

For private circulation only.
(2 Samuel 1 ; 20.)

Brief History of 'Ravenism'

Its Origin (1888-91) and
baneful results.

U.S.A.
BIBLE TRUTH PUBLISHERS,
1112 NORTH TAYLOR AVENUE,
ST. LOUIS 13, MO.

Foreword

The purpose of the following pages is not the happier work of showing how God has blessed those Christians known as "Brethren"—their writings have surely borne witness to this fact—but to show the way in which the enemy has worked amongst them in turning many aside from the truth in its simplicity, as it was known at the first, thus causing widespread sorrow and division amongst those gathered unto His Name.

The facts and details have been drawn largely from books and tracts written during past years. The object in presenting these facts in the following brief form is to give those young in the faith, who are exercised as to the truth, the opportunity to judge for themselves. With many there is complete ignorance of what has taken place in the past; with many also there is complete indifference. The following pages will be of no interest to the latter, but should they fall into the hands of any seeking the truth may God in His grace be pleased to use them for help and blessing to such.

Nothing has brought such dishonour upon the Lord's Name and marred the clear testimony to the truth—amongst those outside of "Bethesda"—as the new doctrines commenced in 1888, which have since spread like a gangrene. It is therefore important that those who, through His grace, have been hitherto unspoiled by "Ravenism" should know something of its character, so as to be able to detect it immediately and to refuse it, root and branch, should they come in contact with it, and so continue still in the path of separation until He comes. May He deign to use the following remarks to this end, for His glory.

B.M.

27th February, 1950.

The quotations from J.N.D. have been abbreviated for lack of space; the reader is recommended to read the articles in full.

Brief History of 'RAVENISM'

Its Origin (1888-91) and baneful results

AT this juncture (1888-91) something entirely new was introduced amongst "Brethren"—something alas! that had no precedent amongst them. The question for each soul to decide is, was this "new light" (as it was called) of God, or was it of the enemy? Now this is truly a solemn question; solemn because either those supporting these teachings were fundamentally in error, or those who refused them were. In seeking to answer such a question, we can only appeal to the Scriptures of Truth, and if the words of Scripture do not speak to the conscience, nothing else will be of any avail.

We have seen how in the early church Judaising teachers were at work even in the apostles' day, and then later, when the apostles were gone, those who "sat at their feet" were the instruments to introduce error into the church. At Corinth—where there were large numbers and where they "came behind in no gift"—what does Paul have to write? "I fear lest by any means, as the serpent deceived Eve by his craft, so your thoughts should be corrupted from *simplicity* as to the Christ." (2 Cor. 11. 3. N. Tr.). Take Galatians and see how he warned them against error—though "we or an angel from heaven" taught it, they must reject it. Then further, see how he enjoins Timothy to "take heed to himself and to the doctrine," to "hold fast the form of sound words," to "continue in the things he had learned and been assured of." Take John's epistles and see how they had to "prove the spirits,"—there was "the spirit of truth and the spirit of error." Some were "going forward" and not abiding in the truth, and so he writes to exhort them to let that which they had heard "from the beginning" abide in them. (1 John 2.24). We see in popery, after centuries, how little these warnings were heeded. But what can be said for those who knew all this, and yet were ensnared by error of the worst kind, concerning the Person of Christ?

A system of teaching came to light early in 1888, supported by a number of brethren, Mr. F. E. Raven of Greenwich being its chief exponent. One of the first statements of Mr. R's. to be challenged, according to records, was made in a Bible reading where nearly eighty brothers were present; he taught that the latter part of 2 Cor. 5.21 was "future" and "purpose." This was contested by W.T.W., who insisted that it was "present" though the display in glory is future. (J.B.S. was present on this occasion.) The believer's perfect standing "in Christ" was in question. A little later, at Witney, he made further alarming statements in regard to eternal life as a "sphere of blessing" etc. which led to important correspondence and criticism of his doctrine by well known brethren. Later, in the readings of the London

brothers, his teachings had to be resisted further: and on October 15th, 1889, he was "publicly withstood" at a large meeting at Brixton, especially by C.D.M. and W.J.L. (During these months he was visited by older brethren of long experience, who detected in his teaching that which was false, though covered over by many statements of truth.* He was earnestly appealed to by these brethren, in the presence of a number of others, and at times there was a "little yielding" and *modifying of his doctrine*; but having an active mind, similar statements were soon put forward in another form.) On October 28th, 1889, Mr. R. wrote to Dr. Cotton that "the matter had become public," which closed the door to any further personal appeals. This, however, did not prevent W.J.L. from writing a long letter to Mr. R., dated November 12th, setting before him many points gathered from his writings, and beseeching him to withdraw his teachings. He replied to this on the 25th maintaining his ground.

Before going further it should be explained here that as F.E.R. introduced a *whole system* of teaching, with phraseology that was entirely new or "novel," it would be impossible in this short history to speak of *all* that he taught that was false. Any remarks made must therefore, for the sake of space, be confined mainly to his teaching as to the Person of Christ. It is proposed to show first, what anxiety Mr. R's statements caused even to those who afterwards became his supporters; second, his false doctrine as to the Person of Christ; third, the events that led up to the division of 1890.

As to the first, the following short extract should be sufficient. It was written by a Canadian brother (sound in the truth) to one "almost at the antipodes," and throws some light on events at that time:

"I turn now to some of those fearful expressions, from which I believe every child of God (unless under the blinding power of the enemy) must instinctively shrink." Think of a helpless babe being the exhibition of eternal life" . . . When I read the account of the five hundred brothers in Park Street (with reference to this) I hardly knew how to restrain my indignation. He condescends to withdraw one word† because 'it appeared to be irreverent,' and they express—thankfulness. When he said he would rather go out of fellowship than withdraw the remainder of the sentence—*why* did they not rise as one man, and refuse to be connected with such blasphemy, connected too, as it had been, with such deceit and falsehood? . . . Can you be aware of the statements recently made (which a Thomasonian or Unitarian would readily accept) 'Did God die?' 'When His humanity was in the grave, where was His divinity?' 'I don't for a moment suppose that the Lord Jesus rose from the dead with the same body that went in?' I make no comment on these dreadful expres-

* His teachings were rejected by some of the oldest and best taught brothers in London and elsewhere. These brothers were not prolific writers, as the truth had already been fully brought out—the test was *now* as to whether brethren could hold it fast.

† Mr. Raven withdrew, 4th October, 1890, the word "helpless," as giving an air of irreverence to the sentence.

sions, and more might be named. It is nearly 60 years since I was first acquainted with brethren, and more than 50 years since I first broke bread with them, but I have never known such widespread profaneness and blasphemy among them, as has been brought to light recently." (J.C.B., Brantford, Ont., Feb. 2nd, 1891.)

Now it must not be imagined that all who remained "in fellowship with F.E.R." were in agreement with all that he taught. Many were alarmed at his statements—while others were more or less in ignorance of them—but they took no definite action in clearing themselves from what was so dishonouring to the Name of Him who is "Holy and True." The following was from the pen of one who was a prominent and "ardent supporter" at the time of the division, and reveals that even such were not wholly without conscience in the matter, though hopelessly and deeply involved:

"I know the passages you quote well, and trust through grace I am not asleep but awake, and value, as I ever did, the writings of beloved Mr. Darby, who would make short work of a good deal that passes current as 'truth' today if he were alive."

(J.S.O., 1st Oct., 1895.)

THE DOCTRINAL QUESTION

Here mere "discussion" is to be in every way avoided, as dangerous and "destructive of the spirit of worship and affection." The deepest reverence becomes us at all times in speaking of the Lord Jesus, "Who is over all, God blessed for ever." In Jude we are exhorted to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints," but the servant's attitude in this should be gentleness, patience, meekness, towards those who have been ensnared, "if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." (2 Tim. 2:25.)

The mystery of the incarnation is that which is beyond the finite mind of man. It could never be grasped or defined by the human mind, any more than the fact, presented in the Scriptures for faith, that in eternity dwelt the Godhead, Three in One, and One in Three. "From eternity to eternity thou art God." In time the Father sent the Son into the world, but the mystery of His Person is a "great mystery," to be held "in a pure conscience." "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, etc." (1 Tim. 3:16.) The Scriptures present to us JESUS, truly God and truly man, yet One Person. The New Testament opens with the words: "Jesus Christ, the Son of David" (His true manhood), and in the same chapter it is announced that His Name shall be "Emmanuel" (God with us). At the close of the Revelation we read: "I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star." (The root, His divinity, the offspring, His humanity, but the "I," One Person). Again and again we have in the New Testament that He was both Son of God and Son of Man.

He was as truly one as He was the other, it was Jesus who was both. One more instance will suffice. "Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from (or of) the dead" (Romans 1: 3 and 4). As to His humanity, it was perfect (but not "heavenly humanity"). He was made "a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death," He was "a partaker of flesh and blood," "made in the *likeness* of flesh of sin," though sinless. He knew what hunger, thirst and weariness meant; He "groaned in spirit"; He was "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." As to His death, we read, the Originator of life was slain (Acts 3:15. N.Tr.), the Son of God was crucified (Heb. 6:6). There is no "dissecting of His Person" in the Scriptures.

The doctrines propounded by F.E.R. were first put forward in Bible readings and printed letters: then later in tracts and books. It will be necessary to quote from his paper "The Person of the Christ"; "Quemerford Notes," etc. The following are extracts:

Christ "is not a man in the sense that He is God . . . In Person He is God, in condition He is Man." "Gal. 4:4. The same Person abides, though the condition be changed, in His coming of a woman." "Every Scripture which definitely refers to the incarnation speaks of it as the assumption by Christ of a form or condition." "In the expression, 'Father into Thy hands I commend my spirit' I judge that the Lord takes up an expression suited to the position in which He was. But it is the Person who left the condition, which He had assumed, to take it again . . ." ("Quemerford Notes." pp. 145-6.)

"The second error maintains that the truth of Christ's Person consists in the union in Him of God and man." "It involves a thought very derogatory to the truth of the Son, namely, that in becoming man a change has taken place as to His Person—He is in person something which He was not before." "The fourth (John) is given to us to afford full light as to His Person, that is 'the Son,' and in this respect He is seen in three positions, namely, as eternally with the Father, as come into the world, and as going back to the Father, the same Person unchanged and unchangeable." "He lays down His life (human condition) to take it again." "It is the same person in servant's form, and entering into what that form involved." "Further than this, the Person is even viewed as acting in regard to His form or condition." "It is a person in a condition in which He was not previously." ("The Person of the Christ.")

"I believe the old notion of the union of God and man to be wrong. I do not think it was meant wrongly, but, in the light of what has come out now, it was incorrect." ("American Notes," 1902, p. 314.)

Mr. Raven wrote under date of November 28th, 1890, "I think that I have, through grace, received light on these subjects." But when he pressed these doctrines on the saints (at this time and more openly later) he was fully aware that he was introducing thoughts which were "in *opposition* to those entertained by Christians representative of the faith of Christians *in all ages and places.*" When Athanasius withstood heresy during the 4th century, his creed stated that the Lord Jesus Christ "although He be God

and Man, yet He is not two, but *One Christ*." In the clearest terms F.E.R. rejects this as an "old notion" and presents "a person in a condition in which He was not previously." His doctrine amounts simply to this: His humanity was put on like a cloak (in which He dwelt) to be put off or put on at any time. He had no *human* personality, that is, "manhood" formed no part of His Person.* His humanity was merely a "condition" in which He wrapped Himself. The Son of God was never *seen* by His disciples (that which they looked upon was a "condition" only). He was a divine Person "*acting*" as man! Was there ever a more subtle perversion of the truth? Mr. R. thus attempted to "explain" the mystery of His Person, and fell into fatal error. Many have since imbibed his spurious doctrine, which was put forward with such "pretension to precision," as though he would not dare go a "hair's breadth" beyond Scripture!

It is of great interest to see how J.N.D. wrote in regard to the person of the Lord Jesus (though the authority of Scripture is really sufficient answer to these doctrines). Mr. Darby has been spoken of as the "most accurate, uninspired writer known." The following are brief extracts from his writings:

"But, as I am on this point, I add, they have no true Christ at all . . . Why does the blessed Lord say ' . . . My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken Me?' if there was no *ego*, no human personality?" "This last statement that Christ had no human personality . . . is really heresy (though God and man were united in One Person)." "It shows the danger of those early discussions, for the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in One Person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth; but the moment you deny personality in the Man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors."

("Collected Writings," Vol. 29, pp. 321-2.)

"He was a true man, body and soul, and, one may add, spirit. This was called in question by heresy as soon as His deity was." ("Collected Writings," Vol. 23, p. 478.) "That the person of Christ is mysterious is most true . . . so it is absolutely because of the union of Godhead and manhood in one person." ("Collected Writings," Vol. 29 p. 543.) In an article on "The Humanity of Christ" he wrote: "It is outside the teaching of the Spirit to wish to define how the divinity and the humanity are united in Jesus." He avoids "thorny inquiries," "as if the spirit of man could solve the manner in which the humanity and the divinity of Jesus were united to each other." In regard to this very thing he wrote further: "To define is what I do not pretend. 'No man knoweth the Son, but the Father.' If I find something which enfeebles one or other of these truths, or which dishonours what they have for object, I should oppose it, God calling me to it, with all my might." ("Collected Writings," Vol. 10, pp. 286-291.)

* Note the difference between Unitarianism and Ravenism—"the Unitarian would offer you a Christ in whose person there is no Deity. Mr. Raven presents a Christ in whose 'Person' there is no manhood." ("The Truth of Christ's Person; Is it taught by Mr. F. E. Raven?" W.T.W. P.20.)

With regard to Mr. R's. statement that He was "the same Person unchanged and unchangeable"—the basis of his doctrine—it is perfectly true that from the divine side He never ceased to be God; but it is also equally true that from the human side He was born, or "begotten." So that He *became* what He was not before, "*the Word became flesh*" (John 1:14). But human reason could never understand this mystery. Mr. Darby wrote: "'The Word became flesh,' did not cease to be the Word, but was what it was *not before*—became something, and subsequently took manhood into divine glory." ("Notes and Comments," Vol. 2, p. 398).

If the reader were to examine carefully the writings of F.E.R.—a mixture of truth and error—he would find how opposed they are to Scripture. Many quotations could be given to prove this, but space forbids. Truths which had been held and taught amongst brethren for sixty years were undermined, denied, and openly assailed: particularly the perfect standing of the believer in divine righteousness before God, and the communication of eternal life (now) to all the saints. Even the most simple truths were made complicated and thrown into confusion, only the "initiated" being able to "understand" them, while certain vital truths were positively denied in plain words. How true were the words of another: "All the preciousness and reality of these truths that God had brought to light in these last days stood in the way of Mr. Raven and his doctrines." ("A Defence of the Truth," W.M.S., p. 48).

Just a few extracts taken from the several volumes of his teachings are given below. They need no comment.

"It used to be commonly said, I know that I have got eternal life. Why? Because the scripture says 'He that believeth hath everlasting life.' I say you have thus the faith of eternal life, but that does not prove that you have the thing itself." ("American Notes" 1898, p. 54.)

"J.P.—It has been stated that eternal life was communicated to us this side of the bridge. F.E.R.—There is no truth in it." (p. 56.)

"Another brother asked me, 'Have you got eternal life?' I did not know how to answer it exactly, because he simply meant resting on a statement of scripture." (p. 107.) "Eternal life is realized only in the Assembly; no one touches eternal life now except in that connection." (p. 241.)

"R.S.S.—So that in that way it may not be wrong to say that Christians around us in system, who have the Spirit have life, and yet, so far as eternal life is concerned, they really know nothing about it, because it has to do with a scene outside of death. F.E.R.—Which they have never touched." (p.373.)

"R.S.S.—It says in the last chapter of John's epistle 'These things have I written unto you . . . that ye may know that ye have eternal life.' F.E.R.—Because you have come to it. You are conscious of it—but not as a possession." (p. 374.) "You cannot be conscious of eternal life apart from the saints; apart from association." (p.375.) "The whole theory, 'only believe and you will have everlasting life' is wrong." ("The Head of every Principality and Power." p.95.) "The person who has it (eternal life) is one who hears the word of Christ, and believes on Him who sent Him. (See John 5:24.) Remarkd—That is a Christian. F.E.R.—It is an advanced Christian." ("Readings and Addresses at Sunderland, South Shields and Newcastle." p. 58.)

(On Eph. ch. 1.) "People have looked at it as what they are in Christ, but it is not standing." ("The Purpose and Power of God." p. 10.) "The mischief has been that 'in Christ' has been made a question of standing. I think it is a mistake. Ques.—Is there no such thing as standing then? F.E.R.—Well I do not understand what it means, that is all I would say." ("Readings at Sunderland, etc." p. 11). "Ecclesiasticism, standing, ground, and such ideas have almost ruined us."* ("American Notes" 1898, p. 34.)

Some of the changes introduced by this new system of teaching have been aptly summed up in a letter, which is given in part below:

"THE SCRIPTURES are no longer held to be the Word of God. Man's 'I think' has taken the place of 'It is written.'

NEW BIRTH is not now anything communicated, but merely an effect produced.

THE GOSPEL is no longer good news for the perishing but for born again people.

SALVATION, instead of being God's provision for the lost, is reduced to "title to be free from everything adverse," and refers specially to the "present scene."

RECONCILIATION is not now for sinners but for saints, and said to be the "removal of the man," which is by *crucifixion* never by reconciliation.

ETERNAL LIFE is denied as being possessed *here*, yet affirmed to have no meaning in *heaven*.

THERE IS A CURIOUS GROUPING OF FOUR THINGS peculiar to the system which merges all the Kingdoms (of God, of heaven, of the Son of His love, of the Father, of the Son of Man) into one vague moral idea called (1) the "Kingdom" (without specifying which) or "Moral Sway"; after getting into that, you are taught what is termed (2) the "Covenant." That being learned, you are next fit for (3) "reconciliation," and after having gone through all that elaborate process, you may at last, when you have crossed a certain bridge, be able to, what is called "touch" (4) "eternal life." A travesty of what Scripture teaches!

EVERY OLD LANDMARK has been removed from the TABLE and the SUPPER, and there is now no recognition of either as any symbol of unity in one body.

THE PRINCIPLE OR GROUND OF GATHERING is no longer accepted to be that of One body and One Spirit.

HEAD OF THE CHURCH is now only in the sense of Chief. That Christ is Head of the body, the Church, according to the figure of the human body, is now rejected.

THERE IS NO BODY IN THE SCRIPTURAL SENSE owned at all, it being affirmed that "whereas there were two bodies, Jew and Gentile, before, there is only one now"; that is, it means no more than a set of people. When was there a body before? This denies the whole truth of the mystery.

THE TRUE HOPE of the Christian, the coming of the Lord *for* His saints or "our gathering together *to* Him," has been dislocated, and His coming *with* His saints put in its place. In other words been swamped in the Appearing, which is common to us and to the world, but the Coming "for" is peculiar to His own. Time, however, would fail one to recount the numberless vagaries connected with:

* Statements of this nature not only undermined but completely set aside J.N.D.'s tracts entitled "The Standing and State of the Believer," "On Ecclesiastical Independency," "Is the One Body the ground of gathering?" etc.

THE WORLD TO COME of Hebrews 2 and its mixing up with age to come of Ephesians 1.

THE PRIESTHOOD of Christ, Aaronic and Melchisedec, so perverted.

THE PASSING INTO THE ASSEMBLY after the breaking of bread instead of being gathered together as the assembly.

THE ENTERING INTO THE HOLIEST (reduced too, to a "moral idea") after having got into the Assembly "through the Supper"

This, dear brother, is but a brief epitome of only part of the wilderness of confusion and error which has displaced the unique and wondrous realities distinctive of this church period that brought you and me out of system to walk together in the expression of the truth of one body and one Spirit, holding the Head, not as Chief merely, but the Head to whom the body is united and as united ones endeavouring to keep, not mere unity of spirit or one mind, but *the* unity of *the* Spirit in the bond of peace, and looking for the blessed hope of the coming of Himself to take us to Himself. In your letter you recall the happy times of long ago in the dear old land. How the memory of them sends a thrill of joy through one and begets longings and yearnings for a repetition of those hallowed and blessed scenes. Speaking for myself, I would rather lay my head on the block than give up the truth one knows with divine certainty he has received from the Lord, and would sooner walk alone, if need be, till He comes than compromise it. Without Him one can do nothing, but I thank God every day that He has preserved me from being drawn into this subtle system and enabled me to hold fast what I have from Him. It is a wonderful favour to have conferred upon one in this day of departure and declension. Things could scarcely be lower or weaker, and unless there is a *return* to what has been so sadly slipped away from and given up (the denial that it is so being the worst feature of all), the conviction forces itself on one increasingly, that nothing short of a *fresh start* on the divine principles of the Church according to the revelation of the mystery will constitute any testimony, one that God can own, or meet the heart of the Absent but Coming Christ in these last days."—August, 1903.

THE 1890 DIVISION

Reverting now to the division of 1890, it may have seemed as though the work of the Spirit of God in gathering many unto the Name of Christ in separation from evil, was about to be ruined completely now by this flood of evil doctrine, but not so. "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." There were those present then who had their "senses exercised to discern both good and evil." (Heb. 5 : 14.). As yet these new doctrines were still in their infancy, and not put out in the blatant form they were later, but those who discerned their false character were not deceived. The opposition to the beloved brethren who exposed the thing at its very birth, however, was tremendous, and from quarters they would have least expected. "All the wicked work of misrepresentation"; "Breaking up by violence and false accusation"; "Oppression and clericalism" etc., etc., were just a few of the many things hurled against them. But we can leave these things to the One Who has said "I shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday." Perhaps one of the saddest features of all at that time was the way in which some

of the well known gifted brothers (quite sound themselves personally) lent the whole weight of their influence to something that was false, thus carrying large numbers with them in a wrong direction. In the mercy of God however this was only allowed to go so far. There were many, many meetings both at home and abroad preserved in the truth, where this school of doctrine has never been allowed to rear its head.

The matter was brought to a climax through a "letter of commendation" signed by F.E.R., and presented to the assembly at Bexhill, Sussex. Those who brought the letter were asked to "sit behind," and as one was a 'leading brother' from Greenwich, it resulted in important correspondence between these two assemblies. Now as an "open letter" written by H. C. A., addressed to certain German brethren, "sent out in all directions," and counter-signed by "two aged and highly esteemed brothers," J. B. S. and C. H. M., stated that "The accusers never brought their complaint before the local assembly in Greenwich, where the accused is responsible, nor sought to prove it to them," also "the seceders have settled the matter in their own way, and their way was to leave fellowship," it is therefore of importance to quote the actual letters between these two assemblies, which (it would appear from this) were kept from many. The following are the letters in full :—

Bexhill, 8th June, 1890.

To the saints gathered to the Name
of the Lord Jesus Christ at Greenwich.

Dear Brethren,

The letter from brothers in your assembly to brothers here has been laid before us and considered upon two evenings, and the following is our reply as an assembly here, to the assembly at Greenwich.

The question asked is, our "reasons for refusing a letter of commendation given to a brother and sister on behalf of the gathering here, and signed by a brother in whom the meeting has the fullest confidence."

The ground we take is this:—that you have in your assembly a brother, Mr. F. E. Raven, whose teaching is, we judge, derogatory to the glory and person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and contrary to Scripture.

The effect of his teaching has been to cause sorrow and contention far and wide, amongst those gathered to the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to raise questions leading to discussions concerning the person of our Lord, which are to us irreverent and profane.

Secondly, from a printed letter written by one of your brethren. Mr. Corbett, we find some of your number have separated from you in consequence of these doctrines and that your assembly is thus in a divided state.

We believe it is according to the exercise of godly care with those gathered upon the ground of the One Body, when grave charges are brought against a teacher who is sheltered and supported by the meeting with which he is connected—or where a meeting is in a divided state—to request those coming from it to sit back at other meetings, until matters are investigated or settled.

We have thus acted, and deeply regret, beloved brethren, the necessity for it.

If you ask for proof of the unsoundness of Mr. Raven's teaching we refer you to his own printed letters of 6th December, 1889, and

March 21st, 1890; also the protests and refutations of it, in tracts written by well-known brethren amongst us, viz. McCarthy, Humphrey, Lowe, the late Chas. Stanley, Maynard and others.

Signed on behalf of the saints gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ at Bexhill,

We remain, dear brethren,

Yours faithfully in Christ,

ALBERT WHICKHAM, ROBERT KENT, HENRY JECKELL.

Greenwich, 23rd June, 1890.

Dear Brethren,

The communication from the Saints gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ at Bexhill to the Saints gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ at Greenwich, dated 8th June, 1890, has been read before the Assembly here, and the following is the reply of the Assembly.

We observe that you do not furnish the reasons which were asked for, in the letter of 30th May last, for refusing a letter of commendation given to a brother and sister on behalf of the gathering here, but that you inform us of the "ground you take."

Any subsequent consideration of the matter is not a justification of a step previously taken.

The question of the teaching of any particular brother is scarcely a matter to be discussed between Assemblies, and we are surprised at your reference to the various pamphlets which have been abroad, and which are hardly of a character to be endorsed by an Assembly.

The pleas put forward in justification of your action, *however right they may be in principle*, are inadmissible in the present case.

The first supposes "grave charges" being brought against a teacher who is sheltered and supported by the meeting with which he is connected.

In answer to this we have to say that no charge against our brother, Mr. R. has been preferred before the Assembly here by any person whatever, within, or without the meeting. The case supposed of a teacher under grave charges falls therefore to the ground.

The second plea supposes the meeting in a divided state. The only ground on which you could have assumed this as regards Greenwich is an unsupported statement by one person who avowedly left the meeting in a disorderly way, and whose letter does not bear the semblance of truth.

Though we are not disposed to question the right of a meeting to protect itself from fellowship with another meeting where evil is deliberately sheltered, still we do not consider that such a course should be adopted except in the presence of distinct and unquestionable evidence.

In the present case no such evidence was before you and therefore we consider your course unjustifiable and a grave breach of fellowship.

Yours faithfully in the Lord,

GEO. BROOMHEAD, G. CHESTERFIELD

(Signed on behalf of the Assembly at Greenwich)

To the Assembly at Bexhill.

Bexhill, June 29th, 1890.

To the Saints meeting at Thornton House,
South Street, Greenwich, Kent.

Dear Brethren,

The consideration of your letter of the 23rd inst., is a source of unfeigned grief of spirit to us: where is the simplicity which is in Christ, and godly transparency, which would surely be apparent in your letter were you really before God in your consciences at the

present time as to all this solemn and grievous matter? We say it with grief, we fail to trace any guidance or expression in your letter to us, of the Spirit of Christ, or desire to clear yourselves.

You carefully avoid answering the question that is really at issue between us, viz:—your identification with Mr. Raven and his teaching and seek to escape by raising quibbles that are unworthy the consideration, much less the practice, of saints, and would scarcely be admissible in a court of law, or amongst men of the world.

We have given our reasons clearly and simply in the fear of the Lord, why we refused your letter of commendation: it was your identification with Mr. Raven and his teachings; this you have never attempted to deny.

The principles that come out in your letter are those of Bethesda, which we repudiate, and are not those of holiness and truth, or agreeable to the unity of the Body of Christ, and are practically a denial of our corporate responsibility.

From the tenor of your letter we gather that you are determined to identify yourselves with Mr. F. E. Raven and his teachings.

Our earnest prayer is that our gracious God and Father may work in consciences and hearts for the deliverance of many amongst you from these Christ-dishonouring and defiling doctrines.

It is with the deepest sorrow and with a sense of the solemnity of our act that we feel before the Lord our responsibility to clear ourselves from association with manifest evil, in refusing any further fellowship with you, and in rejecting you as an Assembly.

Signed on behalf of the Assembly at Bexhill,
gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ,

HENRY JECKELL, ALBERT WHICKHAM,
ROBERT KENT.

(Taken from "A RECORD OF SOME CORRESPONDENCE WITH DOCUMENTS AND FACTS, 1888-91.")

The honest reader of the foregoing should have no difficulty in seeing that the term "seceder" had no application whatsoever to Bexhill or to those who owned their disciplinary action. The assembly at Bexhill and those in fellowship with them remained on the same ground as before—the *ground of separation from evil*, taken by brethren at the first. Where then was the change? Surely with those who had embraced the doctrines of this false teacher, forming a party around them, and thereby departing from the ground of the truth, occupied formerly.

The division soon spread to other lands and became a *test* for all—probably the greatest test for brethren, apart from the division of 1848 (resulting in the formation of "Open" brethren). Before referring briefly to the subsequent history of "Raven" brethren and their teachings, it is of interest to see how these matters were treated by brethren abroad. The following documents, drawn up at the time, throw some little light on this:—

THE DECLARATION OF THE CONTINENTAL BRETHREN.

Elberfeld, November, 1890.

A large number of the brothers engaged in the Lord's work in Germany, Holland, German-Switzerland, and Belgium, were assembled on the 1st November in Elberfeld, in order to take counsel together as to the attitude which they ought to assume with regard to the most deplorable division which has again arisen among the brethren in England.

They declare as follows:—

With deep pain and humiliation before the Lord they have for a lengthened period followed the sad occurrences amongst the brethren in England.

They express their sincere regret that on both sides many sharp words have been used, many an unjustifiable charge has been raised, and hasty and even wrong actions have taken place.

They have however, arrived at this unanimous judgment:—

(1) That the cause of these sad occurrences and divisions is to be found in Mr. Raven's teachings, which, in spite of repeated exhortations, he holds to, and which are in greater or lesser degree contrary to Scripture, lead souls astray, and are dishonouring to the blessed Person of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(2) That under the providence of God the assembly at Bexhill was led to take action in this painful matter.

(3) That, in order to keep the Unity of the Spirit, the decision of the said assembly of June 29th this year—to refuse all further fellowship with the assembly at Greenwich because they will not judge the evil in their midst—is decidedly to be recognised.

In the name of the brothers present,

(Signed by C. Brockhaus, Phil. Thielmann,
H. C. Voorhoeve, and five others.)

THE DES MOINES JUDGMENT (U.S.A.)

Des Moines, Iowa, December, 1890.

To the Saints gathered to the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ.
Beloved Brethren,

At a full meeting of the Saints gathered to the Name of the Lord Jesus in this place on the evening of the 21st inst., after 2½ hours waiting on the Lord, and quiet looking into the teaching of F. E. Raven, and the Bexhill-Greenwich correspondence, the following results were reached:

(1) A united and unanimous owning of the authority of the Lord in the action of the assembly of God at Bexhill in refusing fellowship to the assembly at Greenwich. We believe the assembly at Bexhill was not only *competent*, but under the circumstances, *bound*, in faithfulness to the Lord, to judge as to the status of the assembly at Greenwich, having received therefrom a letter of commendation at a time when it was allowing in its midst teaching derogatory to the Person and Glory of the Lord Jesus. The presence and power of the Lord Jesus give *competency*, and the character of His Name, to which we are gathered, the *obligation*. (Matt. 18:20, 1 Cor. 5:4, 2 Tim. 2:19.)

(2) While acknowledging our general low state, on account of which we had incurred the Lord's displeasure, and on account of which we feel deeply humbled before Him, it was recognised that the teaching of F. E. Raven was the immediate cause leading to the sorrowful division which has taken place, and which we deeply deplore. This teaching was the voice of the stranger which scattered the sheep. It is not necessary that the sheep should know the *meaning* of this strange voice in order to flee from it; it is only necessary that they should know it is not the voice of the Good Shepherd. The sheep know the Shepherd's voice, not the voice of a stranger. Even the babes in Christ "have an unction from the Holy One," which "is truth and is no lie," by which they "know all things," and are thus protected against every "lie." They know the truth, "and that no lie is of the truth." (John 10:4, 5; 1 John 2:20, 27.) *The Holy Ghost never said that "eternal life" "was ever an integral part of the Person of the Eternal Son"; nor does He define it as a "sphere," or "order of blessing," or "a condition,"*

or "the purpose of God," or "a new man," and such like things. Even though there be a *measure* of truth in some of these things, it is not *the* truth. Nor does the Holy Ghost ever present to us an analysis of the person of our blessed Lord, in order to show to us that some "part" of His Person is eternal life. And so the believer who heeds "the anointing" he has received turns away from all such teaching as being "a lie" and not "the truth." The Holy Ghost sets before us Christ as "the life," "our life," "the eternal life which was with the Father," the One in whom we have life, "the true God and Eternal life," (John 14:6; Col. 3:4; 1 John 1:2; 5:20.) and ever takes the attitude of glorifying Christ, filling the saints with holy reverence for His Name, and rebuking the unholy curiosity that would intrude into the mystery of His person, or the profane hand that would touch it. (John 16:14; 1 Sam. 6:19; 2 Sam. 6:6, 7.) We are beloved brethren, yours affectionately in the Lord, on behalf of the assembly.
(Signed by Wm. G. Patterson, A. H. Rule, J. C. Quiner, and four others.)

Most, if not all of the brethren who took part in this sore controversy have long since passed from the scene of conflict, and other generations have taken their place. Time, however, does not heal in these matters, but rather the breach becomes wider. The assembly decisions of 60 years ago *remain the same today*; there is no change. The way of recovery is open for the individuals who are prepared to return first to the point of departure—but how few are ready to do this! On the other hand how many have later discovered the false character of these teachings, have gone so far on the path of recovery, and then stopped short. Another 'independent table' has been set up, and the enemy's purpose thus served in adding still further to the confusion already existing.

Before closing this subject the reader's attention is drawn to one more quotation, this time from a printed letter—written to a beloved brother who was truly "unknown, yet well known." Those who have had any experience of souls under the power of doctrinal evil will know the truth of these words:—

"There is no dependence to be placed on any statement where false doctrine is held—its working is stamped by the character of Satan, from whom it really proceeds. When the doctrine is exposed, the first effort is always to deny that it is held, and the excuse of misrepresentation is eagerly clutched at. When shown to have been stated and *maintained*, it is explained away and covered up with statements of truth; then it is gradually adopted, and finally gloried in; and at length this is accompanied with contempt for those who do not hold it With spiritual delusion, the person under the power of evil is unconscious of it, and becomes unable to detect the difference between truth and falsehood

As to Mr. R. himself, I am not conscious of any feeling but that of deepest sorrow But I believe him to be thoroughly deceived; the Lord knows who may have been instrumental in landing him where he now is, and who may be more guilty than he in the sight of God.

Into these things it is not our province to enter. There is One who judges, and will judge. Our duty is to see that hidden evil is duly and faithfully exposed, in order that we may keep clear of it, and in true brokenness and self-judgment, learn the lessons that the Lord would teach us through all this sorrow."

(W.J.L., June 1891.)

“LONDON” and “GLANTON” SECTIONS

The (so-called) “Raven” brethren divided again in 1908 over the Glanton-Alnwick ecclesiastical dispute. There was nothing doctrinal in this dispute. From that time and on they have become more widely known as “London” and “Glanton” brethren. The extreme Raven brethren, or the followers of J.T., C.A.C., and others, are to be found today with the “London” party. Such well known brothers as W.T.P.W., J.A.T., and others, whose teachings did not really co-incide with that unholy school of doctrine, sided with the “Glanton” party.

The “Glanton” brethren—with all the respect that is due to them—have in the main acted similarly to “Bethesda,” i.e. they have treated the *evil* of F.E.R.’s teachings with *indifference*. It is true there are some amongst them who are opposed to these teachings, but on the other hand there are those in their ranks who tenaciously hold to them; the remainder manifest a total indifference. The following brief quotations from three of their best known teachers in recent years show how “Ravenism” has been both imbibed and openly taught amongst them—the fruit of their direct association with it from 1890. to 1908. Other quotations could be given, but these are sufficient to show how the leaven has worked.

“That the Son was the Spirit of His own body I have not the slightest question.”

“The Person was Divine—the Son unchanging and unchangeable as to His Person . . . Though in Person ever the Son, yet He *personally* entered into Manhood.”

“When F.E.R. said the Lord was ‘the same Person unchanged and unchangeable’ I think Scripture would support this.”

The hymn book used by the “Glanton” brethren is the one revised by T.H.R. in 1903. In the preface to the “Little Flock” hymn book revised by J.N.D. in 1881, one of the things he considered needful was “a basis of truth and sound doctrine.” But the editor in 1903 left out, amongst others, hymn No. 61—the only one of its kind in the book. The reason for doing so was obvious. It did not co-incide with their new doctrine: they could sing the first two verses no longer.

“How wondrous the glories that meet
In Jesus, and from His face shine,
His love is eternal and sweet,
'Tis human, 'tis also divine!

“His glory—not only God’s Son—
In manhood He had His full part—
And the union of both joined in one
Form the fountain of love in His heart.”

The 3rd verse of Hymn No. 216 (J. G. Deck) was completely altered. Why? Undoubtedly for doctrinal reasons. Those who could ask such a question as “Did God die?” could never sing—“Where *God’s own Son was crucified*, And for our sins a ransom died.” Another noticeable omission was the whole of Hymn No. 215 “O solemn hour, O hour alone.” (J. G. Deck). When we consider the truth contained in the 1st verse there is no difficulty

in seeing why the hymn was omitted. Hymns 79 and 80 App. (A. P. Cecil) and others, often sung, were completely left out for the same reason.

But the (so called) "London" brethren have surpassed all others in going astray from the truth and from the "old paths." (Jer. 6 : 16.) It would be difficult to speak even a little about the many volumes of their teachings—truth, mysticism and error combined—which they have printed and circulated during the past half a century. More than 18 years ago they claimed to have received "fresh light," and in 1932 the hymn book in use amongst them was revised to co-incide with what they now shamelessly hold and teach. It is not necessary to give quotations from their writings, because it is already a well known fact that they now believe (whatever they believed before) that the Son of God *became* the Son when He was born into this world. In other words they deny the *eternal* Sonship of the Lord Jesus, though they are careful to state that they still hold to His deity, or His place in the Godhead, in the past eternity. They can no longer sing "Son of God, Thy Father's bosom, Ever was Thy dwelling place" (J. G. Deck) nor can they sing "Thou art the everlasting Word, The Father's only Son." (J. Conder.) They have obliterated all mention of the "eternal Son" from their hymn book.

The denial commenced by saying that the name, or title, "eternal Son," is not found in Scripture, though Scripture speaks of the "eternal God" and the "eternal Spirit." Later it was stated to be unscriptural to hold that He was the Son from all eternity, but it is correct to hold that "dwelling in the bosom of the Father" commences with His advent into this world. (Note the "*pretension* to precision.") How strange that those who are so meticulous as to an expression being "scriptural" should use another so frequently, namely "Divine Persons," which is also not found in the text of Scripture. Their profuse use of "Divine Persons" savours of irreverence to those who are accustomed to reading the Written Word, and the sound writings of the early brethren. But such expressions as deity, eternal-sonship, incarnation, humanity, etc., though not found in Scripture are nevertheless words which are used to express the truth.

Now do the Scriptures give any foundation for believing that the Lord Jesus was the Son of God eternally? Without question they do. This truth is written right across the pages of the New Testament. A few passages will suffice to show it.

Firstly, if the Father *sent* the Son, then He was the Son before He *came*. This is plain to honest souls, but not to those who wrest the Scriptures to their own undoing. "God has *sent* His only begotten Son *into the world*, that we might live through Him." (1 John, 4:9. N.T.). "The Father has *sent* the Son to be the Saviour of the world." (1 John, 4:14). "And we know that the Son of God *has come*." (1 John, 5:20).

Secondly, if the Father was there before time then the Son was there also. To deny one is to deny the other. (1 John, 2:23). "As the *living Father* has sent me, and I live by the Father." (John 6:57). "I came forth *from the Father*, and am come *into the world*: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." (John 16:28). "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had *with Thee* before the world was." (John 17:5). "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me may be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: *for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*" (John 17:24). But according to this school of teaching the Son Himself could have known nothing of this relationship with the Father, *and the affections which flow from this relationship*; until His birth into the world!

Thirdly, the Father's Name has been "declared" by the Son. "I have declared unto them Thy name and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." Where then is the force of the following Scriptures, spoken by the One "who came down from heaven" to speak of heavenly things, if all that He knew of "the Father" had been learnt during His brief years on earth? "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." "I speak that which I have seen with my Father." "All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." (John ch's. 8 & 16.) Furthermore, the disciples themselves (according to this teaching) must have known the joy of this relationship with the Father at *almost* the same time as the Son of God! At least this is what we are now asked to read into such Scriptures as the following—"Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." (Matt. 11:27.) "But go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father; and to my God, and your God." (John 20:17.) The thought is preposterous. The force of John 1:18—"The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him"—is not merely that He *was* in the bosom of the Father *before time*, but it is written of Him even after He "became flesh"—"who is in the bosom of the Father." In John 3:13 it is also written "even the Son of man who is in heaven." In thought and affection He was ever there. He *ever* enjoyed that sweet, intimate relationship with the Father, both when in heaven and when on earth—it was His own peculiar glory—and when He became flesh, wondrous fact—"We *beheld* His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father—full of grace and truth." (John 1:14.)

Fourthly, the creation of all things is attributed to the Son of God. In Col 1 it is the "Son of His love" by whom all things were created, that are in heaven and that are in earth. In Heb 1 God has spoken in these last days "in the person of *the Son*, whom He has established heir of all things, *by whom also He made*

the worlds." J.N.D.'s "Synopsis" Vol. 5 states: "But *the Son* is also the name of the proper relationship of His glorious Person to the Father *before the world was*. It is in this character that He created all things." (p. 15). "He was *from eternity* the Son of the Father." (p. 243).

When He was born into this world He was still the Son of God. "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee." Nowhere in Scripture does it say He *became* the Son, but the testimony of the written Word is that He "became flesh." It was said of the child given, "That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." (Luke 1:35.) In Psalm 2:7 etc.—"Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee"—the "begotten" refers to His humanity, and the declaration "Thou art my Son" to His divinity. (Through His miraculous birth, and the union of both in One, He was both Son of God and Son of man.) Is it possible for brethren to believe that "begotten" here refers to the divine side? If so, just think of what such a thought involves—He "began to be" at that moment! But they will say, yes, as the Son, but not as a Divine Person! And yet this school of teaching (under F.E.R.) stressed that He was eternally the Son "unchanged and unchangeable" as to His Person, but now, when it suits their purpose, this formula is laid aside, and they substitute for it, that He was a "Divine Person" who became "the Son" (a change surely) and at that very moment He entered into "human condition." Is it possible for brethren to go much deeper into blasphemy and error?

It is an amazing spectacle—after J.N.D. laboured during the whole of his long life of service to the Lord to present the truth in all its completeness—that a company of brethren, who make the highest claims as to being associated with him, should have wandered so very far from the truth in such a short space of time. But it is nevertheless true. Mr. Darby seems to have anticipated this when he wrote the following. Let the reader take special note.

"It is far more difficult to *preserve* blessing when it is brought in, than to testify of it at the first. So we find in Jude the exhortation given, to earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints . . . Far happier to say 'Believe the Spirit'; but because of error, it had to be said, 'Believe *not* . . . Try the spirits, whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world.' . . . False prophets (or false spirits) are gone out into the world, holy kind of men it may be in their way, but false prophets, who attack true and simple souls, with great apparent power, *a mingling of much truth* . . . The Lord may allow intellect to work . . . There is no power in the truth to preserve, but the question is, whether the soul holds fast the truth . . . The only ground of victory is the power of the Spirit of God in the affections and consciences of the saints, and then the heart will be set on Christ, and the things of Christ, to love Him, enjoy Him, and serve Him better . . . Man . . . does not like the trials and tribulations which arise . . . and then error is found the easier thing, and there must come a falling away, and so it will be but a little flock . . . What we all have to seek, is to be occupied with Christ every day, knowing more of delighting and feeding on Him, as

the True God, and as the perfect Man, subject in all things to His Father . . . Then, everything that is not of Him, strikes on my soul. *It is that Christ who is touched*, and it affects the whole harmony of the soul. Be sure of this, if it is not the living power of a living Christ, known and enjoyed in the soul, you cannot withstand error . . .

Where there is a work of the enemy even saints always fall into it if they do not treat it as such. It has power over the human heart, and where there is not in the soul the power of the Spirit to judge it as the positive mischief of the enemy (and so it will be judged where that power is) there the soul will fall into it, AS IF IT WERE MORE PERFECT TRUTH THAN WHAT THE SPIRIT TEACHES. See the early Judaizing of the Church, traced and *detected* in the Ep's of Gal. and Col., and elsewhere. And see in the Galatian Churches how the saints fell into it; see the same thing in popery.

And here I would explain a little further. It does not follow by any means that there are no truths held by those who fall into such a snare, MANY IMPORTANT TRUTHS MAY BE HELD BY THEM . . . But there is a further point which it is right to notice. Truly godly people may be the instruments of helping on a system which is truly Satan's . . . I call it a work of Satan, when, blessing and testimony having been brought in by the blessed Spirit of God, a systematic effort is made producing a REGULAR SYSTEM: an effort which takes up the truth whose power has decayed as to faith really . . . or some neglected truth (generally), and while it seems to adopt it as it stands in its basis, as a fact subverts it and sets it aside; throwing the soul back on ground which is no longer a test of faith . . . and bringing in apparent *additional* instruction, but REALLY SUBVERSIVE of the power of what the Spirit taught . . . The system which so judges is alleged to maintain the unity of the Church . . . The zeal and activity will be for the SYSTEM . . . It will be to make proselytes and establish them in what will keep them there . . . Connected with this is the pressing much certain doctrines, when it is safe, which form the bond of the institution, and denying them in the alleged meaning, or, *explaining them away*, when they are pressed upon them by those who detect the evil. This, anyone conversant with the subject cannot but have noticed . . . It may be, and is, denied (if detected) after being taught; all the subtlety and craft of Satan may be in play, and is, to disseminate, and at the same time to conceal it. IT IS THE CHARACTER OF HERESY TO BE BROUGHT IN PRIVILY." ('Words for the Times' J.N.D.)

The doctrines of the Raven school have only been briefly touched upon in these pages. It would take a vast amount of time to expose in detail all their erroneous teachings—a most profitless and soul-withering task. Sufficient however has been brought before the reader to show the falsity of their statements, in regard to the Person of Christ in particular. Where souls have been steeped in these doctrines and then later freed from them in a measure, the process of *unlearning* all the wrong thoughts imbibed is indeed a long one. Unless they have *thoroughly* judged the whole system there is real danger in receiving them into fellowship where the truth is known, as the tendency is for them to bring both the spirit and wrong thoughts of Ravenism with them. Where there is honesty and a readiness to own the truth however it is different.

In closing, it should be remarked that these pages are not concerned with the godliness or gift of any individuals amongst the

Raven group, either past or present, but to trace something of the progress of their *decline*, or departure from the truth, marked by two distinct denials, (1) the denial of the true manhood of the Lord Jesus, (2) the denial of His divine glory as the eternal Son. In both cases their hymn book was revised to co-incide with their evil doctrine. We know of course that these false thoughts have not really emanated from brethren, but from Satan himself, the author of lies. But it is brethren alas! that have been ensnared by them, and have spread them abroad. May it lead those who have been graciously preserved from such errors to value the precious truth more deeply, in all its simplicity—knowing that there is *nothing* better—and so may they continue in separation from evil, growing by the true knowledge of God, until the blest moment of the coming of Christ for all His own!

Son of God ! Thy Father's bosom
 Ever was Thy dwelling-place;
 His delight, in Him rejoicing,
 One with Him in power and grace :
 O what wondrous love and mercy !
 Thou didst lay Thy glory by,
 And for us didst come from heaven
 As the Lamb of God to die.

O solemn hour ! O hour alone
 In solitary might,
 When God the Father's only Son,
 As man, for sinners to atone,
 Expires—amazing sight !
 The Lord of glory crucified !
 The Lord of life has bled and died !

Thou art the everlasting Word,
 The Father's only Son;
 God manifest, God seen and heard,
 The heaven's beloved One;
 Worthy, O Lamb of God, art Thou
 That every knee to Thee should bow.

The following books and tracts more fully unfold
the truths and principles contended for in this
booklet:—

Paul's Doctrine and other papers. F.G.P.

The First Years of Christianity. C.S.

There is One Body and One Spirit. F.G.P.

A few thoughts on the Church. A.H.R.

Privilege and failure under it. A.B.P.

Present Truth for Christians. H.E.H.

Christian Truth. Vols. 1, 2 & 3.

Principles or Compromise. F.L.

Remarks as to discerning and approving the
things that are more excellent. A.B.P.

All the above may be obtained from the
Publishers shown on the front cover.

“**R**AVENISM never got the foothold in Canada or in the U.S. that it gained in England, but these papers might help some to see the error. However, I have noticed that those who came from the Raven meetings and identified themselves with us were so full of these vagaries of the mind, that they were tainted by them. It appeals to the intellect, and nothing touches our pride, and feeds it so much as intellectualism. We do like to be thought of as “brilliant of mind”, May we be kept at all times—subject to Scripture. We need much to remember that our minds are to be subject. Can the finite mind of man grasp the infinite? Job. 37. One has only to read their ministry to see it is: ‘Intellectual mysticism’.”

H.E.H., Ottawa.

January 3rd, 1951.

This booklet may also be obtained from:—

LONDON:

C. A. MIZEN

2 Wilton Rd., Colliers Wood, S.W. 19.

FRANCE:

S. BREUIL

47 Rue Saint Christophe, Limoges.

FAR EAST:

CHRISTIAN BOOK ROOM

39 Stamford Road, Singapore 6.
