
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

<https://books.google.com>





4139. оооо. 38.

'EXCLUSIVISM' UNVEILED.

A HANDBOOK

OF

SIXTEEN QUESTIONS

ON

THE TENETS PECULIAR

TO

DARBYISM.

LONDON:

W. MACINTOSH, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

DUBLIN:

G. HERBERT, GRAFTON-STREET.

SEVENTH EDITION, REVISED AND ENLARGED.

Price Two Pence.

1872



PREFACE.

THE title of this little hand-book is taken from a tract called "Exclusivism," reprinted from *The Bible Treasury*, and attributed to Mr. Darby, and from which two paragraphs are taken. The *Lectures on the Church* by Mr. Kelly, and the *Blackrock Lectures* by Mr. Patterson, form also important materials to judge of the tenets of the Exclusive teachers on what is called "Church ground" or "Church position."

After this come some remarkable extracts on Mr. Darby's peculiar errors with respect to the non-vicarious sufferings and punishment of Christ for sins. Then his translations of the New Testament into *English, French, and German*, in which, as the head-centre and leader of a religious Party or sect, he puts his *imprimatur* on the corruption and adulteration of the Holy Scriptures, so as to shake received beliefs on vital subjects.

The former editions of this tract have been used for a preventive to many and for the deliverance of some. We trust that this enlarged edition will be used in like manner, as one cannot but think that there are many upright Christians who, when they come to sift evidence and search into facts, studiously

kept from them, will demand explanations; and when these are not forthcoming, in any honest sense, then conscience will assert itself. For the body of people called "Exclusives" we entertain both love and compassion, though they may not believe it, and perhaps scorn it; but with the leaders who propound the following sentiments we have a serious and deep controversy.

The injury done to young people is incalculable. Self-exaltation, arising from church position, is esteemed above solid Christian graces; and this church position, as will be seen, reckons among the fond fictions and the crude optimism of men who have but just begun to think. On certain doctrines we have not spoken. *The Adam life doctrine*, for instance, has not been touched on; it would require a tract to itself. But if the explanation of it given in a recent pamphlet, "The Basis of Peace," be correctly reported (p. 11, 12), Mr. Darby and the writer either betray total ignorance of the vital point in question, or else words are used to conceal thoughts—an experiment often used in the diplomacy of the kingdoms of this world, but not suited to the honest integrity of the kingdom of God.

For further remarks on this pamphlet, see post-script at the end. And we implore that all may be considered not as before man, but as before God who trieth our hearts.

LECTURES
ON
THE CHURCH OF GOD,
BY W. KELLY.
LONDON BROOM.

I.
THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Is it true that "exclusivism" is to other assemblies and meetings of Christians what the House of Commons is to the different London Clubs?

Mr. Kelly says:—

"All here know what the House of Commons is. A hundred members of that house might belong to the United Service Club or Athenæum or anything else you please. These hundred might discuss the measures actually before the house in this club, but this could never make the club to be the house; whereas, in their true position, with the speaker in the midst, a much less number would constitute a House. It is exactly the same principle here. What constitutes God's assembly? Two or three gathered unto the Lord's name. He has been pleased to bring it down to the point described with the fullest possible stamp of His approval and authority. On the other hand, suppose ten thousand Christians, meeting simply as Christians, is that enough? I can conceive an assembly of professing, yea, real Christians; and yet there would be no more reason to call them God's assembly than to consider any number of members at their club the House of Commons. It is not the fact of being Christians that constitutes God's assembly, but their being gathered unto the name of the Lord."—pp. 256-7.

Fallacy.—This paragraph speaks for itself. "Exclusivism" stands in relation to all other denominations as the House of

Commons to the different London clubs. This no doubt must be very comforting and assuring for the members of that body.

But the point we should like to see proved is, what that thing is which constitutes "exclusivism"—the House? or again, how it is that "ten thousand Christians," meeting simply as Christians, cannot gather unto the name of the Lord? or why it is that they can only do so when they are "exclusives"? We should like to see some proofs of this.

The House of Commons possesses authority (*εξουσια*) and power (*δυναμις*), not because it meets in a particular place and manner, as every one knows. This would be foolish and is mere fallacy. But what authority or power does "exclusivism" possess, that any other Christians gathered to the name of the Lord do not possess? The power which Matt. xviii. 19, 20, gives, is the power of prayer and nothing else. The passage is eminently un-ecclesiastic, and fixes this power of prayer in any two or three Christians gathered to the Lord all the world over. And has anyone the hardihood to say that this power is exclusively with the Darbyites? The contrary is notoriously the fact. But if they can in any manner show that their prayers are more efficacious than those of other Christians, it would be a very efficacious proof that they gather on the ground of Matt. xviii. 19, 20, *par excellence*, and there are few who will not be happy to join them. But anyone can see that the power in Matt. xviii. 19, 20, is the power of prayer—a most precious legacy which survives everything. It is a promise parallel to Ezek. xi. 16, which see.

II.

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT.

How is it proved that to "endeavour to keep the unity of the spirit," signifies to endeavour to hunt out the meetings of Darbyites in every place?

Mr. Kelly thus defines it:—

"What is the unity of the spirit? Where does it begin and end? What is its nature and character? Scripture tells us that He has established a unity amongst men, yet apart from and above them. What is it? The answer is, it is in the Church, which God has made the body of Christ. What a comfort it is for a believer, that he has simply to judge by the

word of God where the unity of the spirit is. But how? I come to a place, and I am at a loss to know where to turn. Where shall I find the unity of the spirit of God? How do I know it? God has left landmarks; He has given us clear and distinct light in His word. I search and see that He is gathering together the children of God into one. He gathers them unto the name of Christ, assuring them that when they are there, He is in their midst."—p. 30.

Fallacy.—This paragraph, if possible, is more absurd than the last. Mr. K. asks, "What is the unity of the spirit? where does it begin and end?" The answer is, "It is in the Church which God has made." This is where it begins; but where does it end? The answer is, "I come to a place, and where shall I find the unity of the spirit of God?" I search and search until I find the place where the children of God are gathering unto the name of Christ, and this is only where the "exclusives" meet. I find at last the Church which God has made, and by falling in with it I keep the "unity of the spirit." But as exclusivism only began about twenty or thirty years ago, how was it possible to keep the unity of the spirit previously, or was there none before to be kept? How people can impose on themselves and others, and thus prostitute the word of God, is truly astonishing. But we see again that Matt. xviii. 19, 20, is the basis on which all this pretension rests—the last one would suppose that could support it. And now for a word on the much abused phrase, "the unity of the spirit." In the same chapter "the unity of the faith" is spoken of—Eph. iv. 3, 13. The unity of the spirit, the unity of the faith, what do they signify? If they be taken objectively, viz., the unity belonging to the Spirit Himself, or the unity belonging to the faith itself, of course neither can be affected or changed at all. But if taken subjectively, viz., the unity which the spirit works, and the unity which the faith effects, then either of them can be kept or not, as it is said, "I have kept the faith;" and so, when the apostle said, "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace," he is clearly speaking subjectively, viz., of a thing they might or might not do. But he was not speaking at all of the outward unity of the Church of Ephesus, of which at the time there was no question, showing clearly that they were two things quite distinct. And to do this now towards all who are Christ's in "lowliness, and meekness, and forbearance," is much more difficult than to tilt oneself into any party whatsoever in any town or place.

III.

THE CHURCH—THE ONLY “SOLID DIVINE
ROCK.”

Why does Mr. Kelly style the Church, even when speaking of it as the body of Christ, “the only solid divine rock?”

He says as follows:—“After His people departed from the power, and even let slip the bare form of this great truth, He has brought it before them anew. I cannot doubt that its recovery in any measure is vouchsafed of God in view of the Lord’s speedy coming; else how do you account for it that God has been pleased to recall the bride, to put herself, as it were, in readiness for the Bridegroom, signally bringing out again that mass of heavenly testimony which had been despised, deserted, and forgotten. Happy are they who not only bow and receive the grace of God in it, but keep the treasure faithfully.” And in the next page Mr. Kelly says:—“I call upon you all to beware lest Satan should, in any insidious way, lead you from the only solid divine rock in the midst of the rising surges of apostacy. Fully do I admit that all who are brought into this glorious place, the body of Christ, ought to walk and carry themselves in a way suitable to such a position. It is a deep shame when there is no devotedness beyond what existed before this further measure of truth dawned on our souls.”—pp. 32, 33.

Fallacy.—Mr. Kelly, p. 37, has the humility to tell us that they do not “originate the Church,” but here we find that they have “recovered” it. And the Church—not Christ himself—but Christ and the Church, is the “only solid divine rock in the midst of the rising surges of apostacy.” We could scarcely believe our eyes, and went over the page several times so as not to mistake the meaning. But there it is. The Church, the body of Christ, “the only solid divine rock,” and “exclusivism” the expression of it on earth! Little wonder then that it should be to other denominations as the House of Commons is to the London clubs. Before this we were only accustomed to hear such language from the lips of Romanist priests, but a few years make a great difference from the time when people were little in their own eyes. But the emptiness of these pretensions sometimes falls flat even on their own people, and so Mr. K. has to lash them up to further church devotedness, or devotedness arising out of the doctrine of the Church, of

which "exclusivism" is the expression. And as it is "the only solid divine rock," how strange that its exponents should have to be told that "it is a deep shame" if it does not stir up to more devotedness than when they were without further information on the subject.

IV.

CLEAVE TO THE CHURCH.

Why does Mr. Kelly fall into the Roman Catholic error of calling on persons to cleave not to Christ but to the Church ?

Mr. Kelly counsels his friends thus:—"Never deny that they are members of the body of Christ; remind them of that very fact and of its gravity—that they *are* members of His body: why should they value any other body? If members of that 'one body,' why not own it, and own it always and nothing else? If they belong to the unity of the spirit, why not endeavour to keep it. God is now raising a question, not about Popery and Protestantism, but about Christendom's denial of His Church, Christ's body. Our business is not to originate a Church of the present or future, but to cleave to the Church God has made, and consequently to confess the sin of all rivals, to repudiate them, and come out from them."—p. 37.

Fallaoy.—We never find in Scripture such an expression as "cleave to the Church"—even the "Church God has made." It is an invention of Romanists and Sectaries. Scripture speaks of cleaving to the Lord with purpose of heart (Acts, xi. 23); and again of believers being added to the Lord (Acts, v. 14); and of much people added to the Lord (Acts, xi. 24). Indeed there is one passage that says the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved (Acts, ii. 47). But every respectable critic knows that the word "*Church*" is not in the original—it is an ecclesiastical gloss; yet strange to say it is the chief passage Mr. Kelly singles out to comment on, whilst the genuine passages are left unnoticed. The very notion of cleaving to the Church is subversive of the nature of Christianity, for it makes the Church a distinct entity from Christ—a something objective on earth beside Christ to which you are to cleave—and in so doing you are all right. Scripture avoided such language, foreseeing that the Church would in the course of time become split into parties, or else a great worldly house. In the eyes of a Romanist the Church of

Christ is the Church of Rome—in his mind they are synonymous terms; and in the eyes of an “exclusive” the body of Christ is synonymous on earth with Mr. Darby’s body. Hence we have such language as the above from these light-some guides, and the natural conclusion drawn is that all other denominations and meetings of Christians, “even true Christians,” are but “clubs”—rivals of the true Church that God has made, and which is now objectively “represented” in “exclusivism.” The two statements here are, that instead of cleaving to the Lord, Christians are to “cleave to the Church,” and as this is only to be found in exclusivism, they are “to confess the sin of all rivals, repudiate them, and come out from them,” and join Darbyism.

V.

FRUITS OF HUMILITY.

Is it true that those views of the Church as exhibited on earth in the manner described by Mr. Kelly have such an edifying effect in the way of humility?

Mr. Kelly, in accounting for Satan succeeding in the face of this Church testimony, says: “Alas! the reason of this, too—the moral reason—is evident. The children of God may be more readily deceived, because the doctrine of the Church, the body of Christ, brings God too close to us—sets His grace too richly before our souls—makes us feel (if our souls believe, bow, and enter into it) the vanity of all things here. Alas! our hearts shrink from the feeling. We naturally love ease; we like position in this world; we are fond of a little reputation, it may not be perhaps in the vulgar world, but in the so-called Church—something at any rate for self—something outside the portion of Christ and the cross.”—p. 20.

Fallaoy.—We admit the preciousness and value of the doctrine of the Church, the body of Christ; for to it belongs the oneness that exists between Christ and His members, and their fellowship and blessing in God, which is of a character most sacred—so sacred indeed that to make a party to it and call it “the expression of the Church” and the “recovery” of it, is but a travestying of a divine mystery—and it is with the travesty we are now dealing.

Mr. Kelly, as we said, is practical, but his practice takes always an eminently ecclesiastical turn. Here in this case it

takes the turn of ecclesiastical humility and abnegation, for we are informed that this doctrine of the Church, carried out of course, as already described, by exclusivism, has the effect of making us see the vanity of all things here, and of promoting other most important Christian graces. And the reason why others do not appreciate and live out this doctrine in the same way, is because they naturally love ease and position, and reputation, if not in the vulgar world, yet in the so-called Church, "something at any rate for self." Too true indeed! But it must be highly edifying, no doubt, to see those who "cleave to the Church God has made," and are "in the unity of the spirit," and are in the world what the House of Commons is to the London Clubs, present such a spectacle of sublime humility; whilst those ordinary people who belong to the "rivals," and are "outside the unity of the spirit," and are but as members of the London Clubs in comparison of the House of Commons, are seeking position and reputation in the so-called church, if not in the vulgar world. Alas! we little know ourselves.

BLACKROCK LECTURES,

BY

F. G. PATTERSON.

VI.

THE CHURCH THE CITY OF REFUGE.

Is it true that the Church is the city of refuge for any sinner, Jew or Gentile?

Mr. Patterson, speaking of the Church, in Acts, ii., says:—
 "This assembly is now God's habitation through the spirit. The one hundred and twenty disciples—thus baptized—are technically named the 'assembly' from that moment (Acts, ii 47). The Holy Ghost now dwells on earth for the first time, and consequent on redemption. He had wrought before He came to dwell, as in Old Testament days. The 'temple' in Jerusalem was an empty house, and Israel an 'untoward generation.' The 'assembly' was now 'the city of refuge' for

the slayer of blood, where those who bowed to the guilt of their Messiah's blood could flee." And in the note Mr. Patterson adds: "The 'Assembly of God' is ever since the 'city of refuge' for the poor Jew; guilty of His Messiah's blood, and fleeing to it, he is safe from the avenger of blood."—p. 22.

Fallacy.—Here again we could scarcely believe our eyes. But when Mr. Kelly told us that the Church was "the only solid divine rock," it was not a matter of much surprise that Mr. Patterson should call it "the city of refuge where the guilty ones could flee and be safe from the avenger of blood." What next?

If Darbyism continues long, we wonder what Gospel the next generation will preach?

Indeed, as to preaching the Gospel at any time with a simple view to save sinners they were never very enthusiastic. It was done more as ancillary to the increase of the cause. No true or genuine "exclusive" (so far as we are aware) has been known to cross an isthmus or a strait to preach the Gospel where Christ was not named, like the great Apostle of the Gentiles, while they compass sea and land to make proselytes. But till now we were not prepared for a negation of the Gospel in set terms by their teachers, and to hear that it is not Christ Himself alone that is "the only solid divine rock," and the "city of refuge" for sinners, but Christ and the Church conjointly. And the expression of the latter we are further informed is now found on earth in "exclusivism!"

As to the Church "being technically named the assembly from that moment," there is nothing technical at all about it. The word comes in most ordinarily from the LXX., and was applied at the time to the Jewish remnant that embraced Messiah, whilst at the same time the Apostles and all worshipped and continued to worship in the Temple.—Acts, ii.-iii. But this part of his subject Mr. P. does not seem to understand.

VII.

"EXCLUSIVISM," AND THE SEVEN CHURCHES OF ASIA.

How is it proved that in the Seven Apocalyptic Churches there were no directions left for the discipline of Christians?

Mr. Patterson, in his second lecture on *the Church*, says:—"On the last evening I noticed that in the messages to the Seven Churches you get no individual directions what to do.

You get blessings, plenty, promised in them ; but you are not told how to overcome. Many say, look at all the evil that is in the Seven Churches and the like, and the Lord does not direct His people to leave them ! Shall I tell you why ? For this reason ; you never have in them a single direction as to what you are to do, but one. That is, you are to ‘hear’—the Church ? No ; it is corrupt—but ‘what the Spirit says’ to her ; then you find the blessing promised to ‘him that overcometh.’

“ Turn with me to a few Scriptures in the Old Testament, that we may see how others overcame in an evil day.”—p. 84.

Fallacy.—Mr. Patterson here echoes the sentiments of his leaders, and as usual it is mere dogmatic assertion—but he of course takes for granted that it is all true. In the Apocalyptic addresses to the Church, we are informed that there are no individual directions as to what to do or how to overcome. Therefore, Mr. Patterson, to prove the point of his lecture, has to go off to the Old Testament and look up the history of Moses, Phineas, Gideon, and Jeremiah. And all because no directions are given as to what to do. But what are the facts ? Why, that there are few Scriptures where in the same compass so many directions are given. We shall just give a few headings, and refer the reader to the text.—*To Ephesus* the Lord says : “ Nevertheless, I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember, repent, and do the first works,” etc.—Rev. ii. 4-5. Does this sound like “ no direction ? ” *To Smyrna* He says, “ Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life,” etc.—ii. 9, 10. Does this sound like “ no direction ? ” *To Pergamos*. See Rev. ii. 14, 15. *To Thyatira*. See Rev. ii. 19, 25. *To Sardis* He says, “ Become (γενου) watchful, and strengthen the things that remain, which are ready to die, for I have not found thy works filled up (πεπληρωμενα) before God”—and again, “ Thou hast a few names in Sardis which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with me in white,” etc.—iii. 24. Does this sound like “ no direction ? ” And to *Laodicea* He says, “ I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich, and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed,” etc., “ and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see,” etc. Does this sound like “ no direction ? ” But no doubt Mr. Patterson means that no directions are given to leave those Churches or to cut them off—and this fact puzzles him and

his party exceedingly. For as their religion takes an eminently ecclesiastical turn, they might naturally expect that in the last place where the Church and its discipline are spoken of, something might be found in favour of their peculiar notions and Church interpretations. But no! Mr. Patterson has to go off to the Old Testament to find out some kind of application or meaning for the exhortation "to him that overcometh," etc. But the reason why there are no such directions here or in any other part of the New Testament is very simple. It was because in those assemblies there was divine *authority* (*εξουσια*, 2 Cor. x. 8), and power (*δυναμις*, 1 Cor. v. 4), present for the governmental guidance (*κυβερνησις*, 1 Cor. xii. 28) of the Church—and this was carried on, first by apostles, then by elders or bishops, and finally by our Lord Himself, who walks in the midst of the seven Churches, holding the stars in His right hand, clad with the insignia of jurisdiction. Such are the facts. But for one Church to cut off another whilst they were in His hand, were a simple absurdity—or to leave those Churches where the Lord Himself was walking were another absurdity: no such thing could be, and consequently there are no directions given about it. There is no difficulty in putting out people who violate the rules of any meeting. But when a real difficulty comes to test the oft-vaunted expression, "the ground of the Church," lo! "the exclusives" become like all others, and instead of having authority, or power, or divine government present, to maintain such ground, they are obliged to employ not even a hollow imitation of former things, but a hollow substitution—a substitution of something else besides anything that ever did or ever could take place in the Church of God whilst it stood on earth as an objective assembly. But this will appear more clearly under the next head. However, it is important to note that the last form of divine government in the house of God which Scripture furnishes is in Rev. ii. and iii. Whatever prophetic import the seven Churches may have had, there can be no doubt of this, that they were actual Churches, and exhibit simultaneously the actual divine government that existed at the time in the whole Church on earth—the Lord walking in the midst of them holding the seven stars. Now those who say they have still divine government present so as to "behave" as the house of God, only show that it is more congenial to the pride of the human heart to "build the house," to make "the Church," or "recover the Church," than to learn the A B C of the subject itself, or to strengthen

the things that remain. And this is not confined to exclusivism.

VIII.

SINGULAR CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Is it true that "the Lord's Table" is nowhere except where "Exclusivism" happens to carry it?

Mr. Patterson, replying to a letter sent by nineteen young men, calling for humiliation and prayer, and a breaking down of partyism, dated March, 1871, speaks quite in keeping with the foregoing sentiments, and says:—"Take the case of Dublin. For about thirty-five years the Lord's Table had been spread there—the critical moment referred to arrived, and separation from those who held to the evil, or were indifferent to it, was absolutely necessary. Those who separated carried with them the Lord's Table, and the Lord was with them," etc. *Tract*, p. 2. Blackrock, March, 1871. (Signed) F. G. Patterson.

Fallacy.—In the last case we were told that there are no directions given for leaving the Church, which is very true; but here we find that this want is now supplied—and how? Out of their own heads. The faithful not only leave the Church but carry the Table with them. But as some readers may not be able to comprehend this, it is necessary to explain. According to Mr. Patterson, there was an assembly in Dublin on "the ground of the Church of God," and gathered in "the unity of the spirit," and standing as the House of Commons in comparison with the London Clubs—the expression of "the unity of the body" whilst all others were "rivals;" and this continued for thirty-five years, until "the critical moment arrived"—that is, until the particular Sunday came—when lo! on that day the Lord's Table was carried away and fixed in another part of the city, where the true and real Church has been ever since—founded by those who separated. Now whether this separation was right or wrong is another question; we are not now discussing it, nor are we writing in defence or condemnation of it. But in the sense of Church discipline, and the transferring of the Lord's Church by taking the Table from one place to another, it is simply ridiculous. No such thing is known to the New Testament. There are a few cases in Scripture where an opening was given for such action had it been in the Lord's thoughts. One was in

iii. John, where the faithful are found outside the Church. Diotrophes, who loved to have the pre-eminence, we are told, "prated against the apostles with malicious words, and cast the brethren out of the Church." Here the faithful brethren are outside, whilst Diotrophes and his followers are inside. Now why did not St. John tell those brethren to carry the Table with them? Had he done so then there would have been a precedent—but he says not a word of the kind. And why? Because governmental guidance was present to act on the Church when the Church was there. The other case was in Sardis, which had a name to live while it was dead. But of the faithful therein the Lord says: "Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments, and they shall walk with me in white, for they are worthy." Why did the Lord not tell them to carry the Table with them? For the same reason—because governmental guidance (*κυβερνησις*) was present to act on the Church when the Church was there as an objective assembly. But governmental guidance was manifested under difficulties. For it is clear that if love were always uppermost it would in itself suffice. The house of God was exposed to many evils, and Christ was son over His own house (Heb. iii.); and to meet these there was (1) power (*δυναμις*) in the Church itself, so that the person put out was exposed to exceptional judgment (1 Cor. v. 4, 5). There was also sickness or death inflicted on a person who brought judgment on himself *κριμα εαντω* (1 Cor. xi. 29, 30)—where are those seen now in the Church?

There was (2) apostolic authority (*εξουσια*) from the first, and asserted by St. Paul and St. John up to the last. See 1 Cor., iv. 21; 2 Cor., x. 6-8, and xiii. 1-2; 3 John. Where is it now? There were (3) elders or bishops and deacons, styled in the abstract 'government's helps' (*κυβερνησεις, αυτιληψεις*) and joined together with 'tongues' (1 Cor., xii. 28), where are these now? And finally (4) there was the Lord Himself walking in the midst (*περιπατων*) of the seven churches in the form of governmental jurisdiction.—Rev. ii.-iii. And those seven simultaneous churches, representing the whole Church at the time, exhibit the last form of government in the Church whilst it stood as an objective corporate body on earth. Such at least are the facts we get in Scripture. And if the Church now as an objective corporate body can go on without these, it is somewhat different from the above. Hence, the absurdities and contradictions in which people involve themselves every moment.

In sum, there was in the early Church itself, a Divine severity variously manifested. There was, in the apostles and elders, a "readiness to revenge all disobedience" (*εκδικησαι*), and use the "rod" when requisite (1 Cor. iv. 21). St. Peter calls himself one of the elders (1 Pet. v. 1), and St. Paul frequently refers to this power, see 2 Cor. i. 23, and xiii. 10. But while rule was to be with diligence, mercy was to be shown with cheerfulness (Rom. xii. 8). Hence severity was the last resort; yet it was there to be used when requisite. But where in Scripture is anything without Divine rule ever called *the Church*? See how it was used at first in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, Acts v.

IX.

THE "UNITY OF THE CHURCH."

In what way does the "distinctiveness" of "exclusivism" express "the truth of the unity of the Church?"

Mr. Patterson, speaking in the tract, on the unity of the Church, says:

"When the truth of the unity of the Church began to exercise souls amongst them, the leaders sought by shifting their ground to keep the consciences of many at rest; but I bless the Lord your appeal proves that souls will not be thus deceived," &c.

"As for amalgamation, it never can be. You would be the first to blame us, bye-and-bye; and rightly so, for having surrendered the path in which we have been mercifully preserved. Would such an action ever make a schismatic thing right? Would it not be rather to surrender the truth, and to blot out the distinctiveness of our place?" Page 3, of same Tract.

Pallacy.—The first paragraph is launched against Merrion Hall (Dublin). But Mr. Patterson and the "Exclusives" are the last people that should complain of "shifting their ground," for we have seen that they, on a certain Sunday in Dublin, "carried the Lord's table with them," and took the Church of God or assembly of God that had been gathered "in the unity of the Spirit for thirty-five years," clean out of where it was and put it in another place!

Now, assuming that it had been on church ground, as "the distinctiveness of the place," and position of Darbyism assert; where ever did they find in Scripture a course such as this? But to make the matter still more absurd, some years after this, certain chief men belonging to "exclusivism," left that body; and amongst others Mr. Stancombe of Yeovil with the whole congregation, owing to the wrong doctrine of Mr. Darby himself (which we shall consider presently); and, on the same principle, they carried the table with them, thus shifting the Church of God out of its place again. Have not Mr. Stancombe and those who left "exclusivism" as good a right to say "the critical moment came" as Mr. Patterson; or was it "schism" in one case and not in another? We pause for a reply. Moreover, it cannot be pretended that Mr. Stancombe acted from pique or any personal motive, for it is well known to have cost him many tears, as indeed the reader can judge for himself as he reads on this Tract. But his conscience towards God rose higher than party when foundations were being destroyed.

X.

THE MOTHER CHURCH.

Is it true that "exclusivism" is the mother of unity?

In a Tract called "Exclusivism," attributed to Mr. Darby, and reprinted from *The Bible Treasury*, we have the following on the subject of unity:—

"As to unity, they [the denominations] have themselves nothing that is Divine to contend for, and do not see the use of contending, and would have us give up the truth we have learned, and for peace sake to resolve ourselves into a mere sect, like the denominations, and go on comfortably as they do. But no! it was the true mother of the child who exclaimed, with horror, at the decree of Solomon to divide it. The other had nothing to lose by it, and could afford to consent; but it only betrayed the true state of the case—she had nothing to lose. The true one had a living mother's interest in a living child, whose life was most precious to her; she could not and would not consent to such a compromise. So it is with the so-called exclusives." Page 5.

Fallacy.—The doctrine of Rome proceeds from a correct

premise—that man is responsible to God for unconditional obedience, but it claims this obedience for the Pope as the representative of God; it also proceeds from a correct premise—that Christians are responsible to God for keeping the unity of the faith, but claims adherence to the Church as the expression and exponent of the faith. It is the same with “exclusivism”—exclusivism is the mother of unity, and as the real mother will not consent to have the child divided, so “exclusivism” must have all or none. This illustration is taken from the case of the two women at the judgment seat of Solomon. One may illustrate anything, but illustrations are not proofs. But in this case the illustration singularly breaks down. For it was the absence of self-assertion and abnegation that commended the case of the real mother to Solomon. The real mother said, “O, my Lord, give her the living child and in no wise slay it” (1 Kings, iii. 26). Mr. Darby conveniently omits this part of it, for it would not suit the characteristics. In vain do we look for the remotest approach to the spirit of this woman in Romanism or Darbyism; on the contrary, it is all self-assertion and declamation without proofs. The fallacy and mischief of all this is that the personal individual conscience becomes demoralised, for instead of being exercised as to the unity of the spirit experimentally, a mechanical party unity is substituted. So that if one falls into this party unity and joins an objective body, he then keeps the unity of the spirit. Could anything be more fallacious? Had the woman said, “Give me the living child and in no wise give it to her,” it would have more truly represented the present case.

XI.

RECEIVING TRANSGRESSORS.

How is it possible for “the open vessel, with a covering upon it, to remain clean,” if it receives those who “constantly” make themselves transgressors?

The Tract on “Exclusivism,” attributed to Mr. Darby, further says: “Many admit it would be inconsistent to receive ‘constantly’ at the table one who continued to go to and fro; but are there in Scripture two kinds of receiving, one less important and less definite and less responsible than the

other? Either a person is on the ground of the Church of God or he is not. If he is not, he ought to be seriously instructed, and if possible made to understand, before he practically takes that ground with us, that he makes himself a transgressor in having done so if he abandon it. But, whether he understand or no, you have no right to refuse him his place, if he be not otherwise disqualified." Pages 3, 4.

Fallacy.—Here Mr. Darby rules that he who "makes himself a transgressor, if he be not otherwise disqualified," is "to be received at the Lord's table!" One would think that this was disqualification enough. But what does Mr. Darby mean by "making himself a transgressor." He means that if the person goes "to and fro"—that is, for example, if the person goes one Sunday to the Baptists or other denomination and another Sunday to the "Exclusives," he makes himself a transgressor. This solemn language, taken from the Epistle to the Galatians, and applied by the Apostle Paul to the surrendering of the Gospel of Christ to Judaism, Mr. Darby adopts in this case. "If," says St. Paul, "I build again the things which I destroyed I make myself a transgressor" (Gal. ii. 19); and this grave sin attaches to the person who joins "Exclusivism" one Sunday and another denomination the Sunday following. And yet, notwithstanding this, the person is to be received constantly to the Lord's table, if he be not otherwise disqualified. Now, what greater disqualification could there be than this? Would the Apostle Paul receive "constantly" persons thus disqualified? Does Mr. Darby really believe the things that he says? It is a most serious thing to take up and apply Scripture language, used on the gravest of subjects, to make light of it. Either Mr. D. believes that they "make themselves transgressors" or he does not, one or other. If he believes it, how on earth can they be more disqualified? or how on earth can the place that receives them be undefiled? That Mr. D. believes it appears from p. 6, where we are told to read *Num. xix.*, and that the only way to escape the religious and moral corruption that pollutes the atmosphere is, that vessels should have coverings bound upon them—"every open vessel which hath no covering bound upon it is unclean" (v. 15.) Exclusivism is a vessel of this kind with a covering bound upon it, yet persons who come from "the dead bodies" around, and who make themselves transgressors, by returning to the same atmosphere, are to be constantly received!!!

The truth is, the tract called "Exclusivism" was written to check the violence of his own party on the one hand, and on the other hand, to feed their ecclesiastical vanity and importance. Hence Mr. Darby falls into this dilemma. Now Mr. Darby is master of the situation, and the master of those who surround him as a teacher of doctrine. But they are his masters in driving to their legitimate results the theories which he propounds. They insist on the logical conclusions, and being usually sharp, narrow, and keen, they carry the day in the practical working of the system, and look upon looseness to Darbyism as equivalent to a surrendering of the Gospel itself.

We have next to look at Mr. Darby's doctrine on the non-vicarious sufferings and punishment of Christ for sins, and in this the Gospel is really compromised.

XII.

OUR LORD IN THE EXERCISES OF ROM. VII.

Did our Lord in any part of his life, and without being vicarious, pass through such exercises as Romans VII ?

Mr. Darby, in his pamphlet on "The Sufferings of Christ," says as follows :—

"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, and of the Holy Ghost as His force ; 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 a state—such suffering, for example, as is seen in the case of Job. Christ has passed through all these kinds of suffering, only the last, of course, as Himself a perfect being, to learn it for others. I need not say that He was perfect in all." P. 59.

Fundamental error.—Here Mr. Darby contemplates our Lord in three estates ; the first two all right, the third all wrong. Did our Lord in His life pass through without being vicarious the exercises of a man who as a sinner is so far enlightened as to learn the difference of good and evil in the

presence of God, not fully known in grace and redemption, whose judgment of sin is before his eyes, and exposed to all the advantage that Satan can take of him in that state? If so, in what respect do those exercises differ from Rom. vii.? To say that the Lord was a perfect being, has nothing to say to the question. Every one admits this on all sides, and perfection has many meanings. Mr. Darby has in his new edition added a note which one cannot see mends the matter in the least. If, instead of "passed through," he chooses to say, "realized in His own soul," he is welcome to the change. Did then the Lord realize in His own soul, apart from His vicarious sufferings, the exercises of Rom. vii.? And if not, what is the difference between the experiences of that chapter and the exercises of our Lord as described by Mr. Darby in the foregoing paragraph? The reader will find in a tract of Mr. Kelly's, "*Brethren and their Traducers*," exactly similar sentiments referred to Mr. Newton at the time of the divisions, yet some years afterwards Mr. Darby comes out in the same form.

XIII.

CHRIST PUNISHED, YET NO ATONEMENT.

Is it true that our Lord was smitten of God under confession of sin, and yet not in atonement?

On Psalm lxi., Mr. Darby has the following remarks:—

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 the nations' (in a certain sense we may say ours, but especially the nations' 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.”—*Sufferings*, pp. 71, 72.

Fundamental error.—Mr. Darby’s people complain that the extracts taken from his writings are curtailed. Here is one given in extenso, and the more drawn out the worse it is. In the first place, the interpretation is all wrong, and then the doctrine is infamous. Indeed, Mr. Darby seems himself somewhat ashamed of it, for since it has been exposed, he has added a note (p. 107) to try and neutralize the doctrine in some measure—anything rather than confess the evil—like Rome still. But as a matter of interpretation, it is all wrong, for verse 26 applies to the person of Christ Himself, and not to others. “They persecute him whom thou hast smitten, and they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded.” All applies to Christ. The plural “those,” being what is called a plural of majesty or intensity, is very frequent in Scripture, as in the language of common life. So the LXX and Vulgate apply the verse to the Lord Himself. But the proof of it is seen in the verse immediately preceding, verse 25: “Let their habitation be desolate,” etc. This verse is ruled by inspiration as referring to Judas, and quoted thus—Acts i. 20: “As it is written in the book of psalms, let *his* habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein.” The Holy Spirit Himself makes it refer to one person. The Lord and Judas being the chief actors, are spoken of in the plural—the plural of majesty or intensity, as grammarians call it. So much for the interpretation on which Mr. Darby builds his doctrine. But what of the doctrine itself? Mr. Darby admits and asserts that the Lord confessed our sins [verse 5]: “O God, thou knowest my foolishness and my sins are not hid from thee.” He then admits and asserts that the hand of God was on Him, and that He was smitten of God for sins, all of which is very correct. But now comes the astounding dictum—“But we have the clear proof that they are not atoning sufferings;” and what is the clear proof? Why, that the language of ver. 26 is partly plural. Such is the dull and blinded process by which he gets the clear proof of this shocking doctrine.

The reader can see here also the same sentiments attributed to Mr. Newton at the time of the divisions in Mr. Kelly’s tract, “*Brothren and their Traducers.*”

We have lastly to look at Mr. Darby’s translations and perversions of the New Testament, in which he shakes received beliefs on vital subjects. We give eight of the passages.

XIV.

THE NON-WORSHIP OF CHRIST.

Is it true that our Lord does not get true worship in the New Testament ?

In Mr. Darby's translation of the New Testament into *German, French, and English*, true worship is denied to our Lord, and a lower word is systematically substituted for it, and this we consider fundamentally demoralising and erroneous. It is just as the Unitarian version of 1808.

1. The wise men who came from the east to worship Israel's Messiah, are said to do Him homage. "For we have seen his star in the east, and have come to do him homage—*rendre homage*, D.; and are come to worship him, A. V.; *l'adorer*, Ostervald.

2. When the disciples saw Jesus walking on the sea, and stilling the tempest they "*did homage to him, saying, truly thou art God's Son—et lui rendirent homage*," D.; and worshipped him, A. V.; *et l'adorerent*, Ostervald. Matt. xiv. 33.

3. The mother of Zebedee's children came and asked the Messiah for a place for her sons beside Him in His kingdom, "*doing homage to him—lui rendant homage*," D.; worshipping him, A. V.; *et se prosterna*, Ostervald. Matt. xiv. 33.

4. When, after His resurrection, the women came to Him "*they did him homage—et lui renderent homage*," D.; and worshipped him, A. V.; *et l'adorerent*, Ostervald. Matt. xxviii. 9.

5. And when He appeared on the mountain of Galilee, saying, "All power is given me in heaven and in earth. *They did him homage—ils lui rendirent homage*, D.; they worshipped him, A. V.; *ils l'adorerent*, Ostervald. Matt. xxviii. 17.

6. When the Lord ascended to heaven in the presence of the disciples, *and they having done homage to him—lui ayant rendu homage*, D.; and they worshipped him, A. V.; *l'ayant adoré*, Ostervald. Luke xxiv. 52.

7. When Jesus asked the blind man, whose eyes He had opened, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" and he said, *I believe, Lord: and he did him homage—et lui rendit homage*, D.; and he worshipped him, A. V.; *et il se prosterna devant* w; Ostervald. John ix. 38.

And when, in the Apocalypse, the Lamb is seen in the throne. *The elders fell down and did homage—et rendirent homage, D. ; fell down and worshipped him, A. V. ; se prosternerent, Ostervald. Rev. v. 14.*

Mr. Darby thus applies homage to Christ, in company with Gilbert Wakefield, the famous Unitarian, and so translates all the passages in the New Testament, with one exception, *English* version, but with no exception in the *French* version. Yet, in reference to God the Father, Mr. Darby translates the same Greek word (*προσκυνω*) rightly, John iv. The term *worship* in English may be used in a higher or a lower sense, but the term *homage* is never used in the sense of higher divine worship, and this makes all the difference. We have been asked what intention Mr. Darby had in this, and our reply was "We are not judges of any man, much less of his intentions." The Lord knoweth the hearts, but this public corruption of the word of God, with the *imprimatur* on it, of the head of a large religious party, is very evil indeed. And what must be the necessary effects on the partizans but a justification and palliation of the evil. Indeed, one of their teachers some time since told a young man (Mr. P. of Dublin) that Mr. D. was right, as our Lord was not worshipped and could not be worshipped when on earth, for the people were not regenerated, and no unregenerated person could worship. The effort thus to corrupt that poor young man's mind was very horrible.

Of course the reply was that Israel was God's covenant people, and called upon to worship Jehovah all through the Old Testament, and the same worship was claimed for the Messiah. The only real question was, if Jesus were the Messiah, and all who believed Him to be so, did and should give Him divine worship, and He accepted it; whereas an angel or an apostle when they got worship instantly refused it. Acts x. 26; Rev. xxii. 9.

On the renderings of *homage* and *not worship* to the Son of God, Mr. Kelly says that "he is not aware of a single orthodox Christian, of competent biblical knowledge, who would not, in the main, support the discriminating value given to *proskuneo* (the Greek word for worship) in J. N. D.'s version as against the authorized version," &c. *Bible Treasury*, December, 1868; June, 1869. Before this we thought that the worship of Christ in the New Testament was clear to all but the enemies of Christianity.

XV.

THE DEITY OF OUR LORD IN ACTS xx. 28.

On what authority does Mr. Darby exclude the deity of Christ from Acts xx. 28.

The passage runs thus: "Feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." Now, this passage has been from of old a subject of controversy with the Unitarians; for it asserts the deity of our Lord in a remarkable manner—viz., that He who had purchased the Church with His own blood was God. Therefore, one class of them sought to get rid of the difficulty by reading *Lord* instead of *God*, in which they are supported by some MSS., which reading would make little difference, for Lord (*κυριος*) constantly in Acts is equivalent to Jehovah, as in the Greek Old Testament, the LXX. Another class admitted God but introduced the word Son. "Feed the Church of God which he had purchased with the blood of his own Son;" and this word *son*, supplied, but not expressed effectually, excluded the passage from supporting the deity of Christ to any one who called it in question.

The Unitarians based the rendering on what is called the two articles in the Greek, and as a criticism it was ridiculed by Bishop Middleton in his day. For the two articles only strengthen the position in favour of the common orthodox view, as the reader can see by comparing the same elsewhere: Acts i. 25; John i. 42, and v. 43, and vii. 18; Mark xv. 25.

With the latter class of Unitarians, however, Mr. Darby agrees, and insists upon it that "he is fully satisfied it is the right translation" (*note to English version of the Acts*); and not seemingly aware that the Unitarians had done so well before him, he appears in his preface to his *French New Testament* to look upon himself as the solver of the difficulty.

But the Unitarians and Mr. Darby have been several times challenged to produce one single passage from any Greek author, sacred or profane, to support the grammar of the rendering they have adopted, but in vain. In fact, there could be no such rendering, it would not be Greek at all so far as any precedent is forthcoming; and so when some well-known authorities in Biblical Greek were consulted, they replied to the same effect as Bishop Middleton to the Unitarians.

Mr. Paget of Box, Wilts, asked Bishop Ellicott, who replied as follows:—

MY DEAR SIR,—I have found time carefully to consider your note. My very fixed opinion is that *του ιδιου* [his own] is in agreement with the preceding substantive. Such an ellipsis as is suggested would be very foreign to the style of St. Luke, &c. Yours, &c.,

Gloucester and Bristol, &c.

The late Dean Alford also to Mr. Ryan, Dublin, wrote as follows:—

DEAR SIR,—No man in possession of his senses could render *του αιματος του ιδιου* ("the blood of his own Son") unless he were influenced by a foregone judgment. The words in Greek can bear but one meaning, and that "his own blood;" so at least it seems to me, &c. Yours, &c.

HENRY ALFORD.

The professor of Biblical Greek, T.C.D., utterly ignores the rendering in like manner. Literally it is thus: "Feed the Church of God which he hath purchased to himself with his own blood."

Now, to alter unnecessarily and without overwhelming evidence a text that gives such a clear utterance on the deity of Christ, and to rob it of its force for reasons utterly baseless and gratuitous, is surely no light matter in these days. But Mr. D. says that the divinity of Christ does not depend on this text. Thank God it does not, nor any other single text in the Bible. But that in no wise alleviates the matter, or takes from the spiritual pravity and demoralisation of publicly essaying to denude the word of God of such a passage. To display noisy zeal for the glory of Christ, whilst our own acts in no wise differ, prove it to be hollow and got up for party purposes more than for the glory of God, somewhat like Jehu in the Old Testament, 2 Kings, 15, 16.

But such things as these sap and destroy the very bulwarks of the faith when done by public teachers.

XVI.

IRREVERENCE.

Why does Mr. Darby in his French version of the New Testament take pains to exclude the capital letters to the name of our Lord and the Holy Ghost ?

To give a few examples of this irreverent exclusivism, we shall take four principal passages referring especially to the personality and divinity of the Lord and the Spirit, giving the English equivalents also :—

- 1 “ *le second homme est le seigneur (venu) du ciel.*”
- 2 “ *notre seigneur Jesus Christ (seigneur) de gloire.*”
- 3 “ *or le seigneur est l'esprit.*”
- 4 “ *et l'esprit saint aussi nous (en) rend temoignage.*”

The *English* equivalents of these, with the capitals excluded, show the reader how they appear to a *French* person :—

- 1 “ the second man is the lord from heaven.” 1 Cor. xv. 47.
- 2 “ our lord Jesus Christ the lord of glory.” James ii. 1.
- 3 “ now the lord is that spirit.” 2 Cor. iii. 17.
- 4 “ wherof the holy ghost is a witness unto us.” Heb. x. 15.

The poor Frenchman has thus the capital letters excluded from two persons of the godhead deliberately and scientifically throughout this New Testament, got up especially for his improvement and edification.

This and the foregoing present some of the gravest defilements, at least, in our humble judgment, that any public teacher of religion could perpetrate on the word of God.

But whether “the open vessel with a covering bound upon it” (Num. xix. 15) be rendered unclean by them or not, we cannot say. One fears that the covering may possibly be used to shut up the evil and defilement as well as to exclude it; for if these things are clean, it is hard for any one to tell what defilement means, at least defilement in doctrinal teaching.

THE DILEMMA.

If the foregoing be true, and we challenge contradiction, the unfortunate position in which the leaders and teachers have fixed their party is anything but enviable.

The ecclesiastical side of the system verges towards Romanism, the doctrinal side towards Rationalism, whilst the pride of a fictitious position injures and falsifies conscience in simple souls, who are kept in ignorance of the real state of things. They cannot (1) confess error in teaching; it would be death to the party, its prestige were gone: They cannot (2) admit that they harbour or shelter wrong doctrine, as anything of this kind they say defiles, as does evil practice, which is so far very true. Hence (3) at all cost the doctrines we have looked at, and the renderings and perversions of Scripture, must be defended or palliated. They must be defended as true, or palliated as too trivial for notice. In this way the exigencies of "exclusivism" at this moment demand and require that those very things which shock the moral instincts of upright Christian men, must be defended or toned down in order to save the credit and maintain the prestige of a party which takes its distinctive place as the true representation of the Church of God.

To prove this, we have only to refer to Mr. Darby himself; he makes a flourish of trumpets to comfort his followers, and demands that all his writings be burnt that contain anything dishonouring to the Lord, and tells them at the same time that he has such a pious horror of Bethesda (Mr. Muller's Meeting, Bristol), that "no persuasion, with the help of God, will ever lead him a step nearer to it." *Sufferings of Christ, Preface p. v.; Introduction p. 10.* In addition to this, nine partizans in London publish a tract, pronouncing Mr. Darby all right. They were chosen to go through this farce, because others being outside the lightsome position of "exclusivism" were incapable of righteous judgment. And what is the result of all this? Why, that the writings of Mr. Darby are not burnt at all; "there may be in them expressions less perfect than they might be," and that is all! And so, though our Lord in His life had exercises in His soul similar to Rom. vii., that is nothing! And though He was punished of God under confession of our sins, but yet not vicariously, that is nothing! And though the worship of Christ is out out

of the whole Book in the translation of the New Testament into three languages of Europe, made for the improvement of Christian knowledge, that is nothing! And though the Deity of Christ is wantonly expunged from Acts xx. 28, that is nothing! And though the initial capitals are expunged from our Lord's name and the name of the Holy Ghost in the French Testament, all this is nothing, or else it is quite right. Nothing in all these defiling at all, or dishonouring to the Lord. And the persons who can thus defend and make light of these enormities are so sensitive to defilement, that they could not dream of approaching such a place as Bethesda, in Bristol, for the world! Alas! alas! there is such a thing as being "righteous overmuch," and at the same time of being "overmuch wicked." There is such a thing as "calling evil good and good evil." There is such a thing as "putting darkness for light and light for darkness." But the prestige of the party must be maintained at all cost. Such is the present dilemma of exclusivism.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since this tract went to press, a pamphlet was sent us—*The Basis of Peace: By Philadelphos*. We are, therefore, obliged to refer to it for the sake of the reader. It may be divided into three parts for the more simple apprehension of the subject, viz., *circumstantials, essentials, and doctrine*. (1) The circumstantials abundantly confirm the foregoing remarks on church discipline. And if Mr. Darby justifies his Church action by referring to the open vessel without a covering bound upon it (Num. xix. 15), Philadelphos refers to the want of battlements on the roof of his own house, viz., those doctrines which cause danger to others (Deut. xxii. 8), and also to his putting a sickle to his neighbour's standing corn, viz., cutting off saints and churches (Deut. xxiii. 25). These are the circumstantials. (2) But when we come to essentials, there is no difference between the writer and the "exclusives." The pamphlet does not merely advocate the unity and community of Christians as such, but the unity of two parties in a body as the Church which, if united, "ought to be the dwelling-place of love, pervaded by the atmosphere of heaven, the refuge and home of every weary soul. But instead of this we see a divided house" (p. 42).

The Basis of Peace was written to set things right in this respect; and if it succeeds, "what a future there might be before us" (p. 47). There is, however, no very glorious future spoken of in Scripture about the end of an erring dispensation like this, but the contrary. However it was this inflated notion and self-glorification about taking the ground of the Church and being the expression of the body of Christ in a corporate objective sense that was at the first so offensive to God that He suffered the divisions to follow, and even the divisions have not cured it. The language of the pamphlet is just the same in this respect as that of Mr. Kelly and Mr. Patterson. Now it is not errors in circumstantials to which we draw attention, but to the absence of the essentials. Mr. Darby is blamed in the pamphlet for cutting off churches himself alone; but why so? Mr. D. had as good a right to do this individually as collectively. There is no precedent for unitedly cutting off churches any more than individually. If they were churches at all in any divine sense as corporate bodies, one were as foreign to Scripture as the other. In fact, it could not be. (3) Lastly, as to doctrine, *The Basis of Peace* proposes the union of "the two houses" in an objective body, with the view of having "a refuge and home of every weary soul" and a glorious future. And to accomplish this, those sad and grievous doctrines of Mr. Darby are to be ignored. They are only "badly expressed." And those translations and perversions of Scripture on the worship and deity of our Lord are of so little account, that they are not even mentioned. How far then the object of the pamphlet if gained would result in more humility or in less spiritual reality every godly unprejudiced reader may judge for himself.

If we really believe in the inspired revelation given us, is it not of more importance to attend patiently to the evidence and convictions of Scripture, and give value and weight to Divine words which produce self-denial and godly edifying which is in faith, than to indulge in splendid theories which exalt self but are devoid of the power of God. If we seek to make a display and an appearance before men, even under the form of doing good, we shall have our reward. The former is much more difficult, and few attain unto it; but the day will try every man's work of what sort it is. 1 Cor. iii.

The Booksellers named in the title page will supply by post a dozen or half dozen copies of this tract by sending an additional stamp, or else they can be ordered through any bookseller.



