

---

---

REASONS FOR LEAVING

RAWSTORNE-STREET MEETING, LONDON,

AS CONTAINED IN CERTAIN LETTERS.

WITH

A FEW REMARKS

*On the Investigation that took place at Plymouth in  
December, 1845,*

*And on Three Passages in the "Narrative of Facts."*

---

---

**BRIGHTON:**

**PRINTED BY J. F. EYLES,**

**28, WESTERN ROAD.**

# REASONS FOR LEAVING

RAWSTORNE STREET MEETING,  
LONDON,

*As contained in certain Letters.*

---

*Brighton, Feb. 27, 1847.*

I had been feeling it might be well, and even desirable, that I should publish my reasons for withdrawing from the Meeting in Rawstorne Street ever since I read the first two or three pages of the "Account of the Proceedings at Rawstorne Street, in November and December, 1846," Part I.

It was put into my hands in Dublin, January, 23, last. I was pained, but not surprised at the use made of the fact of my unwillingness to break bread at Ebrington Street, p. 2. I read no more, having almost made up my mind not to read any more publications connected with this sad division.

But what I had seen in this publication, along with what I had seen in the "Narrative of Facts," by the same author, Mr. John Darby, led me shortly after, in writing to a brother, to say that I was perfectly disgusted with the narratives, both with the spirit of them and the false statements in them, though I did not suppose intentionally false.\*

\* November, 12, 1846, I went to Mr. Darby, and told him of several statements in the "Narrative of Facts," that I considered false. I told him I did not mean intentionally false. He explained two of them. I then brought Mr. Gough, and went over the rest of the statements again. Mr. Darby explained

But on February 6th, 1847, I received an invitation from some of the brethren of Rawstorne Street, to a Meeting of brethren from other parts, to be held there February 9th instant. My reply is here given. I was surprised I was not yet understood as having separated from Rawstorne Street Meeting, after my letter to Mr. Gough, of December 22, 1846, also here given.\*

This made me still more feel the necessity of publishing my reasons for leaving, and I felt I could do so now more completely.

I accordingly prepared to put them forth as contained in certain letters, but was still hesitating, when I thought that at any rate I ought to read the "Account of the Proceedings at Rawstorne Street" *through* first.

I accordingly went on with Part I., from p. 2, February 25th; and last night, the 26th, I took up Part II. What was my surprise, in accidentally looking at Part II. p. 42, l. 1, before I had time to come to them in course, to find that there Mr. Darby deliberately asserts that I would not break bread now, at Ebrington Street, "*on the ground of sectarianism and clericalism.*"

The least I can say is, that it is a bold assertion without any authority whatever.

Ist, Mr. Darby has no warrant for saying, Part I., p. 2, I charged Mr. Wigram with "*schism*;"

another, and admitted the incorrectness of a fourth. With regard to the rest, he stood firm, as did I, still maintaining that they were false.

His report of this interview Part II., p. 43, I do not admit to be correct.

\* I had been standing aloof *without separating* from January 1846, when I first perceived a decided unwillingness to investigate the charge I publicly brought forward against Mr. George Wigram, till December 1846, waiting to see whether there would be *any* investigation.

2nd, he has no warrant for saying (as he does by implication, in the same place) that my unwillingness to break bread at Ebrington Street was *subsequent* to my public charge against Mr. Wigram; and 3rd, he has no warrant for saying, in Part II., p. 42, l. 1, that I would not now break bread in Ebrington Street, *on the ground of sectarianism and clericalism*. These assertions are all false, I suppose through haste, but very culpable.

On my way to Plymouth from London, the second time, January 1, 1846, I returned to London, from Exeter the following day, on hearing there that *the division* that Mr. Darby had made at Plymouth was completed, Sunday, December 28, 1845, by the spreading of a second table. Mr. Wigram came to London, from Plymouth, January 5th, 1846, and I publicly charged him with *helping* Mr. Darby in making it, Sunday, January 11, 1846, after having gone to him first alone and then with a witness.

I have all along, ever since I was at Plymouth in December, 1845, said I felt that there was a sectarian and clerical spirit among the people of Ebrington Street; but I have equally said all along that that did not constitute grounds for leaving that meeting, and so I say now. I will not now break bread with them, simply on these grounds, that they did not do all they might have done to prevent the division, however wrong he was who promoted it.

I would break bread with them next Sunday if the two parties were re-united, because I feel convinced that, though there is a sectarian and a clerical spirit among them, there is the acknowledgment, both in principle and practice, of Christianity as the simple basis of communion, and of the Lord's presence by the Spirit as the simple source of rule and

edification, the door being open for any one to take part who may be led of the Lord to do so.

But I will not, with God's help, belong either to a part of a split body, or to an unsplit body that neglects discipline against division-making, and public defamation (whether that defamation be at Meetings or by means of Tracts), and that refuses to have *any* investigation into a charge publicly brought in reference to the same.

And, further, I feel so strongly that Mr. Darby's act of making a division at Plymouth, in which Mr. Wigram helped him, is a case of high-handed, unwarrantable, proceeding, that I can not go to any meeting of saints where they are received without their conduct being investigated. The questions are two, and only two, one of doctrine and one of facts, namely, *first*, What is the amount of evil in a meeting of saints that will warrant a person in breaking up that Meeting; and *secondly*, had the Meeting in Ebrington Street reached that amount of evil? To decide these points neither the presence of Messrs. Newton, Soltau, Batten, Clulow, or Dyer, is needed, nor is that of Mr. John Darby or Mr. George Wigram.

However, I can now quite understand how I might be supposed to be still belonging to Rawstone Street, and I see clearly my duty in giving my reasons for leaving.

---

## LETTER I.

FROM LORD CONGLETON, TO MR. WILLIAM BERGER,  
IN REFERENCE TO THE MEETING OF BRETHREN  
FROM OTHER PARTS, HELD IN LONDON, APRIL,  
1846.

*Brighton, April 1, 1846.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,

You know, I believe, I have been de-

siring *investigation* into the Plymouth matter, feeling that through our brother, G. Wigram, we in town were involved.

That investigation ought to take place before those who have authority to give a *judgment*,—the Church, or its representatives.

It ought to be *public*, at all events sufficiently so to admit of any one in communion being present who desires it to satisfy his conscience.

On account of the manifest *indisposition* to have the thing investigated, I have been standing aloof from those in London. Now, I do not wish to stand upon trifles, if you will say the proposed Meeting is open to the above investigation, whoever is present, or whoever is absent, I shall hope to come. (D.V.)

By "*open*," I understand that none of you four that signed the invitation will interfere to prevent.

The letter of Newton that you refer to, I have sent to Cronin.

Affectionately yours,

CONGLETON.

To Mr. W. Berger,  
Clapton.

*Extract from Mr. Berger's answer.*

Stamford Grove, East, Upper Clapton,  
April 2, 1846.

MY DEAR BROTHER,— \* \* In going to the meetings, I for one could neither promise to prevent any thing a brother might have to say as before the Lord, or from him, or to abstain from checking what appeared not of the Lord, or to aid any particular order of things. I feel happy in trusting the Lord to come into our midst to order and to bless.

Ever yours affectionately in Christ,

(Signed) WILLIAM BERGER.

## LETTER II.

FROM LORD CONGLETON, TO MR. WILLIAM BERGER,  
IN REFERENCE TO THE SAME MEETING.

*Brighton, April 4, 1846.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,

I understand your letter in reply to mine of the 1st, to be a negative; that is, that you decline saying the proposed Meeting is open to the investigation of the Plymouth matter. Cronin also put it in the negative.

I now have to thank you for your kind invitation, but must decline it, as I cannot in conscience meet Mr. Darby or Mr. Wigram, except for the above mentioned investigation, or at least where the Meeting is open to that investigation. I consider Mr. Darby has made a division in the gathering of saints at Plymouth, and that Mr. Wigram has helped him, and as such am directed to avoid them, Rom. xvi. 17.

In order to be more plain and definite, I would say that I consider that Mr. Darby, after withdrawing from communion, Sunday, October 26, 1845, giving certain reasons, did publicly slander and defame, in Ebrington Room, Monday, November 17, 1845, his neighbour, his Christian brother, and his fellow minister in the word, and thereby caused a great breach and division in that gathering; that although asked by certain brethren, who went to Plymouth from a distance, (some at his own invitation,) and who investigated the matter, to seek to remove the impression his statement had made, on account of the insufficiency of the grounds on which he had made them; he did nothing to that effect, but persevered in his course



until he succeeded in making a separation and spreading a second table.

That Mr. Wigram helped him, supplying him, on the day he spread a second table, Sunday, December 28, 1845, with a chapel to preach in, in the evening, and ministering therein himself in the afternoons of Sunday, December 28, 1845, and Sunday, January 4, 1846.

I remain, dear Brother,

Yours affectionately,

CONGLETON.

P.S.—They now break bread in that chapel.

To Mr. William Berger,  
Clapton.

[I subsequently went up to the Meeting, urged by W. W. to do so, and made a statement substantially the same as that contained in the last part of the above Letter, before Mr. Darby and Mr. Wigram, but failed to get *investigation*; brethren from a distance interposing, thinking *common confession* was more to the mind of the Lord *at that time*. I bowed to the grace that was in those brethren, and felt I had done all that the Lord wished me to do on that occasion.]

---

### LETTER III.

FROM LORD CONGLETON, TO SIR ALEXANDER  
CAMPBELL.

(I have not a copy of the whole of this Letter, it was written before the two preceding ones.)

March 30, 1846.

MY DEAR BROTHER,

\* \* \* \* \*

There is such a thing as judging bills as well as judging persons. We judged there was no true bill (that is, evils warranting separation,) brought against Mr.

Newton, and the thing OUGHT to have been dropped, and all hands ought to have been united to heal the breach; and great is the *responsibility* of those who kept the breach open until a separation was made.

Evils there were, but not sufficient to warrant breaking communion,—Mr. Darby's step and Mr. Darby's bill against Ebrington Street. You surely know this, dear Brother.

Yours affectionately,

CONGLETON.

---

#### LETTER IV.

FROM LORD CONGLETON, TO MR. P. HAMMOND,  
MR. M. J. STARLING, AND MR. F. LEFFLER.

*Sunday Evening,*

*Brighton, Feb. 7, 1847.*

DEAR BRETHERN IN CHRIST,

I received last night a kind line from you, giving me notice of a Meeting to be held in Rawstorne Street, next Tuesday evening, February 9. I feel it thereby becomes my duty to inform you that I do not belong to Rawstorne Street. The accompanying copy of a Letter written by me to our brother Gough, last December, will best (although it does not fully), convey my reasons, and will, at the same time, show you that the proposed Meeting for free conversation with some from Devonshire, could not satisfy my mind.

I remain, dear Brethren,

Yours affectionately in Christ,

CONGLETON.

To Messrs. P. Hammond,

J. Starling,

F. Leffler,

Rawstorne Street, London.

*Brighton, December 22, 1846.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,

I have been trying, since I saw you last Sunday week, to consider fairly the conduct of Rawstone Street Meeting, in reference to the Plymouth matter, and I can but come to the conclusion they have greatly failed.

First. Because a charge brought before them last January, against Mr. Wigram, on account of his helping Mr. Darby, at Plymouth, to make a division, they have taken no notice of.

Secondly. Because they have received Mr. Darby himself without investigating his conduct, in reference to the division-making above mentioned.

Thirdly. Because having (after the above manifestations of partiality,) cited Mr. Newton to appear before them; they have, upon his refusal, declined to have communion with him without even hearing the reasons why he so refused.

I cannot consider myself identified with them.

At the same time I cannot identify myself with Ebrington Street Meeting.

They did not do all they might have done to prevent the division, however wrong he was who promoted the division.

Yours, dear Brother,

In our Lord, affectionately,

CONGLETON

To Mr. Gough,



## A FEW REMARKS

*On the Investigation that took place at Plymouth in  
December, 1845,*

*And on Three Passages in the "Narrative of Facts."*

---

The investigation began Friday, Dec. 5, 1845; it ended Monday, 8th.

Those present at the investigation were Mr. G. Wigram, *especially not invited by Mr. Darby, because "considered an adversary to Mr. Newton;"* Mr. Moseley, Morris, Rickards, *these three were invited by Mr. Newton, I believe;* Mr. Naylor, *uninvited;* Sir A. Campbell, *invited by Mr. Darby;* Code, *invited by Mr. Soltau;* Potter, *invited by Mr. Darby;* Rhind, *invited by Mr. Soltau;* and myself, *invited both by Mr. Darby and Mr. Newton from London.*

The subjects of enquiry were *twofold*, Mr. Darby's charges *against Mr. Newton's personal character*, made in Ebrington Street, November 17, 1845; and Mr. Darby's charges *against the Ebrington Street Meeting*, made October 26, 1845.

The charges against the Ebrington Street Meeting were,

1. That God had been practically displaced.
2. That there was a subversion of the principles on which they had originally been gathered together.
3. That there was evil and unrighteousness unconfessed and unjudged.
4. That the Friday Meeting, which was a means of enquiry and service, had been suppressed.—*Narrative of Facts*, p. 43.

Mr. Darby told us that the 3rd point had reference to Mr. Newton, and was identical with his charges against Mr. Newton's personal character.

Mr. Darby *had withdrawn from communion at Ebrington Street upon delivering the above four charges.* The

rest of us either before the investigation or during it, had all, except Mr. Wigram, broken bread at Ebrington Street, most of us both before and during it.

Monday, Dec. 8th, 1845, the investigation closed.

In reference to the *first* matter, I will give first my own account, then Mr. Wigram's, then Mr. Darby's.

*Lord Congleton's account of the result of the Investigation.*

The Sunday *after the investigation*, Dec. 14, Mr. Richards, Sir Alexander Campbell, Mr. Code, Potter, Rhind, and myself broke bread at Ebrington Street. Of the remaining four brethren who were present at the investigation, Moseley and Morris were hindered by other duties from being present. Naylor had returned to Jersey. Wigram was holding a prayer meeting in the Mechanic's Institute, to which he had invited, by printed notices, all the saints in communion at Ebrington Street. He had done the same the previous Sunday, *while the investigation was pending!* \*

I would add that some of us tried to get Mr. Harris to resume his ministry in Ebrington Street; and Sir Alexander Campbell, Potter, and myself took steps to get our wives to come to Plymouth, that we might remain there for a season, living in communion in Ebrington Street, and so try to get existing evils remedied.

Mrs. Potter actually arrived in England.

It may be surely concluded that whilst we thus acted, we not only did not think Mr. Newton guilty of any intention to be untrue or dishonest, but we did not think the case had been made out against Ebrington Street, that she had so departed from original principles that Brethren were called to come out of her. As to the *teaching* being sound in reference to the basis of communion, viz., simple Christianity; and in reference to the source of edification and rule, viz., the Lord himself by his Spirit in the midst of her,—the testi-

\* The time appointed for these prayer meetings was 8 o'clock in the morning. Mr. Wigram carried them on right into the time of breaking bread at Ebrington Street.

mony of Mr. Harris and Mr. Hill (whom Sir Alexander Campbell, Mr. McAdam and myself visited) was complete. The two great points, *open communion* and *open ministry*, still existed, however much failure there might be in spirit, and infirmity in practice. The Friday meeting it is true we found given up.

*Mr. Wigram's Account.*

"The following letter to Mr. Newton was written on the 12th" (that is, of December, 1845, *after the investigation*); "but I did not send it; because brethren Campbell, Code, Potter, Rhind, and Parnell, thought they could act from inside the congregation in Ebrington Street: they were men of God, and, *wishing* them success, I refrained from every act which I thought could impede it." *A reason for withdrawing from Ebrington Street, Plymouth*, p. 3, date January 14th, 1846.

*Mr. Darby's Account.*

"There is one fact I will notice here, that all who were not, and did not come as avowed partizans of Mr. Newton, declined breaking bread any longer in Ebrington Street. That is Mr. Mc'Adam" (he left before the investigation took place), "Campbell, Potter, Code, Wigram." *Narrative of Facts*, beginning of the page 47. He adds a correction at p. iv. "I am warned that the beginning of the page, [that is page 47] might seem to say that they did not break bread at all. This is not at all the meaning. "Any longer" refers to after their investigation of the matter, which gives it indeed its whole importance."\*

\* When I called upon Mr. Darby, with Mr. Gough, he admitted that Campbell, Code, and Potter broke bread the Sunday after the investigation; but in the mention of this interview in the "Account of the Proceedings at Rawstorne Street," Part II. p. 43, l. 27, he calls it, "Their taking a Sunday to consider." In Part II. p. 42, l. 11, he says, the whole passage that I have quoted has reference to the present time, that is the time in which he was writing his "Narrative of Facts." Which will he take for his vindication? He cannot take both.

Let the church now judge. *Matt. xviii. 17.*

In reference to the *second* matter, I will first give Mr. Darby's account, and then my own.

*Mr. Darby's account of the state of feeling, in reference to Mr. Newton's character, among the Brethren who investigated matters.*

“Several efforts were made by Mr. Newton and his friends to obtain a vindication of his character from the charges, which issued in nothing, as several declined signing them for different reasons. Not merely because they were not satisfied, but because they felt that the Church ought to judge such a case. This was the feeling of many or most of the brethren who came, even of those who were more particularly friends of Mr. Newton, as of all the rest. I will recur to this as a very material point, but to close the narrative as to vindication. After the refusal, for whatever reasons, of a joint signature of such justification, five brethren, in order to settle this point, agreed to sign a paper which was in fact, printed with their signatures, Sir A. Campbell, Lord Congleton, Mr. Rhind, Code, and Potter. Some refused, and, I think I am authorised in saying that Mr. Potter was glad when the paper was withdrawn, as being more favourable than his conscience really permitted. It stated that Mr. Newton had read a paper which convinced them that he had no evil motive in the papers on which the charges were founded, but that he had given occasion to them by what he had printed. Before the document appeared, Mr. Newton came with Mr. Dyer and declared in great earnestness that he was ruined if this came out, and that he should go to Canada. It was accordingly suppressed,”  
—*Narrative of Facts*, p. 52, 53.

*Lord Congleton's Account.*

Sir Alexander Campbell prepared a statement saying that the brethren who investigated matters, after hearing Mr. Newton read, in reply to the charges made against him (in reference to the Clulow letter and the letter that had additions), a certain paper, “*were entirely satisfied*” that Mr. Newton had no intention to



deceive or mislead in the letters referred to, though through being over cautious on the one hand, and deficient in carefulness on the other, he had laid himself open to accusation.\* Date, December, 19, 1845.

This account of the investigation, Code, Potter, Rhinde, and myself attached our signatures to, saying it met with our "*entire approbation.*" [*See a copy of this document in Mr. Wigram's possession.*]

In reference to Mr. Darby's account I would remark,

1. When Mr. Darby says, "After the refusal, for whatever reasons, of a joint signature of such justification," he must, I suppose, know that the difficulty that arose at the close of the investigation was not whether Mr. Newton should be considered innocent of any intention of untruthfulness or dishonesty, because it was a clear case for charity to step in and claim the accused, even Mr. Wigram said, after hearing Mr. Newton's paper read, "*I can receive it from Mr. Newton,*" alluding to the Clulow letter, Mr. Morris having proposed the same line of defence the previous Friday which Mr. Wigram was unable to receive from *him*. But the difficulty that arose was, whether we could give a *corporate* testimony to his innocence or not; Mr. Wigram and Sir Alexander Campbell were chiefly opposed to it, and their arguments prevailed, because Mr. Newton and Mr. Darby had both met us on the understanding that we were certain individuals seeking information, not a Court having authority *to judge and decide*. But there was no question as to whether Mr. Newton was to be reckoned innocent of the personal charges; at all events *it was not avowed*. Subsequently to this, Mr. James Harris suggested a way of clearing Mr. Newton's character. It was that one of us should stand up in Ebrington Street, and make a statement, (not give a mere verdict, but make a state-

\* When Sir Alexander Campbell first brought to us this statement, it had not the expression "entirely satisfied," but merely "satisfied." Mr. Rhind proposed that the word "entirely" should be inserted, which after due deliberation and consideration among us all, that is, the *five*, was consented to, and inserted accordingly by Sir Alexander.

ment) to the effect that such were the charges, and such the explanations, and that he was satisfied with them; and that the rest of us should then stand up in succession and signify our approbation of the statement. Code, Potter, Rhind, and myself, at first approved of this plan. Subsequently we did not, with the exception of Rhind. Sir Alexander Campbell said if any thing of the sort were done, he should stand up and oppose.

2. He says, "It (the document of acquittal) stated that Mr. Newton had read a paper which convinced them," that is, the *five* brethren who signed it.

But what is the truth? Why it stated that Mr. Newton had read a paper which "*entirely satisfied*" the investigating brethren,—that is, the *ten* brethren. This was signed by Sir A. Campbell. And then it further stated that this account (Sir Alexander's) of the investigation met with the "*entire approbation*" of Code, Potter, Rhinde, and myself, our four signatures being attached to this certificate. So that instead of being a document that stated that *five* of the investigating brethren were convinced, it stated that the whole *ten* were "*entirely satisfied*," and this was testified to by the signatures of *five* of them, none of whom were "partizans of Mr. Newton," though, as Mr. Wigram says, they "thought they could act from inside the congregation in Ebrington Street."

3. He says "some refused," that is, to sign it. To this I answer, *first*, if any refused, it was not because they did not go along with the statement "*entirely satisfied*,"—at all events *they did not avow it*. *Secondly*, I answer, *none refused, for no others were asked to sign it*.

4. He says "before the document appeared Mr. Newton came with Mr. Dyer." *It was no such thing*; Mr. Newton did not come with Mr. Dyer; Mr. Moseley came.

---

In reference to the the *third* matter, I will first give Mr. Darby's account, then my own, and then Mr. Code's.

*Mr. Darby's Account of a certain Interview.*

“ Lord Congleton, Messrs. Potter and Code, took it in hand. They came to me, and Lord C. stated that they could not get over the impression produced by my charges in the minds of others: would I meet the assembly if they could get it convoked, and undo the impression as to the charges. I said they must not ask me to state that my impression was not such, as I could not go beyond my conscience, but I would gladly meet the assembly, and urge upon them not to receive any impression from me: that I could do it with all my heart, as I earnestly desired that the conscience of the brethren should be aroused. That there was no good done, whatever judgment they arrived at, unless it was: that I thought the grand evil was that it had been deadened and dulled, and that they would be there to see whether I did it cordially. And that if these three brethren honestly brought before the assembly what they now admitted to be facts, and the assembly acquitted Mr. Newton of any evil in it, even if my individual judgment were not satisfied, I should acquiesce, because, being done, as I should trust uprightly, the church's conscience would be clear before God. I left Plymouth to preach elsewhere that this might be accomplished. Nothing was done.”—*Narrative of Facts*, p. 54.

*Lord Congleton's Account.*

Mr. Code, Potter, and myself went to Mr. Darby, and read to him Mr. Newton's defence, and asked him to seek to remove the impression his previous statement had made. He said his own judgment remained unchanged, but he proposed to bring before the brethren at large the charges, and to urge upon them not to take his judgment, but to form one of their own.

*Mr. Code's Account.*

“ As far as I can trust my memory, my impression is that the visit to which J. N. D. refers was strictly and

only for the purpose of reading to him Mr. N.'s explanation of the charges of a personal nature preferred against him by Mr. D., and I think the proposal to bring before the brethren at large the charges, &c., was Mr. Darby's, not ours, his object being not to settle the matter privately, but exercise the consciences of all, and on our saying that he had already produced his impression of the matter upon the minds of brethren before they had had opportunity of judging of its merits, he said he was willing to go before them and state his desire that they should not act on his impression, but try it themselves, and if they came to the conclusion that impression was wrong, he would submit."

—*Addressed to Lord Congleton, date March 11, 1846, in answer to an enquiry about a similar false assertion of Mr. Darby in the first page of his "Letter to the Saints' Meeting in Ebrington Street."* He says there, "Lord Congleton, Potter, and Code, having proposed to bring before the brethren at large," &c.

Here it is to be remarked that Mr. Darby leaves out the important fact that *after the investigation* we brought to him Mr. Newton's paper, and read to him Mr. Newton's explanations, and that it resulted in *his* proposing to do something. It was *he* that proposed, not *we*. His proposal was but little valued, and *he did nothing*. He certainly did not transfer the responsibility that was upon himself to act, to us. He went away from Plymouth, leaving us to do what we could. And why us? Because he knew we were *in* communion (this was *after the investigation*) seeking to "act from inside the congregation in Ebrington Street," where we broke bread the following Sunday, Dec. 14.

Let the church *now* judge, *Mat. xviii., 17.*

I do not attach any very great importance to this last matter, but I notice it as helping to shew the style of Mr. Darby's narrative writings, and how false, however unintentionally, many statements in them are.

---

### Conclusion.

What ultimately brought matters to a crisis in Eb-

ington Street, was Mr. Darby's persisting in maintaining his original charges, and that *outside communion*, notwithstanding the investigation; *further* investigation being called for; and Mr. Newton's refusing it. *There had been investigation, and that at Mr. Newton's request, and the result, though much sectarianism of spirit had been discovered in him, and many failures in Ebrington Street, had been favourable to both.* There had been, I judge, *sufficient* investigation to shew those who attended it, that Mr. Darby *had not sufficient grounds for separating on.* This they made known to him and others, both by their words and their acts, although they did not (*because they were not allowed*) give a *corporate* testimony. (I certainly judge Mr. Newton was to blame in not receiving the testimony to his acquittal proposed by Sir A. Campbell; but in *ordinary* circumstances it would not be considered a proof of guilt.) In fact it was a settled thing amongst some of those who kept together after the investigation, Sir A. Campbell, Code, Potter, Rhind, and myself that Mr. Darby had made a great mistake; that, instead of going *out of* communion, what was wanted, was more strength *in* communion. Mr. Wigram justly describes them when he says they "thought they could act from inside the congregation in Ebrington Street." With this thought some of us tried to get Mr. Harris to resume his ministry, and some of us tried to get our wives to come to us, that we might remain at Plymouth *in communion.* Mr. Darby had no *palpable* reasons, calculated to meet the consciences of brethren generally, and to carry them with him, for his act of separation. There seemed to be much deficiency, much failure, a sectarian spirit, a clerical spirit, but nothing sufficiently decided to warrant such an act; there was still *open communion* and *open ministry.*

Nevertheless Mr. Darby remained separate, even after the investigation. He said his judgment remained unchanged. He offered indeed to tell the assembly that such and such were Mr. Newton's explanations, that his own judgment remained unchanged, but not to take his judgment, but to form a judgment

of their own. This he did not do,—I suppose from his offer being but little appreciated.

This being the case, *further* investigation was called for. Those who were conscious that Mr. Darby had no true grounds for separating on, might think, what could *further* investigation, and much more public investigation, do, but afford Mr. Darby an opportunity for *agitation*. If there was *common fairness* among brethren, much more if there was *their first love for the unity of the body*, they would surely judge Mr. Darby's recklessness about division in separating himself from communion on such grounds, without even waiting to know whether they would investigate his charges, and in forthwith publicly attacking Mr. Newton's personal character without having first gone to him alone, and then with a witness.

Mr. Darby had certainly greatly committed himself by so doing, and, if there had been only him to consult, he might, as not within reach of discipline, have been fairly left to himself.

But on the other hand, how could it be expected that people that had been so disturbed, as many had been, by Mr. Darby's charges and Mr. Darby's act, could be quieted without *further* investigation. His charges and act would make them think things were *much worse than they really were*, that the evils existing were indeed of a very grave sort. Refusing to have *further* investigation would go to *confirm* Mr. Darby's charges. The fact is that whilst Mr. Darby persisted in taking a stand *outside the body*, things were sure to come to a division, whether there was *further* investigation or not, *for evils there were*, and it only required his weight in pronouncing them sufficient cause for separation, and acting on it himself, to make others do so too; therefore he has the greater blame. But it was *a novelty, a new doctrine altogether*, that people with *open communion* and *open ministry* were to be separated from, that is, previously to their having committed, by any corporate act, a breach of discipline, or to their having refused to investigate charges publicly brought before them. And I am persuaded that nothing could have

brought this division about, but the weight of Mr. Darby's own personal influence and a great growth of sectarian feeling. Love to the church and to its unity had declined generally: people wanted their own opinions and their own leaders, and leaders wanted their own people.

If Mr. Newton had consented to the proposed *further* investigation, and the result had been division, on no better grounds than what I conceive Mr. Darby stands on, the blame of such division would have been *wholly* with Mr. Darby; as it is, the blame is *partly* with Mr. Newton, therefore I cannot go with either of them. If Mr. Darby *had remained in communion* and Mr. Newton had refused investigation, *any* investigation, or *further* investigation of his charges, and division had taken place, the blame would have been *wholly* with Mr. Newton.

I urged upon Mr. Newton myself *further* investigation. I urged upon him both in private and before Mr. Clulow, and Dyer, and, I believe, Mr. Batten, after a Thursday forenoon prayer meeting, the restoration of the Friday meeting, and that all "the working brethren," as well as the brethren from a distance, should be invited to it, and that every grievance should be thoroughly sifted. But he refused, and so did they. I can quite understand that Mr. Darby's act of leaving communion and publicly slandering Mr. Newton, coupled with Mr. Wigram's act of inviting all the saints in communion at Ebrington Street to another room, twice a day, on Sundays, even whilst the investigation was pending, might well provoke Mr. Newton and others and make them very unbending; but their love for the unity of the body ought to have overcome all these things. They ought not to have refused *further* investigation.

Sir Alexander Campbell was not in Plymouth, Sunday, Dec. 21st. He told Mr. Wigram, Dec. 26th, he should leave Ebrington Street. He left Plymouth, Dec. 27. His second "Letter to the Saints meeting for worship in Ebrington Street," in which he declares his separation, is dated January 1st, 1846. In it, whilst

declaring his separation, he says, "*not because I judge Mr. Darby's accusations correct,*" p. 7. *He did not join Mr. Darby's party.* I certainly judge Sir Alexander Campbell was to blame both in the manner in which he sought to bring about *further* investigation, and in leaving Ebrington Street before the division was actually completed.

Mr. Code, Potter, and Rhind, all attended (I believe) the Lord's table at Ebrington Street, Sunday, Dec. 21st. Mr. Code and Potter were not at Ebrington Street, Sunday, Dec. 28th, the day the division was completed; but *they did not join Mr. Darby's party.*

I left Plymouth Saturday, Dec. 20th, owing to my wife's illness.

Mr. Wigram *formally* left Ebrington Street, Saturday, Dec. 27th, 1845, writing a note to Mr. Soltau to say so, and at the same time recalled the loan of Raleigh Street Chapel. The following day Sunday, Dec. 28th, Mr. Darby and Mr. Wigram both broke bread with some, though in different houses, in the morning; and ministered in this chapel in the afternoon and evening, *thus jointly completing the division.* Mr. Wigram also preached in it the next Sunday, January 4th, 1846, and left it in Mr. Darby's hands.

May the Father kindle the repentings of his children and knit their hearts together in love closer than ever, for the sake of his son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen. "Hath he smitten him according to the smiting of those that smote him: or is he slain according to the slaughter of those that are slain by him," *Isaiah*, xxvii. 7.

CONGLETON.

London: 1, Warwick Street.