darby's doctrines, real, or

Held, on the 'Sufferings of Christ' by the London Brethren, as respects their meetings in their corporate character.' I mention this in qualification of what was said in mine, with regard to a meeting held; he mentions the action of some leading Brethren, connected with the subject of Mr. Darby's doctrine.

"He says, 'in May last, Mr. Darby returned to London, from the Continent, and he intimated his intention to withdraw from communion in the ground of certain representations that had been made to him by Mr. Ord.' This, it would appear, was as to great objection or questioning, that existed as to his doctrine respecting the Sufferings of Christ.

"As then his communion has been continued amongst London Brethren, which his communion in the breaking of bread has been continued, how the Brethren acknowledge or disclaim, the doctrine referred to in my letter with regard to the 'Sufferings of Christ' extract, and the separation between *wrath* and *atonement* in the Synopsis extract, which I consider could be entirely objectionable even if applied to supposed Sufferings of Christ, as the *Messiah King* directly from God on the cross, in contrast to His atoning sufferings.

"Yours in Christ Jesus,
"GEORGE B. GILPIN."

erly untruthful. [S. F. I.]

He seceded in deep distress and sorrow; and writes as follows:—

“And now as the Spirit of God has characterised the *mother*, in Rev. xvii. 5., so I now put a stamp on one of the *daughters*, so far as it has developed itself, and I write upon its forehead ‘IRRESPONSIBLE CORRUPTION.’ The latter word I use in a spiritual sense.

“As to what had been done, I did not ask for the judgment of the nine brethren only, or any limited number of that kind: I tried, if I could, to get at the conscience of the *Church*: a conscience might be found there sometimes, when that of leaders is paralyzed.

* * * * *

“As to Mr. Newton’s doctrine, I did not myself that I know mention his name in the pamphlet. If he was wrong, and Mr. Darby’s doctrine of the same character, what’s proved of the one, touches the other: but I have spoken already with regard to the pamphlet, and consequently I propose exhibiting Mr. Darby’s doctrine on its own ground.

“I return then to the ground of ‘Irresponsible corruption,’ and on that ground withdraw: in the part already referred to we have a word bearing on the Mystic Babylon, and I re-echo that word, Rev. xviii. 4, ‘Come out of her, my people.’”

Thus we see the tables turned, and the very men (Mr. Kelly, a leading man of the number) who have for 23 years and over, been Mr. J. N. D.’s willing helpers in carrying out his unholy and unchristian discipline, wherever he or they could obtain a footing, now engaged, to their own utter condemnation and shame, in shielding and supporting their *Leader* from the just consequences of his own perversions of truth, and the fatal errors into which he has been permitted to fall.

Truly the language of the Psalmist is in point here. “He made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealings shall come down upon his own pate.” *Psalm* vii. 15, 16. “He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but he that confesseth *and forsaketh them* shall have mercy.” *Prov.* xxviii. 13. “Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word: your brethren that hated you; that cast you out for my name’s sake, said, let the Lord be glorified: but He shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed.” *Isaiah* lxvi. 5.

FARTHER CORRELATIVE EVIDENCE.

The following is from a dear, and justly venerated servant of Christ—Mr. D. WALTHER, of London,—now beyond the strife of man and party feuds. His last letter to the author, written not long before his death (only a few months since), is fraught with wisdom and godly prudence even on this present subject; in which it will be clearly seen how warmly attached he had been to Mr. J. N. D. and G. V. Wigram; yet, faithfulness to God, and His Christ, led him to oppose their course of action from the first. He says,

“I am resigned to the being debarred the visits and fellowship of many to whom I have been under obligation [as teachers] that I would always acknowledge. How humbling it is to see the influence of eminent gift in drawing after it those of whom we hoped better things. A mind gifted with insight in the deep things of scripture with difficulty sacrifices fellowship with such men as J. N. D., G. V. W., &c. Still let us own the dear children of God who will not bow to J. N. D.’s passionate edicts.

“We ought by this time to have learned the blessedness of dwelling together in unity. It is, I repeat, *humbling* to hear of one and another spiritual christian drawn aside by *gift*; and as to *attainment in truth*, there are many blessed truths which the Lord can shew us that we have but little apprehended. Let us—you and I—and those we love, esteem it a good thing to bear the reproach cast on Christ’s people, and with them to suffer affliction by unjust suspicions. *We* (and I speak for *many*) are no partizans. It were well if our ‘Exclusive brethren’ were as free from the dictation of J. N. D. and others as we are from ‘Bethesda’ and its respected leaders.

“Now, beloved brother, I bid you affectionately farewell, trusting through grace to meet when communion will be unbroken and separation not known. Yours in much affection, D. WALTHER.”

May this justly revered brother—a man of counsel and sound wisdom—now with Jesus!—yet speak to our hearts and consciences in the above extract; and may many listen—so listen—as to be emancipated through his teaching, from the *hard bondage* of a spiritual despotism and delusion which are unhappily but too apparent to every enlightened conscience, in connection with the above names, and the system inaugurated and sustained by them.

We will now present a published paper of this truly

devoted and faithful servant of God, who has for so many years witnessed a good confession of Jesus Christ; and who, "being dead," shall yet *witness* to us in the following pages, viz:—

“‘DIVERS WEIGHTS BROUGHT OUT AND BROKEN.’

“For sometime prior to 1845, Mr. B. W. Newton had been building up a school of teaching opposed to that of Mr. J. N. Darby, on ‘Prophecy.’ In 1842, Mr. N. published ‘Thoughts on the Apocalypse.’ Mr. D. followed by ‘An Examination of Thoughts on the Apocalypse.’

“In the winter of 1845-6, Mr. Darby made an open division at Plymouth. Mr. D. did this, not on the ground of any particular doctrine, but of *Clerisy* on the part of Mr. N.

“More than a year later, Mr. N.’s peculiar doctrine was brought to light by Mr. Harris publishing notes from a lecture by B. W. Newton on the 6th Psalm. These notes had been taken by a sister present.

“On the *exposure* of the doctrine, Mr. Darby threw himself into the fore-front of the opposition to his old antagonist. Some of Mr. Newton’s chief friends withdrew from him, and he himself put forth a partial retraction; but his *peculiar* doctrine, touching our Lord’s *experiences*, remained unretracted.

“Mr. Newton’s doctrine was now (*i. e.*, from the autumn of 1846) decidedly and generally disowned: he himself was not formally put out of communion; but it was understood that he would not be received without clearing himself by confession. At *Bethesda*, Bristol, there was so much of agreement in action,—that any coming from under Mr. N.’s teaching were *examined* as to whether they had imbibed the evil doctrine.

“In 1848, certain brethren who agreed with Mr. Darby, required further of the leading brethren at *Bethesda*, that they should publicly and corporately judge Mr. N.’s tracts. This they declined doing, and gave reasons. Mr. Darby then issued a circular, and the requisitionists *seceded* from communion. Under some change of circumstances the leaders at Bethesda afterwards publicly judged Mr. Newton’s tracts; and declared that they would not receive the upholders of them.

“It was *after this* (*i. e.*, in March 1849) that it was required of brethren in Orchard Street, London, that they should *refuse Christians coming from Bethesda*. They declined compliance, and were at once separated from by Mr. Darby’s followers. The same parties quickly went the length of refusing to receive *any* Christian, however sound in faith, who felt free to break bread in a meeting where *any-one* coming from the *open* meetings was allowed to break bread. By ‘open’ is meant not shut against the Christians of Bethesda.

“This is ‘the Bethesda question.’ Let a Christian present himself at the table in a meeting of Mr. Darby’s followers, stating that he feels free to break bread with A, who has broken bread with B, who

breaks' read with Geo. Muller and others at Bristol,—and he will have the proof.

“I pass over ten years of trial—cruel misrepresentation—and all the miserable fruits of division among Christians.

“About the end of 1848, some attention had been drawn to an article in the ‘Words of Truth,’ (Vol. III, pages 357-361)*—an article never denied to have proceeded from Mr. Darby. It was however *passed by* as mere faulty expressions, from inadvertance to consequences.

“But in 1858, in the ‘Bible Treasury’ of March, August, September, October, and December, we have a series of papers by Mr. D., containing doctrine *the most startling*, from its near approximation to the worst things charged against Mr. N.

“The reader may see some of these startling statements in certain printed tracts: † and thus have the opportunity of judging for himself *how nearly* the teaching of Mr. Darby resembles Mr. N.’s doctrine in what has been considered revolting to godly minds.

“It should be mentioned that in 1858, ‡ Mr. N. put forth a tract called, ‘Our Suffering Surety’—in which he gave us to understand that a material change had taken place in his views. But up to this day we have had from him no becoming *expression of sorrow* for his previously published tracts and the deep trial of which they have been the occasion. He is now altogether outside ‘the Brethren.’

“It is fair to say that Mr. N. has never reprinted his bad tracts. Mr. Darby, when remonstrated with by his friends, reprints (1863) his papers in the ‘Bible Treasury,’ and defends the doctrine of them.

“What will brethren do? Will they ‘judge the evil’?

“If Mr. Newton’s *Clerisy* justified Mr. Darby in spreading another table; is not Mr. Darby’s course an abundant justification of our rejection of his worse than Popish claim over our consciences?

“If Mr. Newton’s *doctrine* demanded that we should refuse the bread and the wine to a Christian, sound in faith, who does not go Mr. Darby’s length in opposing it; may we not reasonably expect that an assembly of Christians should *openly* mark their disapproval of Mr. Darby’s papers in the ‘Bible Treasury’?

“If a *repudiation* of Mr. Darby’s statements is enough to clear an assembly that receives him, and suffers him as a teacher—in other respects profitable; might it not have proved sufficient in the case of Mr. Newton, to have *condemned* and *silenced* his wrong teaching?

* The reference is to the *first* edition, certain portions being omitted in the *second*; and their absence mysteriously indicated by *asterisks*. The reader will distinguish the *first* edition by the mention made of Cain in page 360—showing what Mr. D.’s friends can *pass by* in Mr. D.’s.

† Notice of a Recent Doctrine, with remarks on the Psalms, by the writer of this, &c. Also a tract entitled, ‘The Leaders of High and Low Brethrenism,’ by an anonymous writer—here referred to for the sake of the extracts contained in it. *2d.* See also six pages on the ‘Temptations and Sympathy of Christ,’ by D. W. *1d.* These may be obtained for postage-stamps, enclosed to E. ALLEN, 31, Edgware Road.

‡ I notice that Mr. D.’s papers in the ‘Bible Treasury,’ appeared in the same year!

‘If, in the face of these facts, any Christians shall judge that a brother is deserving of being put from the Lord’s table for not following Mr. Darby, I must count their love for Christians small indeed! They CAN only excommunicate from a sect; and to be outside all sects is not a bad position. Sects have generally originated with gifted men; it is so in this case. But let brethren ask themselves the question—What if in following *gift*, we are found *sinning against Christ*? Are these brethren really guarding truth of doctrine in their awful breach of charity? Alas! ‘*Their rowers have brought them into deep waters!*’

“Christ gave *gifts* for the edifying (not scattering) his body. *Power*, really of *Christ* is mighty in bringing down high thoughts, and making us incapable of sinning against Him. There may be *power* accompanying delusion. It was said to the church in Philadelphia, ‘Thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word.’

“Happily for *Christians*, they still have ‘the Word,’ and no master on earth,—but One in heaven, to whom Paul commended them (Acts xx), and to whom I, in my insignificance, would commend the reader. I feel unworthy to give counsel; but would gladly see a return to the practice of receiving Christians on the ground of what each one is by his faith, continuing to warn against all questionable associations ‘*Let all your things be done with love,*’ was the word of a true Apostle

“D. W.

“P.S. For twenty-seven years I have moved among ‘the Brethren.’ It will be readily conceived that I pass unmentioned many sorrowful things. If anything here stated can be disproved, it shall be *publicly* confessed. To those who question the facts, I offer to refer the evidence to any half dozen Christian men whose names we may open upon in the Directory.”

ALSO :

“‘MR. J. N. D.; A SKETCH OF SOME OF HIS RECENT DOCTRINES.’ By T. Ryan.

“The following dialogue was suggested by questions lately put by an intelligent Christian young man to the writer; it therefore takes the form of question and answer. The contents themselves will, to any one concerned, make the necessity for considering the subject self-evident, the things referred to being very grave—but the author disclaims all unpleasant or unkind feelings of a personal nature towards any one, not being himself personally connected with any party; therefore he gladly omits certain words and expressions which were objected to in the first edition.

“Q. What first caused divisions amongst ‘the Brethren’?”

“A. Certain individual and ecclesiastical errors at Plymouth.

“Q. Were they not caused by doctrines fundamentally erroneous?”

ll judge that a
le for not follow-
is small indeed!
e outside *all sects*
ated with gifted
: themselves the
l *sinning against*
f doctrine in their
brought them into

his body. *Power*
ights, and making
power accompany-
lphia, 'Thou hast
ord,' and *no master*
ended them (Acts
commend the reader
see a return to the
that each one is by
nable associations
of a *true Apostle*

"D. W.
ong 'the Brethren'
ed many sorrowful
it shall be *publicly*
er to refer the evi-
s we may open upon

OF HIS RECENT

estions lately put by
; it therefore takes
s themselves will, t
sidering the subject
ave—but the author
f a personal nature
connected with argu-
nd expressions which

Brethren?
ors at Plymouth.
amentally erroneous

"A. No; those doctrines were not discovered for months after.

"Q. Who discovered them?

"A. Mr. H.; but Mr. D. used them afterwards to further the division he had previously made upon other and different grounds.

"Q. Did Mr. N. teach at Plymouth doctrines fundamentally erroneous, and on what subject?

"A. Yes: on the sufferings and experiences of our Lord, as described in the Psalms—a kind of semi-Irvingism.

"Q. Has Mr. D. taught anything peculiar on this subject?

"A. Yes: he has taught doctrines on the same subject just as bad as Mr. N.

"Q. Where are they to be found?

"A. In 'The Bible Treasury' for 1857-58. 'The Bible Treasury' is one of the organs of Mr. D.'s party; also 'The Present Testimony,' and 'The Girdle of Truth.'

"Q. And what did his brethren do about them?

"A. They called a special meeting in the following year for the purpose of reprimanding him and questioning him; but Mr. D. complained of illness, and did not attend. He afterwards praised the brethren for their laudable zeal in the matter, and thus the affair has been silenced ever since.

"Q. This meeting and the necessity for it is denied, and consequently Mr. D.'s absence from it is denied also; what say you?

"A. The meeting referred to was the first public meeting called after the articles appeared in *The Bible Treasury* on 'the sufferings of Christ,' and took place in Bristol. Mr. B. of Liverpool, took there from the author some half-dozen questions to put to Mr. D. touching these views. When t^h brother returned to Liverpool, he said that Mr. D. complained of gout in his eye in London, and did not come to Bristol. Since then we have heard no more of such a meeting, and the matter has since been silenced. As to the *necessity* for it, that is another affair; if persons have come now to acquiesce in those views, every one knows that at the time there was a *sensation* about them. Indeed the two succeeding letters of Mr. D. prove it. *Bible Treasury*, pp. 177-179. 1858.

"Q. How do they prove it?

"A. In one of them Mr. D. speaks of the 'alarm' felt by certain Christians at the reconsideration of these doctrines, and he strives to quiet them. In the other, some even had the hardihood to ask *what is the difference?* 'The inquiry made is, what is the difference between the doctrine of the paper and Mr. N.'s? The question shows the need of making the matter clear to those who have been occupied with it. The answer is very simple; the doctrine of the paper is exactly the opposite of Mr. N.'s. Mr. N. taught, that Christ, as born an Israelite and a man, was at the same distance from God as Israel and man, because He was one of them—was exposed to the

consequences of it, and passed through the experience of an unconverted elect man . . . had the fierce displeasure of God resting on him, as born one of the people.' 'But I believe that in grace at the close of his history when his life work as presented to Israel, according to promise and gracious service towards man, was brought to a close, He the object of divine favor entered into the sorrows of his people.' *How he entered into them*, and what those sorrows were, we have seen in the text. Both agree that our Lord was without sin or spot or stain in himself, and that what he undertook, he undertook voluntarily; but one brings him into those terrible experiences, judicially or objectively; the other brings him into them by sympathetic assimilation or subjectively. But both agree that He actually experienced them; so that I have not misrepresented Mr. N. or Mr. D., say what they may. Now if some at the time were *alarmed*, and if others saw no *real difference* between the views of Mr. N. and Mr. D., how comes it to pass that there was no necessity to hold a meeting to question Mr. D. on the subject? Did Mr. D.'s *ipse dixit* quiet this *alarm*, and satisfy these anxious consciences without further trouble? and if the many have since acquiesced in them, it only proves that when party runs high, we are not apt to 'cease from man;' still I am bound to say that some amongst them reject these views altogether.

"Q. And what have Messrs. N. and D. taught fundamentally erroneous?"

"A. Mr. N. has taught on the 6th Psalm as follows: 'But another interesting and important question is, the manner in which Christ was personally chastened and afflicted whilst the servant of God in the earth; for, it was not merely the sufferings he had, because his soul entered into the condition of things around him, but there was quite another question—the relation of God to him whilst thus suffering. For a person to suffer because he serves God is one thing, but the relation of that person to God, and what he is immediately receiving from his hand is another; and it is this which the 6th Psalm and many others open to us. They describe the hand of God stretched out as rebuking in anger and hot displeasure—and remember this is not the scene on the cross.' This is Mr. N.'s doctrine, extracted from Mr. Trotter's *Tract*, 1850, p. 14.

"Q. And what has Mr. D. taught fundamentally erroneous?"

"A. Mr. D. has taught that 'man may be looked at morally in three conditions:—first, as a sinner under condemnation; secondly, as a saint through grace partaker of the divine nature, &c; and thirdly, 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: and Christ has passed through *all these* kinds of sufferings. But what met the *first* condition, that of a sinner under con-

demnation, he went through as actually bearing sin, and so enduring wrath vicariously for others that they might never have it to endure.—*Bible Treasury*, 1858, p. 132. This last sentence is right enough as applying to the first case; but he applies it to that only.

“Again, ‘Now here the judgment of God against them (*i. e.* the Jews), 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, &c. *All this* exercise Christ entered into so as to be able to help them. Thus the *full judgment of evil is wrought in them* in hope of goodness and mercy prophetically revealed. Who is to furnish *thoughts, feelings*, faith, hope, which can be known to be acceptable and a sustaining ground of faith till they look on him whom they have pierced, and find peace? The answer to this question, as well as the groundwork of atonement, is found in Christ.’—*Bible Treasury*, 1858, p. 134.”—p. 1-3.

“Q. Will not Mr. D. deny the conclusions now deduced from these doctrines?”

“A. Very likely he will, and so will Mr. N. There is no man, at least Christian man, who utters erroneous sentiments on foundation truths that won't deny the conclusions which may be drawn from them, inasmuch as all men know but ‘in part,’ and divine life and the grace of God survive some of the worst things. Moreover, one and the other may appeal to other publications; but still these doctrines are strictly defined.

“Q. Have not men of great note gone as far astray on fundamentals as Mr. N. or Mr. D.?”

“A. Yes truly: Pearson on the Creed, Drs. Clarke and Candlish and others, all standard authorities in Christendom have said just as wrong things as either of them. The truth is that till of late years the minds of western Christians have not been much exercised in such questions; albeit it were always better to worship than to analyse profound mysteries; whereas the minds of Eastern Christians have been long conversant with them. It is not, then to be wondered at that those who first assayed to enter upon them should err exceedingly. Thus, Mr. N., trying to avoid the error of Mr. Irving, has himself written false doctrine which remains unconfessed and unretracted; and Mr. D., in trying to avoid the error of Mr. N., has himself written false doctrine which remains unconfessed and unretracted. Yet, one has learnt this—that men are not to be reckoned as heretics, unless they persist in error, or make a party to it, for the balances of the sanctuary should be equal.

“Q. But has not Mr. D. lately sounded a slender note of confession?”

“A. Yes; aware that some are already disposed to outstrip the master, and step farther in error, Mr. D. sounds a slender note of confession, and writes to a sister who complains of the excesses of a

certain brother in this respect. He says: "I may add, that I am so profoundly convinced of man's incapacity in this respect, that it is outside the teaching of the spirit, to wish to define how the divinity and humanity are united in Jesus, that I am quite ready to suppose that, with every desire to avoid, I myself may have fallen into it, and in falling into it, said something false in what I have written to you."—*Bible Treasury*, 1861, p. 368, Letter on the Humanity of Christ.

"This is very good, but it is a pity Mr. D. did not arrive at the same conclusion long ago! but better late than never; and it is to be hoped, when he says so much for a letter, with the contents of which brethren on all sides, and Christians in general agree, that he will have grace to confess and retract, and his party will have grace to repudiate those things which he has actually said and done, to compromise the faith, and change the Word of God.

"Q. Will you, then, sum up the points to which this sketch refers?

"A. Yes; the first is, that Mr. D. has taught, in a series of articles written in 1858, that our Lord, in his life, passed through in his soul, and not vicariously, the exercises of a sinner with the judgment of God before his eyes—that is, that he had in his soul the subjective human consciousness of sin and its consequences!

"The second is, that in the *Girdle of Truth* for the same year, Mr. D. has taught, that all our sin is gone in the giving up of the Adam-life of our Lord; and in this consists 'God's work for the sinner,'—the atonement!

"The third is, that Mr. D. has had the temerity to add to, to change and alter the Word of God without any authority whatsoever, and that upon a famous passage which affects the very foundations of the faith itself on the point it touches.

"One does not impute design or motive to Messrs. N. and D. in the foregoing; to their own Master they stand or fall in this respect, and to no one else; but as far as words go, facts lie out as much on one side as on the other—facts which undermine the truth, and which the enemy can make use of at any moment."—p. 13-15.

Other pamphlets of importance in their bearing on this sad subject might be referred to: *e. g.* "A Caution against the Darbyites." 1st and 2nd Edition, by J. E. Howard. "Heresy, What it is, and Who are the Heretics. By C. Paget." "Notices of some Recent Doctrines among the Brethren, by D. Walther."

But I must refrain, and refer only, in an Appendix, to two others; viz: "Darbyism: its Rise and Development," &c. by Henry Groves. And, "The Exclusive Brethren: their Origin and Discipline."

Other writers' pamphlets lie before us; but the heart sickens to follow through the tirade of abuse and untruthfulness of such presuming young men as *J. S. Oliphant*, and like type. Oh that they could be content to sit at the Master's feet, and there learn lessons of wisdom and truthfulness of Him, and so follow Him, as "little children," onward towards a "young manhood" in Christ Jesus, that He may yet be able to use them as *servants* in the great harvest-field of the gospel, and so learning of Him, as finally to become "fathers" in knowledge and sobriety—elders within the Church of the Living God.

Thus my painful task is being brought to a close. Much, much more could be written of my own personal knowledge touching this most sinful and unhappy schism, but I gladly forbear. The Lord only knows how much of real sorrow *this* has cost me.

IS THERE A RAY OF HOPE IN THE FUTURE?

Some dear brethren, loved ones of the Lord (on both sides we will hope) still ask the question "Can there be *re-union?*"—they long for it, and hope against hope!—I did so myself. I well remember pressing the same question with a heart full of sorrow upon Mr. Kelly in Jersey, in 1854, on the "C. Paget case"; when I felt the sacrifice of every thing personal—Yea! life itself would be of small consideration compared to the solemn question at issue—and the calm, firm, determined manner in which the negative was given, viz: "It is impossible; the breach [the second division] is complete; neither will give way; and God's honor must be maintained at all cost." From that moment I felt there was no hope,—for Mr. Kelly was *an authority* of the temper of the body and platform he so faithfully represented. I also felt *he was committed to a course of action which was NOT OF GOD!* My whole soul recoiled from his accepted position—though I had not then so fully proved its falsity as I afterwards did. I write this with extreme pain. Yet, however, the question may be asked again and again by loving hearts and truly faithful men of God: "Is there a Meeting-

place—a mutual ground for united prayer and RECONCILIATION? My answer must be: "What is *not* possible with man IS possible with God." My firm conviction is, that the evils and the errors have been permitted of God to fall upon us (as all of like character have from the earliest times) as special chastisements for neglected privileges, abused mercies, and that *fearful departure* from God—THE IDOLISING OF INTELLECT IN TEACHERS!! "Cease^{ye} from man whose breath is in his nostrils," is still a needed admonition, so frequently forgotten—or at least so constantly unheeded—by *even* children of God and heirs of the Kingdom. Hence the sad, sad results: severance of those who should—who *ought* to be united; and deep dishonor done to God and to His cause. And all this, in the face of the in-coming flood, that subtle scepticism, and rampant godlessness everywhere apparent; and which will, ere long, sweep over the land with demoniacal fury—overwhelming, if possible, everything religious with the blackness of blasphemy from the pit—the rankest Atheism: "*There is no God!*" Against all this the real followers of the Lamb *should be united!*—heart, soul, and spirit,—united in visible manifest testimony for God and His Christ. I need not say with what joy I should hail any *real effort* towards soothing the troubled waters, and healing the unsightly and deeply painful wounds of the above unhappy controversy; but it must be *reality*—pride of heart and intellect must be brought low; Yea! sit in the dust before God. Backslidings of heart and life must be confessed and forsaken. Man, *any* man, must be forgotten in view of truthfulness, and a truthful following of God. If Mr. Darby, Mr. Newton, and others who have fallen *so low* by the lifting up of themselves—intellectually so—*can* be won back to the simplicity of truth, and truthful ways, we will thank God with all our hearts. And here I would not endorse a statement of Mr. Kelly's, in "Brethren and their Leaders." In p. 25, he writes, "No heretic that I know ever set himself to debase Christ: neither Arius nor Socinus—neither Mr. Irving nor Mr. Newton." He might have added with equal propriety at *the time* of writing (for the deep error was then

but too manifest), "nor Mr. Darby, nor those partizans of his who have followed him in teachings equally bad and dangerous."

For one, I have never imputed *personal alienation of heart from Christ* to either of these men specially in question. Probably, down deep in the secret chambers of each heart, there is, *personally, real love for Christ*; and a resting only and entirely on HIM as "GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH"—*their only and all-sufficient Saviour*; hence HE is still *the only foundation* of their souls: their *only hope* before God. Their deep error individually has been, allowing the intellect to revel where "angels bow and worship;" hence illusion and darkening of council have followed. Why not then, we may well ask, seeing as they must what evil they have both wrought, what desolations they have been instrumental in consummating, fall prostrate before God, as the guilty King David did in other circumstances, saying, "I have sinned against the Lord!" and receive as he did the blessed assurance, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin." Is it so much easier for a deeply guilty moral transgressor as David was, to confess his guilt, than for an intellectual transgressor to confess, "I have sinned?" It does, alas, appear so. David's sin, his folly, yea, his great wickedness was brought to light: we read of it to-day as a solemn admonition to ourselves: but he was pardoned—pardoned by a gracious God against whom he had knowingly and guiltily sinned.

The no less sad, sad effects of intellectual transgressions are patent to every one. Could angels weep in heaven, what *bitter tears* would flow there! what a sea of waters, of deep, deep sorrow would surge up in heavy waves of anguish over the NEWTON-DARBY sins; their heresies; and consequent divisions within the Church of God! But, "there is forgiveness with thee that thou mayest be feared." Oh that these *once* mighty men in truth (and we will still hope) in love to God and Christ, may even yet be brought to the Saviour's feet, as "little children;" and then *once more* used as true servants of the *Master* in building up what shall never be

destroyed—even "truth and righteousness"—in the Kingdom of God, and of our Saviour the Lord Jesus Christ. What joy—intense joy—would this impart to angels who stand in the presence of Jehovah! and oh! brethren, what a cloud—a dark, heavy cloud—would be lifted from thousands of drooping and bleeding hearts on both sides of this most unhappy controversy; and what a testimony for God and truth might yet be borne "while Jesus tarrys," which, with God's blessing resting upon it, would be felt, and owned, and acknowledged by tens of thousands of Christians who yearn in spirit for better things than they possess, or can find anywhere: viz., a firmer faith in God; a deeper love for His truth; a holier life; a Jesus-owning walk; yea, *being*—and manifesting to the world what Christians are indeed called to be "Letters of Christ known and read of all men." Then in the midst of all the conflict of mind and thought, amid overturnings and overturnings, which threaten at times to uproot everything truly of God and His Christ, with, alas, a wide-spread and still culminating worldliness in christian circles (the present bane of every church), together with a growing and daring impiety in dealing with the truths of heaven, oftentimes amounting to (covertly, perhaps) a blank infidelity, propounded alas, by many who bear the christian name, and are recognised as ministers of *Him* who is essentially "The Way, the Truth, and the Life." Yet, amid all these aboundings of evil, which the truly godly in all Christian circles deplore and confess before God, realizing their individual privilege to "*walk with God*," they may yet become "burning and shining lights;" yea, in them, "**LIGHT AND TRUTH**" *lived out* before God, and in the world, would then bear aloft its own heaven-born imprint; and Jesus!—Jesus only! the "**MIGHTY VICTOR**" finally, would indeed be the "**Alpha and Omega** [of the heart], the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty."

A
Qtra
ma
an
abbe
sh
ne
ho
is
litt
ma
nes
wa
mu
nee
wh
shr
det
or
ual
a m
arg
Chu“
as t
bell
ver
wit
car
to b
opp
dist
all t
who

APPENDIX.

Extracts from a pamphlet, entitled, "DARBYISM: ITS RISE AND DEVELOPMENT, AND A REVIEW OF 'THE BETHESDA QUESTION.' BY HENRY GROVES."

"The requirement that we should investigate and judge Mr. Newton's tracts, appeared to some of us like *the introduction of a fresh test of communion*. It was demanded of us that, in addition to a sound confession and a corresponding walk, we should *as a body, come to a formal decision* about what many of us might be quite unable to understand."

"We will only further observe here how distinctly those who have been stigmatized as careless in preserving the sanctity of Church fellowship, and of the Lord's table, maintain to the fullest extent, the necessity of a sound confession of faith, as well as of a corresponding holiness in walk; for it has been asserted, that while laxity in morals is carefully watched against in Bethesda, laxity in doctrine is thought little of. Nothing can be more false, and more contrary to simple matters of fact which continually occur, to prove the extreme sensitiveness of the leading brethren in every matter affecting vital truth. It was feared that this *requirement to judge* would become a *test of communion*, and so it has proved in the case of all who have bowed their necks to the yoke of Mr. Darby's anti-christian discipline. This result, which was inevitable from the course pursued, Bethesda instinctively shrunk from: and in order to preserve their simplicity as it is in Christ, determined to keep themselves clear of all and every objection, general or particular, that the Word of God bound not upon their own individual conscience. This at once led them to reject the command to judge a matter as they were told, 'because the Church had judged it,' the argument ever made use of by Popery, to enforce its decrees—the Church ever being in every case the same, 'Those who think as we do.'

"We remembered the Word of the Lord, that 'the beginning of strife is as the letting out of water.' We were well aware that the great body of believers amongst us were in happy ignorance of the Plymouth controversy, and we did not feel it well to be considered as identifying ourselves with either party. We judged that this controversy had been so carried on as to cause the truth to be evil spoken of; and we do not desire to be considered as identifying ourselves with that which has caused the opposer to reproach the way of the Lord. At the same time, we wish it distinctly to be understood, that we would seek to maintain *fellowship with all believers*; and *we consider ourselves as particularly associated with those who meet as we do, simply in the name of the Lord Jesus.*'

"The dread of strife in the things of God, especially connected with that which belonged to the Holiest of Holies, every godly soul instinctively shrinks from, and this is stated as a reason for avoiding the controversy. But this clause contains an unpardonable crime, in the eye of the domineering spirit that prevailed, and that is, the bold avowal of wishing to belong neither to the party of Mr. Newton, nor to that of Mr. Darby. It was too independent a place to be tolerated for a moment by those incipiently aspiring to the exalted position of 'the one Assembly,' that was to be ruled over by some Diotrephes or other, one or more. There is no greater crime than independence with certain minds, and hence the cry of 'independence' so often raised against Bethesda. Mr. Wigram in reference to this writes, 'The aim of Bethesda is still to make a party positively apart from us all, and apart, I judge too, from Mr. Newton.'*" —p. 41-42.

"The following remarks on the Letter of the Ten, and on Mr. Wigram's comments on it, in the 'Present Question,' as written about the time, we here give in a note, as a co-temporary witness, which may be of value.

"We could write much in reference to this paper, 'The Letter of the Ten,' and to the notes and comments annexed to it in the 'Present Question,' but we cannot trust ourselves to compare the holy calmness and scriptural reasoning of the text, with the unhallowed rage and unauthorised dogmatism of the commentator. Suffice it to say, that this much abused letter contains not a sentence on which a candid mind can found the charge of adherence of any kind, or in any degree, to the heresy. Its chief object is to state the causes of the unwillingness, of those who signed it to lay the subject before the church. Any one is at liberty to differ from these brethren in judgment, and to think that under the circumstances of the case, it might have been better, out of condescension to weak brethren, to resign themselves to the painful task of examining the errors in question; but let it be remembered that these brethren were occupied with far nobler and more useful labors, and that having sat at the feet of that Teacher whose commandment is 'Love one another,' they naturally shrunk from following in the footsteps of those who beginning with apparent zeal for the honor of the great Head of the Church, had ended with heaping abuse on the members of His body, and with bringing some of the bitterest fruits of the flesh,—anger, wrath, malice, clamour, and evil-speaking,—to a perfection, which, happily, is seldom to be found among those who profess to follow Christ."—From a tract entitled 'Prove All Things, &c.' p.p. 4, 5, published by Partridge and Oakey, Paternoster Row, London, 1850." —p. 45.

"Shortly after the reading of the Letter of the Ten to the church, Mr. Darby came again to Bristol, and had an interview with both Mr. Muller and Mr. Craik, in which he again urged the taking up of the tracts by Bethesda, and passing a church condemnation on them. The reasons already given were repeated, and finding their threats were not to be changed, he sought to intimidate by the threat of separating from them all those believers in other places, with whom

"* Letter bearing post mark Feb. 2, 1849, see 'The Bath Case, p. 10,' printed by Eyles, Brighton."

for years they had held christian fellowship. Those who have learnt to have to do with God alone, are not easily to be moved by either the persuasions or the threats of man. They stand on a Rock and allow the waves to beat around. Having failed to induce these brethren to carry out his wishes, he started off on his unholy errand, and surely 'destruction and misery have been in his ways.' At one place as in Stafford, he led those meeting there into his views, at another as in Kendal, he failed. From one place to another he went, sowing discord and strife, seeking to enforce everywhere the adoption of his course towards Bethesda, which has, in its consequences, and in the miseries it has caused, cast into the shade all that had taken place in Plymouth. Assemblies of saints, one after another, were placed under the ban of excommunication, for no other sin than not being able to see that Mr. Darby was right, and Bethesda wrong. The eyes of many ran down with tears, and the hearts of many were broken, at this proud high-handed dealing with the consciences of others, and this trampling in the dust the rights of every conscience but its own." —p. 47.

"We now come to the second stage of the inquiry in connection with Bethesda. The charges made by Mr. Darby and his party were: 1st, that Mr. Newton's doctrines and those holding them, had been admitted into fellowship; and, 2ndly, that, as a church, they had refused to judge and condemn the tracts. The first charge we have shown to have been without foundation, and as for the second, the course had been justified for the reasons given in the 'Letter of the Ten.' Towards the latter end of the year, however, the aspect of things had altered. By the unceasing efforts of the Darby party, the tracts which in April, May, and June, were comparatively unknown, had been so circulated, that all had become more or less conversant with the subject; and the brethren were further charged with indifference to the Lord's honor in connection with the introduction of error. The result of this was, that the minds of very many were disturbed and perplexed. The discussion of questions which it had been wished to prevent, had thus been introduced by the actings of others, over whom the Bethesda brethren had no influence. In July, 1848, also had appeared another tract of Mr. Newton's, in which the erroneous statements of the tracts then under reconsideration had been reproduced, only in a somewhat modified form. This removed much of the uncertainty as to the views held by Mr. Newton, and facilitated the investigation of his doctrines. These considerations led Mr. Muller, Mr. Craik, and the other leading brethren, to regard it as needful to take up as a church matter, that which before it had not been deemed desirable to do; and in consequence several special meetings of the church were held, commencing on Nov. 27, and ending on Dec. 11, 1848. At the first meeting, Mr. Muller, after prayer, stated the reasons which had led them to call the church together, to investigate the painful subject of Mr. Newton's tracts, and explained the reasons

which now led them to do that, which in the middle of the year they had declined doing.

“At the first two or three meetings Mr. Muller spoke almost exclusively, reading from the tracts, page after page, pointing out as he went along, what inferences were legitimately deducible from what was read, and which, if they were allowed, the Lord himself would need a Saviour; and while these influences might have been disallowed by Mr. Newton himself, in judging of his views, they must necessarily be the guide in leading to a decision on *them*. During the remaining four or five meetings, sixteen of the brethren spoke, and gave their views as to the tracts, entering very fully into the questions at issue. The result of these deliberations was, that the following conclusion was arrived at: ‘That no one defending, maintaining, or upholding Mr. Newton’s views or tracts, should be received into communion.’ Of this decision Lord Congleton writes: ‘This conclusion was given out two or three times by the brethren Groves, Muller, and Craik.’ This public announcement we particularly would bring to notice, because it has been asserted by many, ignorant of the facts of the case, that the judgment thus arrived at was merely the private judgment of a few, whereas it was much more to be regarded as expressing the *judgment of the Church*, than was the Letter of the Ten.

* * * * *

“It would have been imagined that the whole controversy between Bethesda and her opponents, as far as they were concerned, would have been brought to a close; the investigation which was demanded had taken place, and the conclusion come to, to admit none holding Mr. Newton’s views. The ostensible object had been gained; the real object had not, and that was submission, submission it was said to the church, but in reality to a party. This was avowedly stated at a public meeting in connection with the Letter of the Ten, when these questions were under discussion. It was asked by one of the Bethesda brethren, ‘Why should we judge a matter that has taken place at Plymouth?’ It was replied, ‘Because the church has judged it.’ ‘And what is the Church?’ asked Mr. Muller. The answer given was, ‘Those who meet as we do.’ Mr. Muller replied, ‘That is not my view of the church,’ and Mr. Meredith further remarked, ‘I should consider, holding such a view of the church, as going completely back to Popery.’ Bethesda had acted for themselves in the matter before God, and sought to obey His word, but they had not obeyed ‘the voice of the church!’ and Mr. Wigram writes, Feb. 2nd, 1849, ‘You may depend upon it that the aim of Bethesda is, to make a party positively apart from us all, and apart, I judge too, from Mr. Newton.’ He was quite prepared to allow that they aimed at keeping aloof from Mr. Newton, and his charge against Bethesda resolves itself into a wish on their part to act apart and stand apart from those to whom he belonged; and if this implied the rejection of the assumed exclusive place of the church on which they were taking their stand, and by means of which they sought to enforce their decrees on all

those with whom they consented to hold fellowship, it must be acknowledged Mr. Wigram was right.

* * * * *

“ Since 1849 nothing has occurred to disturb the peace of the saints meeting in Bethesda and other places in Bristol connected with it; and those principles of holy independence of man in the things of God, which the brethren have sought to maintain in the church, and for the benefit of the church at large, have taken root, and the real fellowship of the church in the oneness of the spirit has been increasingly sought after, and by the grace of God increasingly felt, in much happy fellowship with all saints, irrespective of party, name, or denomination: and those fundamental truths, touching alike the divinity and humanity of the blessed Lord are held, preached, and contended for earnestly, as the faith once delivered to the saints. Those who know most of the church at Bethesda will testify to the earnestness with which a godly discipline seeks to keep alive among the saints a deep sense of the value of foundation truth, and of the imperative necessity of a godly consistent life in all admitted to church fellowship.

“ The following remarks made by the late Mr. Craik in reference to these separations, written at the time, we transcribe for the instruction of all.

“ ‘ Since we have been separated from both parties (*i. e.* Mr. Newton’s and Mr. Darby’s), there has been much quietness amongst us; the Lord is present in our meetings; souls are constantly added to the church. We meddle not with things too high for us; as in ourselves lost and guilty, we make Jesus our only refuge. We meet to exhort one another, and to wait patiently on God; we publish the glad tidings to the world, and the Lord gives testimony to the word of His grace. Far removed from strife and contentions, we are not over anxious what man may think of us, so long as we can walk in spiritual comfort, and promote the cause of Jesus. The days of our earthly pilgrimage are gliding away; we profess not to be superior in light and attainment to other believers. We know ourselves to be weak. We confess it to God; we do not desire needlessly to talk about it. We seek to enjoy the truth in secret, and to serve Him in conscious weakness; to avoid all heartless, thorny, and unprofitable controversy; to be in fellowship with all who love our Lord Jesus, and who do not require anything which we cannot grant as the price of that fellowship. We would use no hard words or cherish unkind feelings towards any. We know that we have been misrepresented, evil spoken of, unjustly condemned. The day will declare it; but oh! when the soul is really conscious that accusations are false, they are as harmless as the roar of the distant thunder. I would rather enjoy the serenity of conscious innocence on any point, than possess the undeserved approbation of the whole church of God.’

“ The course pursued by Bethesda all through this painful controversy, up to the present hour, has been to maintain silence, and to avoid all self-vindication, committing their cause as between them and their exclusive brethren who have cast them off, to the Lord who judgeth righteously, and the Lord has not left them without witness; and in regard to that honoured servant of God, who has been so

grievously slandered, and whose work in the Orphan Houses has been frequently termed by members of that party, 'a work of the devil,' we can say in the words of a dear brother, in hearing of the work of conversion that has been going on among the orphan children of late, 'May this always be the answer God will enable Mr. Muller to give to his accusers.' The Lord will not withhold the honor to him whom He can honor—an honor read not in the light of a party, but in the light of the whole Church of God."—p. 49-53.

"THE ONE ASSEMBLY OF GOD."

"In these pages it has been sought to dwell particularly on the falsity of certain principles maintained and acted on by many, and these remarks will be directed to pointing out the growth and working of these destructive notions, which have marred so much of the Lord's work, and brought so much dishonor on his name, and added another to the many sects that already deface the religion of Him who prayed that all his followers might be one; for if the following of any one man ever marked any body of men, which justified their receiving the name of their leader, those to whom allusion is here made, have earned the unenviable claim to be called Darbyites. No sooner is the name of 'a body' assumed, and 'a corporate action' maintained, outside the limited sphere of the two or three, who are gathered in the name of Jesus; than those, so taking to themselves such corporate responsibilities and powers, become virtually a confederacy, a sect, a body of their own, be the name by which they are called what it may. The leader of the party is never the leader in everything. He points out the way, and those who follow generally outstep their master, in those particulars which form the peculiar characteristics of his creed and action, and while he leads as to the direction that views and acts take, he is none the less under the leading influence of the current, which it may be, he has caused; and borne along by influences which he can no longer control, he becomes at once the leader and the slave of his own system. Notice of the gradual development of the corporate standing assumed by Mr. Darby has already been taken, but those embryo developments already alluded to, and so painfully brought to light eighteen years ago, have not lain dormant; the seed has become the full corn in the ear, and, as some of the party acknowledge, already 'new circumstances need new rules,' and as new ideas develop themselves, new expressions are needed to embody them. '*The one Assembly of God*' is an expression made use of in 1861 as the term whereby to designate those federal gatherings acting in unison with Mr. Darby. It is not an expression used once accidentally, it occurs reiteratedly in the ecclesiastical documents of the party, and hence deserves our consideration. It does not appear with whom this presumptuous title originated, but probably it did not originate with Mr. Darby; for it is not likely, deep and grievous as his departure from God's principle of Church fellowship has been, that he would have

been the first to give currency to an expression which he could not but have been wise enough to perceive, would tell more against the catholicity he claims for his party, than any other that could well have been used; recalling so powerfully to mind other similar titles assumed by those with whom he would seek no particular connection, and may henceforth be ranked with 'The one Holy and Catholic Church' of Rome, or 'The Catholic and Apostolic Church' of the Irvingites. The title as assumed, however, can but give to others a clear insight into the workings of the system—a title, that is treason to those whose names are in the Book of Life; to those who 'everywhere call on the name of the Lord, theirs and ours;' to those who still remain by the grace of God outside this 'one assembly.' Mr. Darby, however, who has all along held the position claimed, endorses the expression, and gives additional meaning to it, when in a letter written a little later, speaking of one excluded from the Darbyite assemblies in London, he writes, 'I hold him to be *outside the Church of God on earth*, being *outside what represents it in London*.' Beyond the pale of an anti-christian communion no such arrogant assumption was ever made, in open violation of all the blessed statements in the Word concerning the mutual fellowship and responsibilities of the brotherhood of the family of God. It has been reserved for Darbyism to develop a system which upon the smallest basis should erect the most tremendous superstructure—a superstructure which in the intolerance of its claim, and the boldness of its assertion, reminds us of the days of Papal power in the middle ages. How has the humble gathering of the two or three in the name of Jesus been forgotten and set aside, by this new dogma? and instead of it a position taken, which is destructive of everything in Church standing, but the narrowest sectarianism. Can it be believed possible that those who started with the acknowledgment of the individual responsibility of all saints to Christ, should dwindle down into the position here taken, so as to assert that being outside their small assemblies in London, is outside the Church of God upon earth? Is it possible that original principles could be so openly repudiated, and former testimony so entirely forgotten? but so it is, and these progressive steps in ecclesiasticism it is important to notice, as showing how soon one who excommunicated Mr. Newton in 1845 on the ground of clericalism, should fall into an ecclesiasticism, that embodies in itself far more than all that which was to be condemned in another. This dogma, which might almost cast into the shade all the schisms in the Church, which Brethren from the beginning so raised their voices against, is that into which the Darbyites have fallen, with as narrow a sectarianism as any that has gone before it.

"As this letter, above alluded to, is of importance, we will give an extract from it here, which we hope all will ponder and read in the light of the Word. It was written to Mr. Spurr, of Sheffield, from the South of France, bearing date Feb. 19th, 1864.

"I understood the breach arose between you and Rotherham by reason of your reception of Goodal. With the main facts of his case I

am acquainted, for I took part in what passed, and now allow me to put the case as it stands as to him. I put it merely as a principle. He (or any one else) is rejected in London. The assembly in London have weighed, and I with them, the case, and counted him as either excommunicated or in schism. I put the two cases, for I only speak of the principle. I take part in this act, and *hold him to be outside the church of God on earth, being outside* (in either case) *what represents it in London*; I am bound by scripture to count them so. I come to Sheffield; there he breaks bread, and is—in what? *Not in the church of God on earth, for he is out of it in London*, and there are not two churches on earth, cannot be, so as to be in one and out of another. How can I refuse to eat with him in London and break bread with him in Sheffield? have one conscience for London, and another conscience for Sheffield? It is confusion and disorder. I do not apprehend I am mistaken in saying you received Goodal without having the reasons or motives of the Priory or other brethren in London. If you have had their reasons, the case is only stronger, because you have deliberately condemned the gathering in London and rejected its communion, for he who is outside in London is inside with you.*” (p. 61-63.)

“We have now to trace schism unrepented of developing itself into heresy, and that no longer accidentally brought in, but systematically maintained. It was, as we have seen, about twenty years ago that Mr. Darby commenced his attack on Mr. Newton on the ground of heresy, and now we find two of his leading followers, Mr. Dorman and Captain Perey Hall, leaving him for holding views which they regard as identically the same.† We had heard of these views put forth by Mr. Darby, as has been already alluded to, but we had hoped that they were rather hastily written thoughts than firmly rooted opinions, for the maintenance of which he was prepared again to sacrifice his party of ‘the one assembly’ on the altar of his ambition. From various quarters have been heard rumours of dissatisfaction amongst his followers because of views promulgated by their chief and echoed by others; but we were unprepared for the state of things which the pamphlets written by Mr. Dorman and Capt. Hall bring to light. The pamphlets reveal nothing new in regard to Mr. Darby’s own views, to those who have seen what has been going on among the party of late, but they reveal a state of things in the body that is sad to contemplate, and such an advance in the downward path of false doctrine which, however, need cause no surprise to those who know whereunto allowed evil will grow. But God is speaking, and may we all hear: But a few years have passed away, and the unrighteous course pursued towards Mr. Newton has not been forgotten by the Holy God, and now He who makes those, who are wise in their

* * For this letter in full, the reader is referred to a Pamphlet published at Sheffield, ‘Letters of J. N. Darby, &c., with Replies, &c.’ This Pamphlet is well deserving attentive perusal, together with the notes and comments on this letter which is under review. It is sold by S. W. Spurr, West Street, Sheffield.

† Captain Hall, writing of Mr. Darby’s views, says, ‘So like are they to Mr. Newton’s doctrines, that even had they not been as bad in themselves as I judge them to be, I should be quite unable to maintain the place of what is called testimony against Mr. Newton while connected with those who hold what I think to be as bad.’ We hope our brother will soon be led out of his testimony as against Mr. Newton or any one else, into a simple testimony for Christ, which would clear his path of many difficulties that seem still to encompass it.”

own craftiness, fools, permits the accuser to stand where the accused stood, and allows Mr. Darby to occupy the place of the heretic. His own discipline, righteously carried out, would at once excommunicate not only him, but all those who maintain fellowship with him.

“It is no uncommon thing for those guilty in any matter to attempt to conceal their own departures from truth and uprightness by an unusual zeal against the delinquencies of others, supposed or real, and so we find Mr. Darby while lying under the imputation of having put forth unsound statements, writing of Bethesda in the letter to Mr. Spurr already quoted from in page 63 as follows:—

“The evil at Bethesda is the most unprincipled admission of blasphemers against Christ, the coldest contempt for him I ever came across. All their efforts to examine and hide it only make the matter worse; all who do not abhor the whole system, and all connection with it, are already entangled and defiled. It is, I am satisfied, a mere net of Satan, though many christians may be entangled in it. Every question of churches and unity disappears before the question of Bethesda. It is a question of Christ. Faith governed my path as to it, but I have seen its fruits in America, the West Indies, France, Switzerland, and in a measure in India. I have seen it the spring and support everywhere of unprincipledness and evil, and all who are under its influence turned from uprightness and truth.”

“The man who here accuses others of admitting blasphemers, is accused by his own followers of maintaining the very same blasphemies, which he falsely says that Bethesda has admitted; is himself defiled, and has himself been turned from uprightness and truth, by the shewing of his own friends! How easy to charge others with unprincipledness! and were it our purpose we could retort the charge accompanied with facts known to some. There is a wickedness in this style of writing that its parade of the name and honor of Christ only makes the more intensely evil; those who can lift the veil and read what lies written, not on the surface but underneath, loathe and abhor the unholy proximity with which the Most Holy is brought into connection with the unhallowed, profane actings of pride; but there are those who are led by their feelings and whose judgment is blinded, and this display of holy zeal at once deludes and deceives such. We allude to this here, where faith is claimed for the perpetration of actings of the greatest church wickedness, considering the light possessed, that has darkened the page of church history for many a long year. But God’s estimate of the faith claimed is to be read in the light of the delusions of all kinds, into which he has allowed him and his followers to be led; into the assumptions of “The one Assembly”; into false teaching on the sufferings of Christ; into a proud schismatic discipline separating from those who bow not down to their idol. It is God who has cast them down, not man; it is God who has hardened and blinded, as he ever will, the wilfully hardened and blinded, who have already refused to feel and refused to see. Let the spirit and tone of the extract given, be examined in the light of present events and passing revelations, in which God would have us learn that ‘he shall have judgment without mercy that shewed no mercy,’ for he would teach us that ‘mercy rejoiceth against judgment.’”—p. 71-73.

Extracts from a pamphlet entitled, "THE EXCLUSIVE
BRETHREN: THEIR ORIGIN AND DISCIPLINE."

"Mr. Darby's adherents speak of 'the wicked and ungodly ways of Bethesda in reference to the heresy.' They accuse that Church of 'having identified itself with the false teacher, his party and his deeds'—of 'fellowship with blasphemous doctrine about Christ,'* and so on. Now these are very awful accusations, but are they *true*? It becomes all who hear them, to pause before they *believe* them, according as it is written, 'against an Elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses,' and 'in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.'

"Even human law requires that we hold a man innocent till he is *proved* to be guilty; and let it be remembered, assertion, however strong it may be, and however oft repeated, is not proof. If these assertions were *true*, 'exclusive' discipline would be pardonable, if not altogether justifiable, for the Church is 'the pillar and ground of the truth,' and if she should be jealous in the maintenance of one truth above another, it is of the truth concerning the Lord Jesus. He humbled himself to the dust of death to raise her to a throne of glory. He is the centre and object of all God's counsels, His well beloved and only begotten Son. Had she a thousand lives she should be willing to spend and sacrifice them all, to maintain and defend His divine glory, and preserve intact the truth of His finished work!

"Blessed be God, therefore, for any true zeal for the name and glory of Jesus, displayed in this chequered controversy. But zeal may run into extravagance; it is fire—a good servant if used to consume dross, but an awful tyrant if it attack the house or the city. Zeal is not always according to knowledge. It is sometimes 'strange fire;' a fruit of the spirit, if pure and genuine, but more easily counterfeited by the flesh than many others.

"We do not hesitate to affirm that these awful accusations are not true; and more, that nothing but the blinding influence of party spirit can account for the way in which they are urged year after year, although long ago they have been proved to be untrue.

"The documents published at the time, are sources of evidence now available for those who are not acquainted with the facts when they transpired. These documents distinctly prove—

"I.—That from the first the leaders at Bethesda condemned Mr. Newton's doctrine. We quote their own words:—

"We utterly disclaim the assertion that the blessed Son of God was involved in the guilt of the first Adam, or that He was born under the curse of the broken law, because of His connection with Israel. We hold Him to have been always the holy one of God, in whom the Father was well pleased. We no of no curse which the Saviour bore, except that

known

* "The Bethesda Fellowship in 1865."

which he endured as the surety for sinners, according to that Scripture 'He was made a curse for us.' We utterly reject the thought of His ever having had the experiences of an unconverted person, and maintain that while He suffered outwardly the trials connected with His being a man and an Israelite, still in His feelings and experience as well as in His external character, he was entirely separate from sinners!—'Letter of the Ten,' 1848.

"II.—That persons known as holding Mr. Newton's errors, were never received at Bethesda.

"In reply to the second reason (for secession) that persons may be received from Plymouth, holding evil doctrines, we are happy in being able to state that ever since the matter was agitated *we have maintained, that persons coming from thence, if suspected of any errors would be liable to be examined on the point*; that in the case of one individual, who had fallen under the suspicion of some brethren among us, not only was there private intercourse with him, relative to his views, as soon as it was known that he was objected to, but the individual referred to, known to some of us for several years as a consistent Christian, actually came to a meeting of labouring brethren, for the very purpose that any question might be asked him by any brother who should have any difficulty on his mind.—'Letter of the Ten.' (This individual proved to be quite sound and was received.)

"III.—That the Brethren at Bethesda so far separated from the Church at Plymouth, as to refuse to receive any to communion on its recommendation.

"The Brethren at Bethesda adopted precautions such as they had adopted with no other gathering, namely, persons from Plymouth instead of being admitted on their application, or by letters of recommendation, should after having been seen and approved of by Elder brethren, be merely proposed to the Church, as though they had not been anywhere in communion before, and a week's interval allowed for any who had anxieties to visit them, and that then, if no objection should be entertained, they should be admitted. This has now been the practice for a year. Subsequently Miss T., of Plymouth, applied for communion; this case not having been satisfactory after examination, Miss T. withdrew, that is to say, was not received.—*The Bristol Case, by Lord Congleton.*

"IV.—That afterwards the Elders of Bethesda, under altered circumstances, convened the Church to read and discuss Mr. Newton's tracts; and that at those meetings not only were the views set forth in the tracts condemned, but the conclusion was arrived at, that 'no one upholding, defending, or maintaining them should be received' at Bethesda.

"Seven Church meetings were subsequently held at Bethesda (1848). Mr. Newton's tracts were considered and investigated, and this was the conclusion arrived at—"That no one defending, maintaining, or upholding Mr. Newton's views or tracts, should be received into communion." This conclusion was given out two or three times at the last Church meeting by each of the brethren Groves, Müller, and Craik.—*The Bristol Case, by Lord Congleton.*

"The result of this decision was the withdrawal from Bethesda of six persons who were friends of Mr. Newton, and on the next occasion when a member of the Church at Bethesda went to Mr. Newton's

meeting at Plymouth, and returned, his act was condemned, and he withdrew, considering 'the regulations at Bethesda' effectually hindered Christians from Mr. Newton's meeting from even applying for fellowship there.

"Let any unprejudiced and candid mind judge whether or not these facts justify the accusations made against the Church at Bethesda, of 'having fellowship with blasphemous doctrines about Christ,' 'wicked and ungodly ways,' &c., &c.!

"The Letter of the Ten' from which we have quoted is said to be 'a slight upon Christ,' and 'a grievous sin against God.' Bethesda is accused of taking 'neutral ground' in a question affecting 'the glory of Christ,' and of advocating 'latitudinarian principles.' These charges rest on no better foundation than the last. The neutrality consists in dealing with the heresy in a different way from that called for by the accusers. That is all. The unsound doctrine was not overlooked, much less commended as truth; and as to latitudinarianism, it is only by taking certain clauses in a wider sense than that in which they were intended, that the charge seems to have any foundation. The Elders at Bethesda assert that this 'Letter of the Ten' was never intended as a rule for standard; and that they own no standard but the Word of God. Mr. Craik, one of their pastors, in 1857, nine years after it was written, says of it:—

"It was never intended as a Church rule.' 'For certain party purposes it was printed and circulated by those who were opposed to our Church action. It was not printed by any one connected with Bethesda. Those who published it, represented it as a statement of Church principles. Some time ago we were requested to withdraw the letter. We entirely objected to do so, inasmuch as that which had never been enacted, could not possibly be repealed.' We have as a body no code of laws but those contained in the New Testament; and we feel bound to receive all those who give satisfactory evidence of belonging to Christ, and who maintaining the essential verities of our holy faith, are at the same time walking consistently as Christians. We recognise no limited or sectarian bonds of fellowship, and desire to be considered in communion with all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. We have no sympathy with any system that would necessitate a sectarian position; nor can we allow ourselves to belong to any other brotherhood except that which is common to the whole family of God.'

"In reply to some inquiries as to the same document, from one who thought it seemed to sanction latitudinarianism, he writes:—

"Bristol, November 25, 1849.

"MY DEAR BROTHER,

"In reply to your letter of inquiry, touching certain points contained in what has been called 'The Letter of the Ten,' I beg to remark that although we did not consider the fact of error having been taught at Plymouth or elsewhere, as a sufficient reason for our bringing the matter before the body here, yet I fully allow, that if we were satisfied that the well-being of the saints here required our investigating and judging any particular form of error, it would be our duty to do so. In reference to the objection against our paper, grounded on the statement that even suppos-

ing the author of the tracts were fundamentally heretical, this would not warrant us in rejecting those who came from under his teaching, until we were satisfied that they had understood and imbibed views essentially unsound.' I beg to remark that in all ordinary cases, and as a general rule of action, persons coming from a known heretical teacher would not be received amongst us, except on the understanding that they had renounced his errors, and relinquished the body amongst whom the false doctrine was taught and maintained. *During these seventeen years past this has been our mode of acting; neither do I know of a single instance in which persons previously connected with heretical bodies, have applied to us for communion and been received amongst us, without by that very act thereby relinquishing the connection with their former associates.* This has been the general understanding amongst us for these seventeen years past. I am satisfied that the other brethren who labor among us accord with the explanation I have just given. Hoping that these explanations may be satisfactory, I remain, my dear Brother, yours affectionately in Christ,

“HENRY CRAIK.”

“And Mr. Muller, in reply to another inquirer, thus writes briefly but explicitly:—

“21, Paul-street, Kingsdown, Bristol,
“Sept. 18th, 1866.

“MY DEAR BROTHER,

“With regard to your letter respecting a paper commonly called ‘The Letter of the Ten,’ I send you this as my reply.

“As a body or assembly, *we have no standard but the Word of God*—no code of laws, or regulations, or Church principles, but those contained therein. We desire in all things to be subject to the Word of God, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The paper to which you refer was never intended to be more than a mere statement of facts and explanation of reasons for pursuing the course which the labouring brethren thought to be *right at that time under the peculiar circumstances of the case.* It is to be regarded as *having passed away* with the occasion which gave rise to it. That paper was never intended for publication, and was read to the Church with explanations. It should not have been published without our consent, or without the explanations which accompanied the reading of it. I am, my dear Brother, yours affectionately in the Lord,

“GEORGE MULLER.”

(—p. 10—14.)

The Pamphlets referred to can be obtained from the Publishers, as follow:

Houlston & Co., Paternoster Row, London:

"*The Close of Twenty-eight Years of Association with J. N. D.; and of Fellowship and Ministry amongst those who adopt his Doctrines concerning the Sufferings of Christ.*" By W. H. D. (Price One Shilling.)

"*Grief upon Grief: a Dialogue.*" By P. F. H. (Price Sixpence.)

"*Translation of a Letter from M. Guinand, of Lausanne, to Mr. J. N. Darby.*" (Price Threepence.)

"*Divers and Strange Doctrines Stated and Examined.*" By 'Tertius.' (Price Fourpence.)

"*Darbyism: its Rise and Development; and a Review of 'the Bethesda Question.'*" By Henry Groves. (Price One Shilling.)

William MacIntosh, 19, Paternoster Row, London:

"*The Exclusive Brethren: their Origin and Discipline.*" (Price Sixpence.)

Rowse & Co., Stephen's Green, Dublin:

"*Mr. J. N. D.: a Sketch of some of his Recent Doctrines,*" &c. By T. R. (Price Twopence.)

Charles Caswell, 135, Broad Street, Birmingham:

"*Cause of his own Withdrawal from Certain London Meetings Explained.*" By George B. Gilpin. (Price Twopence.)

George Morrish, 24, Warwick Lane, Paternoster Row:

"*Brethren and their Traducers.*" By W. Kelly. (Price Twopence.)

G. J. Stevenson, 54, Paternoster Row, London:

"*A Caution against the Darbyites.*" By J. E. Howard. (2nd Edition. Price Sixpence.)

File-Tex
Single Copy Pamphlet Cover

Grade V

Made in all Sizes

MacMILLAN OFFICE APPLIANCES COMPANY

Westboro, Ont., Canada.

Manufacturers of Office and Library Filing Supplies

Loose Leaf Devices and Specialties

