
This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

<http://books.google.com>



4135

aaa 47

2130

THE- RECENT DOCTRINES

OF

THE FIVE.

Mr. Darby's New Bible,

AND

Mr. Kelly's Justification of it.

BY

ONE WHO WRITES ON BEHALF OF MANY.

Third Edition. Revised.

LONDON: W. MACINTOSH, PATERNOSTER ROW.
DUBLIN: G. HERBERT, GRAFTON STREET.

Cheap Edition, in Packages, 12 Copies, 1s. ; by Post, 1s. 2d.
50 Copies, 4s. 2d.

1868.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

THE BRITISH MUSEUM



THE BRITISH MUSEUM

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

1871

THE RECENT DOCTRINES OF THE FIVE AND MR. DARBY'S NEW BIBLE.

UNLESS that we are prepared knowingly to accept falsehood and reject truth, we must all ask at times, whither we are drifting. The Bereans, in the Acts of the Apostles, are commended for testing by the Scriptures of truth the things which the Apostle Paul put before them: "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so."—Acts xvii. 11.

And we mean, in this tract to bring certain doctrines and translations to the test of Scripture—doctrines which for some years have been printed, published, circulated and defended. If the doctrines and translations be true, they alter the fundamental character of what we have for a long while believed to be the teaching of the New Testament. If, on the other hand, they are found to be false, what shall be then said to the pretentiousness with which they are put out, in order to enlighten the public, coupled with the evil which they contain? However, that the reader may be able to test the matter for himself, the materials are furnished in the following pages.

The names of the teachers conspicuous in holding and propagating these doctrines and translations are, Messrs. Darby, Wigram, Kelly, Humphreys, Patterson. We shall commence with Mr. Patterson,

and end with Mr. Darby's translations. The latter, if they be true, have virtually given us a new Bible, which however is now praised by one of their principal organs (*The Bible Treasury*), as exhibiting "discriminating value" in putting the word *homage* for *worship*, in reference to Christ in the days of His flesh.

OUR LORD'S PRAYER.—John xvii.

We repudiate as profane and irreverent the following sentiments on our Lord's prayer, John xvii., published by Mr. Patterson (Dublin, 1867.) Mr. P. says as follows :

"How wonderfully do we find Christ's prayer answered—Acts ii. and iv. We read there, 'They lifted up their voices with one accord;' 'The multitudes of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul,' &c. His prayer was answered for a little moment, 'That they all may be one.' But soon indeed did it fail, and then we find Saul of Tarsus, afterwards Paul the Apostle, called out to reveal to us something that could never fail—the unity of the Spirit in the one body."—*There is One Body and One Spirit*, by F. G. Patterson. Morrish, London, 1867. Page 16.

Our Lord's Prayer failed, but what Paul the Apostle reveals could never fail! What teaching alas is this! If such doctrine be not profane and irreverent, what is profanity and irreverence? A sharp contrast drawn between our Lord's prayer and St. Paul's teaching; and this doctrine circulated far and wide for the last year and half as "fresh and new truth"!

A simple person would suppose that if the Lord prayed for the oneness of believers with Himself, St. Paul reveals its fulfilment and existence, and though we may fail to act up to it now, He will not fail to manifest it in His own time. Such a contrast between the Lord and the Apostle is very evil indeed.

But what must be the necessary effect of such doctrine? Is it not this? If the Lord's prayer failed, but what St. Paul reveals does not fail, what use in my praying? Better far to get up points of

knowledge from St. Paul's Epistles than to give oneself to prayers or prayer meetings; and that such is absolutely the effect of this teaching is observable, and particularly so in the system to which these Teachers belong.

THE HOLY GHOST.

Secondly, We reject as profane, irreverent and erroneous the following sentiments respecting the Holy Ghost. The same author styles the Church in the World as perfect as the Holy Ghost Himself, as the following paragraph declares.

“ Now this Body is in the world as is the Holy Ghost, whose presence constitutes it. . . . True that all that was committed to man has as ever failed; but there was that in the world then, there was that through the dark middle ages, there is that now in the world which has remained all through the ruin of Christendom, as perfect as the Holy Ghost Himself, who by His presence and baptism constitutes and is as ever the unity of the Body of Christ.”—*One Body and One Spirit by F. G. Patterson*. Morrish, London. Page 18.

Here the Body of the Church of God in the world is compared to the Holy Ghost Himself, and said to be as perfect as the Holy Ghost Himself. Why not compare it to God the Father, and say, as perfect as God the Father Himself? And if not, why not? Such language is grievous and dishonoring to the Holy Ghost as God, and it proves that knowledge, falsely so called, is put in place of prayerful reverence. We say knowledge falsely so called; for the Church corporately or the Body of Christ is never, as a whole, looked at as perfect now in the world, but in a condition of progress. The building is growing unto a great temple (Eph. ii.); the body is increasing unto a perfect man (Eph. iv.); and the spouse is now being sanctified and cleansed, so as to be presented without spot or wrinkle or any such thing bye and bye. (Eph. v.) These chapters all show a condition of progress unto

a complete and perfect state. Nor is it at all a question of how long or how short the period of this progress was to last, but of the fact. If it were all perfected in a year from the day St. Paul wrote his last epistle, the principle is the same. The coming of the Lord was to be always present to the Church, and then she was to be perfected, but not till then. On the other hand, the Church, in Ephesians, is also looked at as already seated with Christ in heavenly places. (Eph. ii) The Church of the first born ones (*Prototokoon*) are in heaven, enrolled there, as in Hebrews xii. 23; so that if a Christian falls asleep in Christ before the Lord comes again, his condition on earth is changed, but his status in heaven remains. His position there is enjoyed with much greater intensity, like St. Paul when called up to the third heaven for his citizenship (*Politeuma*) is already in heaven (Phil. iii. 20); and he is a fellow-citizen (*Sumpolitēs*), (Eph. ii. 12) with the saints there and here. Hence Christ is looked at not only as the Head of the body—the Head in heaven, and the body on earth growing and increasing (Eph. iv.)—but Christ and the Church together are looked at as one organic whole. Christ and His members are one man, and man is an organism composed of many members. For this reason the Church is said to be “His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all:” and again, the Head and the members together are called Christ—“so also is Christ.”—1 Cor. xii. 12.

But to compare the Church on earth to God the Father, to Christ, or to the Holy Ghost Himself, evidences only the vanity of the mind, bewildered by a newly discovered subject. Such comparisons are nowhere found in Scripture—they are profane and irreverent, and the more so when applied to *self* and *party*.*

* Since the above was written (October 9th, 1868), a gentleman came to say that in a tract entitled *The Church in the World: What is it?* (Dixon,

THE CROSS.

Thirdly, we reject as pernicious and degrading, the following sentiments on the Cross, published by Mr. Wigram, of London, in *The Present Testimony*. Mr. Wigram writes as follows :

“There was to Him, in addition to the pain of death, the legal curse appended by God’s righteous judgment as King of Israel to the form of death, as it is written ‘Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.’ But this curse of the law was not the same thing as wrath when he cried out ‘My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?’ The thieves bore it as he did; that thief too who went with him to paradise the same day, and who could go there to be with his Lord, because He the Prince of Life had borne the wrath due to sin in His own body on the tree. But the cross had been endured by many an unrepentant rebel against God and man, and the cross in itself could not take away sin. Yea more, while the time in which He endured the cross was the period in part of which wrath came on Him (when He endured the wrath of God’s judgment against sin,) He only of the three that were crucified together could or did bear that wrath, and the agony of His alone, of the three then and there crucified was distinct from, though present to Him at the same time as the agonies (infinitely lesser) of the cross of wood.”—*Present Testimony*. Morrish, London, August 1866. Page 167.

The object of this paragraph, as will appear presently, is to separate the atonement from the actual death of Christ, and fix it on the first moments

Dublin; Paul, London; Price 2d.) Mr. Patterson was misrepresented and misquoted, holding up the tract in his hand to prove it. What has Mr. Patterson done? When the erroneous doctrines and evil sentiments of his tract were exposed, he brings out a new edition, suppressing the evil sentences referred to, without informing his reader that the former tract was withdrawn, and without acknowledging the evil doctrines and sentiments circulated in every direction for a year and half previously without any change whatsoever. Mr. Patterson thereby leaves the reader to suppose that he was falsely quoted and misrepresented. We are very glad that he has suppressed those evil sentences, but whether this mode of doing it was in accordance with Christian candour and honesty we leave it to others to judge. There is a notorious class of religionists elsewhere which think everything right when done on behalf of *the Church*. For this reason, and because Mr. P. says that his doctrines are unchanged, we still quote from the tract dated 1867.

of the crucifixion, "the period in part of which the wrath came on Him," the other part (as Mr. Darby says) having come on Him in Gethsemane and before the cross. Hence His death became only a matter "of course," as Mr. Kelly says, and "He went out of the world in perfect quiet, death was nothing." Hence also the degrading expressions, "The cross had been endured by many an unrepentant rebel against God and man; "The thieves bore the curse as He did; "The agonies infinitely lesser of the cross of wood," &c. Why does Mr. Wigram use the knife to dissect the Lord with such a remorseless hand? Because he wants to prove that the curse of the law and the wrath of God were sundered one from the other in this great scene. The Apostle Paul in Gal. iii. proves exactly the reverse, viz.—that both curse of law and wrath of God coincided.

But this is with a view to justify Mr. Darby, who says that in Gethsemane Christ "was not actually drinking the cup, but He was meeting indignation and wrath."—*Sufferings of Christ by J. N. D., new Edtn. p. 14.*

The cross, Mr. Wigram tells us, was the time or "the period in part of which the wrath came on Him." When then did the other part come on Him? Let the editor of *The Bible Treasury* answer. Mr. Kelly is the editor of *The Bible Treasury*, he says :

"Before He left Gethsemane the whole power of Satan was totally destroyed. He had gone through the hour with his Father, and now takes the Cup at the hand of His Father as an act of obedience. He is now as calm as when doing any other miracle, (healing the servant's ear) as if nothing had happened. It was their hour and the power of darkness was on them, not on Him. . . . At the cross He cries out 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' He went through the hour in Gethsemane, and here drinks the terrible cup, &c. If I look at Satan, I see his power annihilated and destroyed; if I look at the wrath of God, He has drunk it to the dregs: He entered into all the darkness and wrath, but before He went out of the world He had passed through it all, and went out in perfect quiet: the work is so perfectly done that death is nothing."—*Bible Treasury.* August 1866, Page 128,

The time of the Cross then was the period in part of which wrath came on Him, the other part was in Gethsemané. The whole power of Satan was totally destroyed in Gethsemane previously, and the end of the cross was "perfect quiet, death was nothing." This evil doctrine is thus systematically worked out.

What then—if this be true—means that agonizing cry (*Kraxas phone megale*) when the Lord gave up the ghost? Does not *the Cross* in Scripture language stand for the whole penal act of death, and judgment, and condemnation, till the cup was exhausted? But according to this view the atonement was not contained in His death at all, it was accomplished before it—so that the act of death became only a mere matter of course—it was "nothing"!!!

In proof of this in the next Number of *The Bible Treasury*, (September 1866, Page 137,) the editor has the following analysis of the Cross, Mr. Kelly says: "Now that which was properly expiation or atonement, was not the pure, however precious act of Christ's death. Of course death was necessary for this as for other objects, in the counsels of God; but it was what Jesus went through from and with God, when made sin. It is what He suffered for our sins, not in body, but in soul, under divine wrath, that the atonement depends on. Many besides Jesus have been crucified, but atonement was in no wise wrought there."

It is evident that the object of this analysis is as above stated to sever and separate one part of the cross from the other; and the sentence that "the pure, however precious act of Christ's death was not, properly speaking, expiation or atonement," is a sentiment sufficiently revolting to any one not so absorbed by Party pretensions as to forget the dispositions which should surround that great event. The Apostles never treat our Lord's death as a mere matter of course, nor teach that atonement was made before it and independently of it.

"THE NON-ATONING SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST."

Fourthly, we reject as injurious and heretical the doctrine that our Lord, ere He came to the cross, and without it being expiatory or atoning, confessed our sins as His own, and had the chastisement of our peace upon Him. That He was bearing wrath partly in Gethsemane and partly on the cross Mr. Wigram and Mr. Kelly have shown us. Mr. Darby and Mr. Humphreys give further explanations, and tell us that He was confessing sins also, that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, but that they were not atoning sufferings. These were the Lord's "*non-atoning sufferings!*"

In his comments on Psalm lxix. 26, Mr. Darby writes as follows :

"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 persecution. They take advantage of God's hand on the sorrowing one to add to His grief and burden. This is not atonement, but there is sorrow and smiting from God. Hence we find the sense of sins, verse 5 [O God, Thou knowest my foolishness and my sins are not hid from Thee], though of course in the case of Christ they were not His own personally, but 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 in them: 'They persecute Him whom Thou hast smitten, and speak to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.'"—*Sufferings of Christ, by J.N.D. Morrish, London. P. 71.*

Here we are told that "God's hand was on the sorrowing one"—"smiting from God"—"the sense of sins"—"the confession of sins." "But we have the clear proof," says Mr. Darby, "that they are not atoning sufferings." And what is the clear proof?

Because in verse 26 the plural and not the singular is used: "They talk to the grief of those whom Thou hast wounded." This is the clear proof! But in verse 25 we have the plural also, and yet we know from the Acts of the Apostles (chap. i. 20) that it referred to a singular person. "Let their habitation be desolate" is in the Acts quoted in reference to Judas, "Let his habitation be desolate," showing that it is one of those plurals of intensity common to scriptures with other books, and frequent in the language of human life. So that it is no proof at all on the point, for one verse refers to Judas, the other to the Lord, and both in juxtaposition. Yet such is the "clear proof" on which Mr. Darby hangs the tremendous doctrine that our Lord in His life confessed our sins, "had the sense of sins," was smitten of God for them, suffered "His wrath and indignation under them," yet all the while these sufferings did not make atonement or expiation. "We have the clear proof that they are not atoning sufferings," he says. These are what is meant by the "non-atoning sufferings of Christ." And this is the doctrine which remains out before the world to this hour unconfessed and unretracted. Mr. Darby, when obliged by long pressure, writes a long introduction to his pamphlet on *The Sufferings of Christ*, in which he informs us that our Lord had great and intense sufferings in His lifetime, and that these intense sufferings and sorrows were not in atonement. Which nobody denied, at least no one in this controversy. But he omits the real point at issue, viz: the confession of sin coupled with sufferings. This is the point to which Mr. Darby did not address himself, and tried to evade by arguments not very creditable.

But Mr. Humphreys of Hereford, a thorough and honest disciple of these evil doctrines, disdains evasions and openly tells us that our Lord not only confessed our sins and suffered under them

before the cross, but that we are healed by the non-atoning sufferings and stripes of Christ, as well as by His atoning sufferings. The statements and paragraphs are complete in themselves, as also are Mr. Darby's statements—no context can alter them. If I say, It is a good and wholesome doctrine to pray souls out of Purgatory, the statement is complete in itself; no context can change it. Such excuses are merely got up as subterfuges, and are not honest. But reveries of this kind alternate between silliness and blasphemy. According then to Mr. Darby, the Lord confessed our sins and endured the wrath of God before He came to the cross. According to Mr. Humphreys, we are healed by those non-atoning sufferings of Christ. This is what Mr. Wigram and Mr. Kelly call "going through the hour in Gethsemane" when "the whole power of Satan was totally destroyed." The doctrine of all is the same. But let us hear Mr. Humphreys, he says:—

"In Isaiah liii. 5, the expression, 'The chastisement of our peace was upon him' doubtless includes the atoning sufferings of our Lord on the cross, when as dying for the nation of Israel He bore besides the wrath of God due to sin generally, the governmental wrath of God due to that nation as being under the curse of a broken law, but nevertheless the expression does not exclude the non-atoning sufferings of Christ for the remnant to which allusion has been all ready made,—those sufferings which they will themselves pass through in the time of the great tribulation."—*A few words on the Sufferings of Christ.* Morrish, London, Page 11.

Again,

"The reason assigned by our Lord 'Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness'—Matt. iv. 15, shows that by this act Christ openly and publicly took the position of, and identified Himself with the remnant as under the governmental dealings of God. If this position of Christ be once apprehended, such an expression as that continued in Ps. lxix. 5—'O God, thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from thee,' and many others of a similar kind in the Psalms which are applicable to Christ as well as the remnant, become clear and intelligible."—*A few Words on the Sufferings of Christ.* Morrish, London, Page 12.

Mr. Humphreys therefore goes somewhat beyond his Master, and informs us that it was not only at Gethsemane or during the last days of His ministry that our Lord was confessing sins, and that the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, but from the time of the baptism of John, and these were the "non-atoning sufferings" of Christ!

Such was the nature of the doctrines which at first caused commotion amongst the *Brethren* so called; afterwards Mr. Darby and his leading Teachers come out on the same side, a clear proof of how far principle rather than party and personal feeling carried the movement and still carries it.

There are many who hold that our Lord was suffering vicariously and in atonement all his life as well as on the cross. We do not agree with this doctrine, and we are not here discussing it. But to be told that the Lord was confessing sins and suffering for them under the wrath of God in His life, and yet that these sufferings were *non-atoning*, is very evil and grave Heresy in every sense.

We therefore recommend Mr. Darby in his new Bible to give, in next edition, a more exact rendering of Luke vi. 41, "But why seest thou the mote in the eye of thy brother, but perceivest not the beam in thine own eye?" The idea here is not that the individual did not perceive the beam in his own eye, but—he did not regard it, (*Katanoesis* the word—used elsewhere in this sense:—Rom. iv. 19; Heb. iii. 1 and x. 24) whereas he was quick in his perception of the mote in his brother's eye, (*Blepeis*,—this verb here applies not to bodily seeing, but to mental vision). The verse should run thus—"But why *perceivest* thou the mote in the eye of thy brother, but *regardest* not the beam in thine own eye." This verse may thus form a useful subject for meditation next time.

And now let us look for a moment at Mr. Darby's *New Bible*.

MR. DARBY'S NEW BIBLE.

Bad as are the doctrines already sketched, and which no context can justify or alter, yet even these are to our thinking surpassed by the corruption of Holy Scripture. The reader must know that Mr. Darby has made a new version of the New Testament for his people, a version bald and dry. And has emptied those passages on our Lord's divinity where divine worship and honor are given Him and accepted by Him. Endless blunders, errors, mis-translations, confounding of moods, tenses, prepositions,—do not so much surprise us. They simply show that antiquated scholarship does not make a man equal to the literature of his subject. But positively vicious renderings on the side of Unitarian divinity we did not expect. Renderings perfectly gratuitous in themselves. The Unitarians published in 1808 (Longman's, London) a version of the New Testament which they called "An improved Version." In this "improved version" they translate the word *worship* in reference to Christ as *do him obeisance*. Mr. Darby translates it *do him homage*. It is the same word as is used in John iv. in reference to God the Father, where our Lord says to the woman of Samaria "God is a Spirit, and they that *worship* him must *worship* him in spirit and in truth," &c., &c.

The word has a higher and a lower sense in Greek as in English. When it refers to what is divine, *worship* is used in the higher sense; when it refers to

what is human only, it is used in the lower sense, as when the Lord Mayor or the Magistrate is styled "his worship." See also Matt. xviii. 26.

Now the Lord, in the days of His flesh, received that prostration of soul and that adoration of heart which was due to Him as the promised Messiah, and He accepted it. There was an afflicted remnant in Israel, and some strangers from among the Gentiles, that with visible worship sought relief from Him, acknowledging Him as the Messiah of whom Moses in the law and the Prophets did write, the Son of God, who made Himself equal with God, John v. 18. Such was Jairus, such was the Samaritan leper, such were the wise men from the East, not to speak of His disciples, who saw Him walking on the sea, and afterwards stilling the tempest, and "worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God." For of Him it was said by the Prophet—"Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall *worship*, (*Proskunesousin*) because of the Lord that is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee."—Isa. xlix. 7. Who will say that the worship of the Messiah the Son of God was to be mere obeisance or homage? Divine worship was claimed for Him by the Prophets, and divine worship accepted by Him as the Messiah and the Son of God in the days of His flesh. Why the Unitarians should empty the passages of their force, we know well; but why Mr. Darby should empty them of their force we know not; and if this be not siding with Unitarians—what is it? And need it be told that the Lord never refused the divine worship given Him, like St. Peter in *The Acts* (x. 25. 26.), or like the angel in *Rev.* (xxii. 8. 9.)

The Unitarians and Mr. Darby when rendering the Greek word *Proskuneo* in their respective versions in

reference to God the Father (John iv.) translate it *worship* as the authorized version: when in reference to Christ they translate it *do him obeisance*,—*do him homage*, as the following will prove:

UNITARIAN VERSION,
Called "An Improved Version."

Matt. ii. 2, 10, 11.

Where is he that is born King of the Jews; for we have seen his star in the east country, and are come to *do him obeisance*.

And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with very great joy. And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child, with Mary his mother, and fell down and *did him obeisance*.

Matt. viii. 2.

And behold a leper came and *did him obeisance*, saying, Sir, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean.

Matt. ix. 18.

While he spake these things unto them, behold their came a certain ruler and *did him obeisance*, saying, My daughter is by this time dead, but come and put thy hand upon her, and she will live.

Matt. xiv. 32, 33.

And when they had entered into the ship the wind ceased. Then those that were in the ship came and *did him obeisance*, saying, Truly thou art a son of God.

Matt. xv. 24, 25.

Then he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then she came and *did him obeisance*, saying, Sir, help me.

MR. DARBY'S VERSION.

Matt. ii. 2, 10, 11.

Where is he that has been born King of the Jews, for we have seen his star in the east, and have come to *do him homage*.

And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. And having come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and falling down *did him homage*.

Matt. viii. 2.

And behold a leper came and *did homage to him*, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou art able to cleanse me.

Matt. ix. 18.

As he spoke these things to them, a ruler came and *did homage to him*, saying, My daughter has by this time died, but come and lay thy hand upon her and she shall live.

Matt. xiv. 32, 33.

And when they had gone up into the ship the wind fell. But those in the ship came and *did homage to him*, saying, Truly thou art God's Son.

Matt. xv. 24, 25.

But he answering said, I have not been sent save to the lost sheep of Israel's house. But she came and *did him homage*, saying, Lord, help me.

UNITARIAN VERSION,
Called "An Improved Version."

Matt. xxviii. 9.

After the Resurrection.

And as they went to tell his disciples, lo Jesus met them, saying, Hail! And they came near and took hold of his feet, and *did him obeisance*.

Matt. xxviii. 16, 17, 18.

Afterwards the eleven disciples went into Galilee, to a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him *they did him obeisance*, but some had doubted. And Jesus came near and spake unto them saying, all power is given unto me in heaven and upon earth.

Luke xxiv. 52.

And he led them out to Bethany, and lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass that while he was parted from them and carried up into heaven. And they *did him obeisance*, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy.

MR. DARBY'S VERSION.

Matt. xxviii. 9.

After the Resurrection.

And as they went to bring his disciples word, lo also Jesus met them, saying, Hail! And they coming up, took him by the feet and *did him homage*.

Matt. xxviii. 16, 17, 18.

But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, to the mountain which Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him *they did homage to him*, but some doubted. And Jesus coming up spoke to them, saying, All power has been given me in heaven and upon earth.

Luke xxiv. 52.

And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and having lifted up his hands he blessed them. And it came to pass as he was blessing them, he was separated from them, and was carried up into heaven. And they having *done him homage* returned to Jerusalem with great joy.

OBSERVATION.—In the *Apocalypse*, God and Christ as objects before the worshipper so interpenetrate each other that they cannot be well distinguished at times. And so Mr. Darby renders the same word sometimes *worship*, sometimes *homage*, in that book, as he himself tells us. The Unitarian version renders the word uniformly in the *Apocalypse* as *worship*. But in the note to Rev. v. 14, it adds that it was not true worship but homage that is there given to

Christ; and this is the very word Mr. Darby uses, translating it, "The elders fell down and *did homage*." When Mr. Darby thinks the immediate object is God the Father, he translates the word *worship*; when he thinks the immediate object is Christ, he translates it *do homage*. This is the rule he has followed in the *Apocalypse* as anyone can see who looks into it. They are not mere capricious renderings at random, but done on a system. In this he shows more acuteness than the Unitarians, who translate the word *worship* all through that book, but in the notes say that in reference to Christ it is intended in the lower sense, and means *homage*. With few exceptions, they thus row in the same boat all through the New Testament.

UNITARIAN VERSION,
Called "An Improved Version."

John ix. 35-39.

Jesus heard that they had cast him out. And when he met him, he said unto him, Dost thou believe in the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, sir, that I may believe in him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he who talketh with thee. And the man said, Sir, I believe. And *he did Jesus obeisance.*

MR. DARBY'S VERSION.

John ix. 35-39.

Jesus heard that they had cast him out, and having found him he said to him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him? Jesus said to him, Thou hast both seen him, and he that speaks with thee is he. And he said, I believe Lord. And *he did him homage.*

The Unitarian tendency of these systematic renderings, in lowering the worship due to Christ, in Mr. Darby's Bible, is unmistakeable. So far at least as the translation goes, he agrees with the Socinians, and the Socinians with him. But this is not all. He goes thoroughly with them in Acts xx. 28, as follows:—

UNITARIAN VERSION,
Called "An Improved Version."

Acts xx. 28.

Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flock, among whom the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of *the Lord*, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

MR. DARBY'S VERSION.*

Acts xx. 28.

Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flock wherein the Holy Ghost has set you as overseers, to shepherd the assembly of God which he has purchased with *the blood of his own*.

To this last passage, Mr. Darby has appended a note to the effect, that the text ought to be rendered "the blood of his own Son," and says he is "fully satisfied that this is the right translation." Indeed in his French version he seems to take to himself the credit of the discovery. But Gilbert Wakefield the Unitarian critic, and Dr. Henley were in the field before him, and said the same thing long ago, basing the criticism, like Mr. Darby, on the two articles. Which criticism Bishop Middleton at the time ridiculed in his great work on the Greek article. The rendering of the adjective *own* (*idios*) independantly of the noun when in the same case, and number with the noun has no example in the whole circle of Greek Literature, sacred or profane—if so, where is it?—And whether the text be read *God or Lord and God, (tou Kurious kai Theou)*, makes no difference, for *Lord* in this connection identifies Him with the Jehovah of the old Testament, as is frequent in the Acts of the Apostles. It is one of those remarkable passages in the New Testament which predicates of our Lord's Godhead, what was peculiar to His manhood, showing thus the unity of His person. Just as other passages predicate of His manhood what was peculiar to His Godhead, as for instance "no man ascendeth up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven," John iii. 13. See also Rom. ix. 5., Heb. ix. 14, and many others to the same effect, where

what is peculiar to one nature is affirmed of the other. A clear proof of the unity of the person of Him, "who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree," (1 Pet. ii. 24) a text which I also find Mr. Darby has emptied of the word *own* quite gratuitously, (see Alford in loco.)

But Acts xx. 28, has been for the last fifty years and more the *Hougoumout* of the battle field with the Unitarians on the subject of our Lord's divinity, because of the strong positive assertion of our Lord's Godhead, showing that He who offered Himself was God. Hence the importance attaching to the passage by all who believe that "God was manifest in the flesh." Mr. Darby indeed wrote an article in the Bible Treasury, (July, 1862), in defence of his rendering, every paragraph of which was wrong from first to last. Suffice it here to say, that Wetstein in his great authority, and every one knows Wetstein's Unitarian proclivities. Then Belsham and Darby follow Wetstein in reference to Athanasius. Belsham was a notorious Unitarian divine at the beginning of this century. They each refer to the famous passage quoted by critics from Athanasius, and make Athanasius say what he never said. Thus we find that one section of the Unitarians try to get rid of the text by reading it *Lord* instead of God with the *Improved Version*; another section knowing that evidence is against this, admit that *God* is the true reading, but in order to neutralize it add words not in the Greek at all, viz: *of his own Son*. With this last section Mr. Darby agrees, and gives exactly the same reasons they give. Belsham and Darby follow Wetstein, and Wetstein in quoting the passage from Athanasius against the Arians, puts in his own and omits the words of Athanasius in the middle of the sentence. Wetstein, in the following sentence, omits the words *without flesh* and thus alters the whole passage.

The words of Athanasius are "The Scriptures nowhere speak of the blood of God *without flesh*, nor

of suffering and rising again *without flesh*; they are Arians who dare to use such expressions.”*

And again, “But the holy Scriptures, speaking of God in the flesh and of the flesh of God, do mention the blood and suffering and resurrection of the body of God.”

The reader will see the subject discussed and the quotations given at length in *Burton's Testimonies of the Ante Nicene Fathers*, an Oxford class book easily got. And what is more to the point still, Athanasius himself more than once quotes Acts xx. 28, and expressly reads, “The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.”

From this we can easily judge, how far Mr. Darby and the Unitarians have falsified Athanasius in order to empty and destroy the passage.

It is nothing to the purpose, Mr. Darby telling us that he doubts not the divinity of Christ. So much the worse then to side with the Unitarians in corrupting Scripture upon this most vital subject.

That Mr. Darby is alive to the force of the term *worship*, is evident from his note on Heb. ix. 9., where he says on the text that “*worship* is perhaps too strong a word, but *service* is equivocal.”

If then “separation from evil be God’s principle of unity,” we wonder if they think these things to be evil or good!

There is such a thing as putting evil for good and good for evil, darkness for light and light for darkness, as the Prophet says.

NOTE.—Before this tract was first published, Mr. Moore, of London, wrote a manuscript which was sent to Mr. Kelly. The subject was on the *worship* denied to our Lord in *The New Bible* by Mr. Darby, and the word *homage* put in place of it. Mr. M. had said that in every instance in reference to Christ, Mr. Darby rendered the word, *homage*; and in every instance in reference to God the Father, Mr. D.

* The reader can well understand how the sentence would run by omitting the words *without flesh*.

rendered the word, *worship*. In this Mr. Moore was mistaken, for there are some few exceptions—very few indeed. And of course Mr. Kelly took advantage of this to apply unbecoming epithets to Mr. Moore, as if that were an answer or a reply. But upon the issue, Mr. Kelly pronounces a very decided and unequivocal judgment, as follows:—"I am not aware of a single orthodox Christian, of competent Biblical knowledge, who would not in the main support the discriminating value given to *Proskuneo* in J. N. D.'s version, as against either the authorized version, or Mr. Sharpe's."—*The Bible Treasury*, November, 1868, Page 192. So then, according to this there is "discriminating value" in our blessed Lord not getting *worship* but *homage* in the days of His flesh! and it only requires "competent Biblical knowledge to support in the main the discriminating value" given to the word *homage* above *worship* with reference to our Lord in Mr. Darby's version of the New Testament!!! Who are those orthodox Christians?

This is Mr. Kelly's dictum; comment upon it is needless. One may well ask, What next?

The effort also to confound the reader by coupling the authorized version with that of Mr. Sharpe, the Unitarian, is a further specimen. For every one knows that when the Unitarians use the term *worship* in reference to Christ, they qualify it by saying it is intended in the lower sense, and means *homage*, whereas we know that the authorized version makes no such reservation. To couple therefore the authorized version and Mr. Sharpe's version together, by way of justifying Mr. Darby, is simply to throw dust in the eyes of the reader on the subject. We ask Christians if they will sit and listen to this?

These translations are dishonoring to the Lord, or they are not, one or other. For our part we know of nothing more so. And to "support" this dishonor under pretext of "competent Biblical knowledge" is utterly deplorable and shameful. For it does not require much Biblical knowledge to see that Israelites would not give *worship* to any but the Divine person, and such they believed their Messiah to be, and He accepted *worship* from them. Whereas when an apostle or angel received worship they at once refused it. Christ never refused it, but always accepted it, and "the competent Biblical knowledge" which perceives "the discriminating value" of lowering the worship due to our Lord, to that of an angel or man, is not to our thinking very much to be desired. In short, we say with the deepest regret that we know of few things more evil, considering the spiritual pretensions of those who avow and advocate them in these days. For our Lord Himself enjoins in the days of His flesh "that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father who hath sent Him." John v. 23.

30 AP 69

