

Additional Writings of J. N. Darby

Volume 4

PTP

Present Truth Publishers

274 East Veterans Hwy
Jackson NJ 08527 USA

Made and Printed
in the U.S.A.
2018

Website: [**presenttruthpublishers.com**](http://presenttruthpublishers.com)

Table of Contents

Preface	ix
Letters and Documents from the Sibthorpe Collection	1
Letters without dates.	202
Letters connected with New Zealand	236
Letters from Edw. L. Bevir: 3 Jan 1873 to 21 Aug 1878 ...	246
Poem by Edw. L. Bevir (3 Mar 1880)	266
Notes Written by William Joseph Lowe (1840-1927) about early days of the Brethren movement in Switzerland and France ..	269
Subject Index	205

Preface

Additional Writings of J. N. Darby, vol. 4, is an added volume to the *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* and is composed of letters and documents found in the so-called Sibthorpe Collection.

The title of this volume was chosen in order not to conflict with the volume numbering used in the Darby Disk, which uses volume numbers 35 and 36 for a collection of papers found in two books that had been printed by Bible Truth Publishers. The papers in those books appeared in *Additional Writings of J.N. Darby, vol. 3*, as well as other papers.

The Sibthorpe Collection:

The Sibthorpe Collection appears to be the correspondence file of J. N. Darby. It contains handwritten copies of letters that he wrote as well as many original handwritten letters that he received. Over a long and active life, there were surely other letters that he wrote and that he received that were not preserved in this file. A three volume collection of his letters has been available in print for many years. Perhaps, some of these were kept by him because he thought them important in some way. Perhaps, some were not discarded only because they were not important enough to spend time on.

R. A. Huebner wrote:

The papers of J. N. Darby comprising what is called *The Sibthorpe Collection* were committed to W. M. Sibthorpe (of Tunbridge Wells, England). Henry Sibthorpe had inherited the papers, and committed them to a publisher in Holland. From there the papers were sent to the Christian Brethren Archive (CBA) of the John Rylands University Library, Manchester, England, in 2002, where they are at present. Through a former archivist at this library, Dr. David Brady, Present Truth

Publishers obtained a Xerox copy of a Xerox copy held by the CBA which was made years ago. Copies of some of the documents, however, were missing, and not all that were received were numbered. This has introduced some confusion in numbering the documents. No correlation with the original documents has been prepared for this publication. Recently, the present archivist of the CBA, Dr. Graham Johnson, has kindly supplied missing documents for inclusion. Nonetheless, some errors remain in the numbering.

Not all of the originals are readable, however, and the copies are of very mixed quality.

R. A. Huebner March 5, 2005

The Sibthorpe Collection has been given a CBA number of 5540 with a second number for each document in the Collection. The second CBA number is indicated for each item where possible: for example, CBA 535b means the second document in CBA item 5540-535. Not all the contents of the Sibthorpe Collection is published here: illegible documents, letters not in English, and some others were omitted.

Some spelling has been modernized, some Scripture references have been added in braces { }, and Scripture references have been standardized in order to facilitate indexing. Some additions by a copyist have been similarly placed in braces.

The reader should keep in mind that these papers were not edited and corrected by J. N. Darby for this publication. They may, therefore, contain errors of copying etc. Illegible portions or other gaps are indicated by an ellipsis like this: “. . .” Occasionally a conjectural but plausible insertion has been made where the writing is nearly illegible or defective but always in braces { }. Most errors of copying that involve errors of spelling or grammar are not corrected, some of these may be those of the present editor.

The letters and other documents are printed here in order of

their dates, for those items bearing dates, followed by undated items and some other items. So many letters were undated that dates added by a second handwriting were used when found and an attempt was made to indicate roughly the times when some were written by examining the contents of some of these letters. These estimates are always given in the following manner: “{Date: mid 1879?}”. No intention of indicating any particular date, or any particular order of letters is intended by these estimates. Unless otherwise known, we assume unsigned letters to be by JND.

The index lists a letter that may have been an encouragement to him. And there is his letter of sympathy to the wife of BWN. The passing of much more than a century means, in my opinion, that reasons for not publishing any of these letters are no longer relevant when compared with the historical value that they present. Readers are invited to look for wisdom, faithfulness and grace in the letters of JND here published for the first time in this form.

D. P. Ryan

Editor

Letters and Documents from the Sibthorpe Collection

CBA 187 {Est. Date 9 April before 1827.}

{To} Revd. John N. Darby, Temple cing

Delganny, April 9

My dear John Darby,

I hope to have a glimpse of you tomorrow on my way to Dublin, but lest I should be prevented or should forget what I wish to say, I write to give you a little service which I know you will gladly undertake.

There are two persons at Windgates, Sheridan and his wife, who have expressed themselves desirous to conform. I have only seen Sheridan once myself upon the subject. Mr. Ball, however, has seen him and I have begged Manning to pay every attention to him in his power. But you would greatly oblige me by having man and wife together, would it be too much to say, every day during the present week. I know not whether they would be prepared to make a public profession next Sunday. But what makes me feel the more anxious to have the benefit of your instruction for them is that I cannot but feel that the change which they are contemplating affords a choice opportunity for presenting Christianity to them in all its importance and power. I will be guided by you whether or no to postpone their public profession beyond next Sunday. Did O'Brien send you . . . today. It is delightful to me to be able to hope that the first fruits of Achaia are under grace. And their enquiry on the subject of the controverted doctrines seems to have been the means of bringing them under it.

Your affectionate brother,

{Date 1827: See letter of 10 Feb 1863.}

{Calary Letter: not in Sibthorpe Collection}

Calary School House

March 28th 1829

Dr. & Rev^d. Mr. Darby,

We the Inhabitants of Calary as a testimony of our love and grateful thanks feel it our duty to pay our tribute of filial affections and heartfelt thanks to your Reverence for your manifest love towards us in the bowels of our Lord & Saviour in commending us to His grace and the patient waiting for Him. Indeed we have I trust with unutterable (sic) pleasure heard your most tender affections for us, & we whom it pleased Providence to order you once to be the Shepherd of us and amongst whom you have first sown the Seed of life to the comfort of many do most humbly implore at the throne of mercy that where you began to labour in the vineyard willing to spend and be spent in the glorious cause of establishing His Kingdom amongst us, that He may in mercy bless us and grant we may behold your face again it is unnecessary (sic) to multiply words as we only intend simply to declare our feelings which we most earnestly request our acceptance at the same time hoping your Reverence will present . . . our sincere regard may be communicated to that most valuable ornament of grace who made known to us in so plain & distinguished a manner your zeal for our eternal happiness and the consolatory admonition (sic) delivered to us from the 12 of Romans, we candidly declare that some of us could plainly read the second or great commandment of the Law in his countenance and shall now close by praying that our Lord and Saviour may bless you, and mark your zeal for his cause in Calary in the Book of Remembrance (sic) above, Malachi 3^d.

We are &c &c &c.

Ellen Fox	Samuel Fox
Jam Fox	Sutton Delamore
Margaret Fox	Anthony Sutton
Martha Luson (?)	Janet Sutton
Signed by order of	John Sutton
John Hatton	Dr. O'Brien
John Delamore	S Master

CBA 34

{Est. Date: 16 Jan 1844}

{Apparently separated from a letter, the following questions were found at the end of CBA 34. These may be the questions of A. Cosnett of Clapham Common who wrote JND on Jan 16, 1844.}

Can any of the saints who died before the day of Pentecost be said to be members of the Body of Christ? Or the Church?

What is the church of the firstborn in Heb. 12:25?

and is the general assembly mentioned in the same sentence identical?

Was there any dispensational meaning in the expression of John concerning Jesus, Luke 3:16, "Whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose?" Ruth 4:6,7,8 if not verses 9 and 10 typical?

Did not John confess his standing to be the same as Abraham's when he said he was the Friend of the Bridegroom?

What did he mean by "He must increase but I must decrease"?

Also he that speaketh of the earth is of the earth, John 5:31.
What part had John in the Blessing he states in the end of the Chapter?

How will God fulfill his promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, I mean personally? Why did the Holy ghost use the sun, moon and stars to illustrate the Glory of the resurrection? And what does the in {sic} first of Genesis 14 mean by saying they are for signs?

What are the twelve thrones of the twelve Apostles? And will Paul have a throne?

What are the many mansions in John 14?

What is the meaning of the Desolate and the married wife in Isaiah 54:1?

CBA 206 {Est. Date: long after 1845}

Dear Mrs. Newton,

My name I am sure cannot but be now painful to you though I am not unmindful of many kindnesses received, but I write having heard that Newton is very ill to assure you that however I may have felt it my duty, after long delay, in public matters to act with uncompromising opposition to his path, I have only unfeigned sympathy with you in his illness and have not one other desire but blessing for him. The position in which I stood afforded no occasion for the expression of any sentiment. It would have been misplaced, but his illness does and I gladly embrace it and I should be quite glad if the opportunity offered, without doing him any harm, that you should communicate it to

him, unchanged as these may be in my judgment as to duty. I have never ceased to mourn over him individually.

I trust the Lord's mercy may be extended to him and to you in this illness. It is my earnest desire. I have often prayed for him since I have acted so decidedly in what, I do not conceal from myself, must have been personally painful to you all.

I assure you I have no feeling but an earnest desire for his blessing in every way. I do not venture to say any more to you now, lest I should trespass on feelings instead of soothing them, but beg you to believe me unfeignedly and in the remembrance [of many obligations] and with my prayer for his blessing [and the Lord's mercy to be fully towards him].

Yours in the Lord,

J. N. D.

[I beg to be kindly remembered to Miss Treffy and Amy Jane Toulmin.]

{Words in square brackets added from a second copy in a different handwriting.}

CBA 053 {Date: 5 Nov 1851}

My beloved Brothers,

I have been longing to hear of you and am most thankful for your few lines. I hoped to have sent you a tract to request your perusal of, and so delayed answering your note till today, but I have had some interruptions which have prevented my completing it, but I hope you will have it on Friday. I do not like to occupy your time and yet you consider that you have time, but I could thank you to read what I have written. It does not satisfy my heart. the more I have thought and prayed and searched the word upon the subject, the more I see how little I have

apprehended the holiness of God, and what the Church of God really is. Indeed we are, I trust, a little learning it here. We have not yet met to break bread, we are not in a state to do it but I believe the Lord is graciously . . . many hearts and consciences and that there will be . . . and glory to His name as the result.

I do not wish to hurry others, indeed I wait for the Lord and desire to wait more upon Him whom you and . . . towards here been . . . I trust the Lord is working in the hearts of my dear boys. Their letters have comforted me, especially Samuel's who is anxious to see you.

Are you likely to remain long in town?

Yours very affectionately in Him

5th {Nov.?} 1851 J. G. Deck

CBA 057a

{Nov. 1855}

Reading, Tuesday

Most Beloved Brother,

I hasten to send you the enclosed which I received this morning from Gregg. I should advise the Crown 8vo size, and as far as I have any judgment should put Nisbet's name first, as a matter of fairness.

Yours ever affectionately,

W. H. Dorman

CBA 057b

{Date 26 Nov 1855}

L. H. Stanwich Lane

Nov. 26/55

Dear Mr. Dorman,

We are doing "Way of Truth," etc. as a royal 18mo – same size as "Principles of Truth," only with a broader margin to a smaller page, and leaded. In this way it will extend to 108 pp. which will, on good paper, make it a nice little volume, I think.

I hope to send you some slips by tomorrow's post. I have been at Nisbet's today, and had a conversation with Mr. Watson about, "Books of the Bible." He very strongly advises doing it as a crown 8vo that being the size now most in vogue. We consider Demy 12mo an old-fashioned size for a volume. I quite think the crown 8vo preferable in appearance, and it can be printed at as little cost, in proportion to the quantity of matter as the 12mo. You know the size – same as middle edit. of "A Cisin's Europe." Mr. W. does not object to our putting Nisbet etc.'s name provided it is put first on the title page. He says if the circulation is to be principally among Brethren, he should think my name and Broom's sufficient, but if a general circulation is intended, he should advise Nisbet's name. In this case you will have to judge between my ability to give the work a general circulation, and Nisbet's organization for that and Nisbet's have agents in Dublin to whom they could send the work. It would be well for me to know, as soon as convenient, if it is to be done in crown 8vo, and also the number to be printed, so that I may get the paper in order if necessary.

You are very kind in offering to start me with the 1st number of the monthly; but I am quite willing to bear the risk of a few numbers to see how it will sell. I will forward you an estimate in . . . 8vo, with conch., when I send the slips.

Yours affectionately,

J. H. Gregg

CBA 5

No. 2 {Coburg?} Place
Montpelier

Bristol
18 December 1855

To Mr. J. Darby,

Dear Sir,

As I have for some years past been very much exercised in mind respecting the division which have taken place amongst those Christians who had formerly met together in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and as you have taken a prominent part in promoting some of these divisions, I do most earnestly request, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ whose servant you profess to be, that you will have the Christian kindness to point out to me those passages of scripture which teach *any* or *all* of the following principles that are *practically carried out by you and those associated with you* in religious matters at the present time.

I have been meeting with Christians some 14 or 15 years on that one scriptural principle: "Receive ye *one another* as Christ *also received us to the Glory of God*". But here in Bristol where I have lately come I find I would not be received nor indeed several others whom I know at the breaking of bread in the meeting you occasionally attend here because we have been in fellowship with other Christians who meet in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

In order to give you as little trouble and to occupy as little of your time as possible, I enclose a few of the questions which I am most anxious to have answered from *the written word of God alone*. I just state the questions leaving a blank for you to fill up with the name of the *Book, chapter and verse* where such *principles* as are *practically carried out by you and those associated with you* are to be found *in the Scriptures*.

I shall feel exceedingly obliged and thankful if you will have the Christian kindness to return me the questions with the *scriptural references* to each as I cannot find them myself, for which purpose I enclose an envelope with my address.

I am dear sir,
Yours in the Lord Jesus,
Edward Barry

P.S.

The questions are in the enclosed envelope

CBA 6

Caerleon, Monmouthshire

June 29th, 1858

My dear Brother in the Lord,

May I ask your prayerful perusal of the enclosed MSS tract. I have no desire to agitate controversy, far from it, but I do desire to see Christians more united than they are at present.

I need not say, that I highly esteem your judgment in spiritual things, and shall be happy for you to point out to me in . . . any sentiment you judge to be contrary to the word of God.

One instinctively shrinks from propagating any new thought. Yet I cannot help thinking that an open proclamation of man's real condition of *helplessness* before God compared with the *self-existent dignity of the Son of God* may tend to open the eyes of many and turn to that which at present appears very obscure – the *glory* of His Person.

Should you make any use of the Tract or any allusion to it, I confidently confide in your secrecy of my name as I only desire your private judgment of its contents, and its general usefulness. Any remarks you may wish to make, please make by letter, addressed, {to}

E. Bennett

Caerleon

Monmouthshire

Yours in Xtian love,

E. Bennett

An Answer to the oft repeated question,

What is the *cause* of the existing division among Brethren?

Shortly after the Ascension of the Lord Jesus, the whole land was set in a state of consternation by Paul's preaching the doctrine of the Resurrection. "Some said, 'He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods' – others said 'These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.'" Others called it "*new doctrine*" and "strange things" (Acts 17). But was it really *new doctrine*? No. It could be proved from the Scriptures of the earliest ages. Paul had Moses and the Prophets to go to for proof of his so-called new doctrine. Why then did they not receive it? They were blinded by *Tradition*, of which we are all to this hour more or less the subjects (Mark 7:7,13). But did Paul keep back the truth of God because he stood *almost alone*, and because the great mass of the people were against him? – did he reason with himself, "they will never receive this doctrine, and I must give it up?" No, reader, he reasoned with them *out of the Scriptures*, and showed them that although *tradition* had for a long time blinded them to the truth yet, if they would "search the scriptures" (as we find many did daily to see if these things were so) they would find that the doctrine he preached was no "*new doctrine*" but one held and acknowledged by Patriarchs and Prophets (Heb. 11:19). Still a strong current was against him and his supposed new doctrine subjected him to scourging, to imprisonment, and placed his life in danger. Yet he held not his peace, his ardent desire being the *blessing of his Kinsmen* and the *glory of God*. When brought before Agrippa, he said, "I think myself happy King Agrippa, etc. . . . wherefore I beseech thee to *hear me patiently*." Now, dear Reader, allow me to adopt the same language – allow me to ask you *patiently* and *prayerfully* to read the following pages and if tradition {learned?} have hitherto obscured the truth from your view, do

not throw down the enquiry in haste, and pronounce it heresy, but like the Bereans, search the Word to see if these things are so.

Should you find some statements that have been previously obscurely handled, don't let former prejudices operate in your perusal of this. Has it not always been so? Has not the obscure way in which "the personal reign of Jesus . . . led many to give up the truth as a delusion? Yet I ask has that obscurity made void the truth itself? Certainly not. The truth as recorded in the word of God stands the same. Although through man's having affixed dates and times for His appearance, many have been led to cleave more closely than ever to the traditions of the fathers, and have . . . cried, "Where is the promise of His coming?" Let me then ask you to lay aside all past prejudices and examine all by the unerring word of truth and may the sword of the Spirit sever tradition from us, however strong its former hold of us might have been.

Some years ago, the writer accidentally came across the wrapper of an old work entitled "The Life of Christ", worded as follows, "The Life of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, shewing how he took upon him our sinful nature." Now, we cannot think the author held the idea that Christ was in any way tainted with sin, but when criticism was in its infancy and light less clear than it now is, such modes of expression were allowed to pass unnoticed. Since that day, the highly esteemed Doddridge published a Book of Hymns in which repeated reference to the *mortal* body of Christ. . . . the thought that Doddridge held as a doctrine that corruption was attached to Him. At a still later period our much-loved Brother Deck penned that beautiful hymn:

"Lord Jesus, are we one with Thee"

in which occurs:

“Our mortal blood and flesh partook”

but would he for worlds have detracted from the honor of his Lord? How happily was that hymn sung by thousands of living souls, before *advanced light* detected the error. Well then, happy as we may feel in the discovery of such error, and in putting it from us, should we not be equally willing to put from us anything and every appellation that would tend to obscure *His* glory and take from *Him* the “honor due unto His name”?

Let us then inquire while we shrink from applying to Jesus terms which may tend to dishonor him, whether we may not be committing an error of equal magnitude in applying to ourselves that which belongs only to Him and thereby placing ourselves in a supposed equality (power and holiness excepted) with Him which has tended to obscure His personal glory and led to all the division that exists among men in reference to His Person. . . .

We read in Phil 2:6 that Jesus thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God. Now, if He were in any respect inferior it must have been robbery, and a robbery which God the Father would never have countenanced (Matt. 3:17). Had there been the slightest inferiority, He would have been subject, instead of which *He made Himself* subject, which He could not possibly have done had He been so naturally. In what then did the equality consist? In His being *self-existent*. He had life *in Himself* (John 5:26). He was in Himself a *source of life* and although the most perfect unity exists between the persons of the Trinity, yet each is self-existent. All *other* life is *derivative*. This constituted an equality with the Father which no *created* intelligence could claim, and where inferiority or subjection is seen it is *officially* as a matter of choice and not of obligation. Hence when He appeared among me while he paid the strictest regard to the Father’s commandment (John 10:18), He asserted His power to lay down His life, and to take it again. None could possibly have taken it from Him, had he not *voluntarily* laid it down in the power then of this *inherent* life, this *immortality*, He walked this earth. Disease and death fled from His presence. If

He met it at Nain, He vanquished it and imparted *life* from Himself for He was the *Source of Life*. If He entered the house of the centurion it was to vanquish death. If the house of Martha and Mary at Bethany is filled with gloom because Lazarus is dead, He keeps away until His appointed hour because death could not exist where *He* was (John 11:21). On the cross, neither of the malefactors could die, while *He* lived. He thus vanquished death wherever he met it. All His miracles were also performed by the power of His own life. He did not invoke His Father’s aid as Prophets had done before, nor did He employ the name of another as His Apostles did. All was done with the same ease and by the same mandate as that which called creation forth in the beginning. “In *Him* was life” (John 1). His life was *inherent*, and not derivative and was absolutely at His own disposal. No one took it from Him. He had power to lay it down and power to take it again. No other has ever returned from the grave by his own power. He went into it *alone* and He came out of it alone. No disciple could go with Him then (John 13:36). “Of the people there was none with Him.” He is therefore styled “the Lord, strong and mighty”, “the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.”

But *He made Himself* of no reputation. He *took upon Him* the form of a servant and thus His perfect acquiescence in all His Father’s will. The Father had given Him a commandment, and He engaged to fulfill it. The commandment extended to the surrender of His life, and He willingly yielded it, not by constraint, but willingly. He gave Himself.”

Now, Paul, in writing to Timothy, says, “Now unto the King, Eternal, *Immortal*, Invisible, the only wise God.” and in chapter 4 “which in His times shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who *only* hath *immortality*” (inherent life).

It may be asked then, what has led to so much diversity of opinion in reference {to the} person of the Lord. I reply, *Traditions*. Tradition has assigned to the creature an immortality

which only belongs to God “who *only* hath *immortality*.” All created life is derivative, not inherent. Adam derived his life from God, and held it upon a condition. When he lost it (“In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely *die*”), he retained a state of *conscious existence* whether in the body or out of the body (like the evil spirits, of whom we read, that they are reserved in chains and darkness unto the day of judgment) which is called by God – Death! That cannot be life or immortality, as that only can be found in God. All natural life proceeds from God. “In *Him* we live and move, and have our being.” All spiritual life proceeds from Christ. “*Because* I live, ye shall live also.” Nowhere can it be shown in *Scripture* that man will possess *any immortality* before the resurrection and then only the immortality of the *body*. This corruptible shall *put on* incorruption and this mortal immortality. We can no more read of “immortal souls” than we can of “glorified spirits”. “*Search and see.*”

We are taught by patient continuance in well doing to *seek* for glory, honor, *immortality*. Would the Lord tell us to *seek* for that we already possess? Again “this mortal shall *put on* immortality.” Can we put on that which we already possess? Our bodies will be fashioned like unto His glorious body, but our souls will ever derive their life from the fountain of Life (see 1 John 5:12). And this is the word that God hath given unto us *eternal life* and this life is *in His Son* (John 3:36).

Now *Tradition* had assigned to man a like immortality with the Son of God and thus raised him to an equality (power and holiness excepted) and this has both obscured the disparity that exists between the two and set men comparing themselves with the Lord Jesus, as they have with each other. Now, strip man of this *assumed* immortality, and you at once show the *amazing disparity* there exists between him and the Lord Jesus – give him his true place as “a guilty, weak, and *helpless* worm” and you give unto the Lord the glory due unto His name.” But when you allow the Lord to say, “Thou thoughtest that I was altogether

such an one as thyself”, you allow man to exercise a diversity of opinion as to the amount of difference that exists between the Lord and themselves. To some he appears the *man* Christ Jesus, to others a *Prophet*, but to the rightly taught soul, He is the eternal *Son of God*, who *only* hath *immortality*, the Source of life.

As long as we allow Tradition thus to blind our minds, so long will discussion and confusion abound, but let the *whole* truth of God be preached and it will soon be found that these differences which are now so painfully separating Brethren will vanish.

If it be argued that by the term immortal we only mean that which *will not cease to exist* and not that which calls what *God* calls “life,” then I say “can it be any more right to apply that term to man which alone belongs to God, than it is to apply the term *mortal* to Jesus, because He did die?”

If it be a mere question of words, let it die, it is a strife about words to no profit, but if it be a question of *vital importance*, see to it that we do not darken the real truth by allowing in ourselves what we condemn in others.

The Lord give us grace to examine the subject in the light of His holiness and with a zealous regard for His honor and glory.

See 2 Kings 5:2,3 and 1 Cor. 1: 27,28,29.

P.S. A long list of quotations from Scripture may be given if time would permit.

“He that hath the Son, hath *life* and he that hath not the Son *hath not life*, but the wrath of God (*death*, whether in the body or out of the body, and not immortality) abideth on him.”

2 Chadwell St.

Dear Brother in the Lord,

I shall esteem it a very great favor and 'twill really be a great help to me, if you will oblige me with a few thoughts in writing on the subject of marriage, in system and out, for I sadly fear, there is a lack of intelligence, on my part, in failing to convey what I so earnestly desire; Mrs. Chinnell writes me thus: You must (you know) convince my Judgment. The thought crossed my mind that a few printed remarks from your pen would help me very much, with the Lord's blessing.

I remain, Dear Brother,

Yours in Jesus,

C. Brinkman

{to} Mr. Darby

CBA 15

{Date: 6 June 1860}

7 Lime Street City

6/6/60

Dear Sir,

I could not do otherwise than to object "and to deny on most strong terms," that I have been put away at all ---

1st I have not been visited.

2nd no assembly have been formed,

3 I should have lied in owing to it "on two vital principles

1st the oneness of the body of Christ

2nd the presence and sovereign rule of the holy ghost in the midst of the body, as its Lord's viceregent

Now if you had written thus to me, Dear Sir, and said, "Dear Brinkman, I can't say any thing against you whatever, much less

to seek to defame your name, and be a party to put you out – for I well remember my own bad acts at Plymouth and of the schism I committed there and I well remember of the schism I have committed against Bethesda, and I well remember of the schism of Commercial Road, and I well remember the cruel letters to that beloved Servant of Christ Mr. Hutchinson, whereby I hurried him to the grave, and broke his heart through my unkindness and I well remember what I have done and am doing against Mr. Stewart, that I have sat at London Bridge Meeting and heard the tongue of the slanderer liar and that too without witnesses, thus breaking the word of God, and I well remember that this said one hath cut off 34 of the Redeemed of the Lord, and that I am now endeavoring to put all out that are cleaving to the Lord and I well remember all my bad acts, and hard speeches against others and how can I say one word against you poor Brinkman." Now a letter similar to this would have overcome me completely, and I could not contain myself with emotion --- I was compelled to eat the feast of the Lord last Lord's day morning with bitter herbs, and the wine mingled with gall and I partook thereof in hast, the Lord will pass through before this year is out --- and I shall with all humility contend for my rights and privileges as a member --- My protest lieth on the table. I am now free --- if even the Lord leads me to minister at the table --- my protest contains two vital principles --- and if needs be I'll seal them with my blood ---

I have a copy of a protest set to me by two brethren at Hoxton --- protesting against that blundering excommunication by Wendone. Verily, you can find plenty of your minions to do your dirty work --- they are more ready to do your bidding than the Lord's, but bless the Lord --- I'll not co-act in your secret plots --- the Lord is going to vindicate his name. The truth shall be triumphant, and his suffering saints shall greatly rejoice. Take my advice, dear Sir, cut away to the Continent, and hide yourself from your coming disgrace, in deep humiliation before the Lord.

I love and fear the Lord only.

I fear no man.

Jabez Brinkman

CBA 213

{Postmark: Hamilton, Canada West

Received December 15th, 1862}

Dearest Owen,

I had been praying as to the matter in East Street, having briefly heard of the act of their leaders, one or two of whom I believe are misled. But I think, if there were not power to resist the action of the six (that is, as things actually stood), what has happened is the best that could, though it showed weakness.

That meeting began with the activity of some, with little fellowship of Brethren that side the Water, and became a refuge even of those who sought agitation. God has shown the weakness, but delivered the simple; there may be some to be regretted (*all* in one sense), but if those delivered walk in grace and firmness and individually so too, as grace gets the upper hand in the others, they will be delivered too. Complete breach with some, in the state they are in at present, I look upon as a mercy, a *great* mercy.

There is sometimes - - - All this abuse of Brethren I look at as a sign that God delights in their testimony for truth. I feel in every respect, more than ever, the immense importance of their position, and that in respect to the question of truth, too. Only it is a narrow path. Standards and Church authority are proving an utter failure. Infidelity making, alas! mere cobwebs of them. I hear Dissenters are in the same perplexity. This matter of Colenso is most significant.

That there is grace for union, and union holding fast the truth, is just the best and only testimony that can be given for God now. And if we look to Him, He will maintain it. Union

without the truth many would have, the Dissenters uneasy. Yet in practice (here at least) {they} hold it for indifferent.

God has exercised us for this point by the Bethesda question, which I look upon now as the greatest mercy. . .

There was organization at the first; but that too is a failure. Some have tried it in different ways among Brethren, and have in result broken up. What seemed to have power, firmness grace and knowledge, it has not stood.

I believe in the ruin of the Church, but I *believe* that Christ will be where two or three are gathered together in His Name. As to dear --- I do not see that it is more than, "I have not faith for it". I think I could explain that to him. I *have* faith in God for it, feeble faith and in presence of all kinds of difficulties, but I *have faith in GOD*. I have never known Him fail those who trust in Him. Obedience is the path of power. That was settled in the Controversy with the Irvingites, but not of *apparent* power, but of having *GOD* with one. A little strength, not denying Christ's Name, keeping His Word, keeping the Word of His patience. That is what we have to look for now, not *apparent* strength. Obedience, grace, and union in dependance on Christ, waiting for Him, waiting as He is waiting. Where there is this, there will be a . . .

'Tis the weakness in which Christ's power is displayed by maintaining what *is* so weak. Why attack brethren so much? But that they feel there is that they cannot deal with? What works in their Consciences. From what you say of the Pamphlet which I have not seen, I should think it would do good, as the unbelief is betrayed in it. I have answered the Record . . . since I was here, but my path here has been very quiet. I have been kept here at Hamilton longer than I thought, as many earnest serious souls are getting blessing. I know nothing as to their joining brethren, as it is called, nor have enquired, but they are getting peace, seeing what the Church is, and hence, what the state of things which is so called is. Getting, through grace, faith according to

the Truth. I have never asked them a Word about Brethren. But the work is full of interest. Not numbers, but souls in earnest. Yet, everywhere I have been, some have been added or restored. At Toronto too, there are {many most} interested souls and I am thinking of (while here even) going a day there (it is 50 miles by rail), and lecturing. I have been there, and found many, who have been made earnest by my preaching and Meetings. Of course, there are fears and opposition, but this must be expected. But there is distinct and evident blessing for souls in earnest.

I have the Bush to visit yet, save at the point. There the Indian Catechist is, I hear, at length quite decided to send in his resignation. And there is hopeful work among the Indians. It is not *Work* which is wanting here! Yet, I trust, the two clergymen who came out just as I reached Canada will fill up a large gap. And this Catechist among the Indians one of the Clergymen is used to and loves work in the Bush.

Some new towns are opening too, where our brother Evans who had been greatly blessed, had not been. He really (though there were individuals who had come out, but recently got loose into material things), may be (viewing it as a whole) considered the founder of the work in Canada. I have followed his footsteps where he had laid the foundation, save here, and in one or two new places. And even here, the nucleus was indirectly through his means.

In general there are very nice brethren here indeed, and caring for one another. Or course, ordinary trials, but grace and fellowship.

I had a tolerably violent attack in my eye, but, thank God, am quite well. We had had fine weather hitherto, and often pretty much like England, only drier.

I have set about the "Synopsis on Revelation" since I have been here, and have enjoyed my study of it.

Peace be with you. I trust (as you say nothing) you are all well. My kindest love to the brethren, and many unfeigned

thanks for their prayers. The Lord sparing me, I shall see them again, but my work in Canada, I do not see to be finished yet - - - {messages etc. come in here} - - -

If - - - has not yet enough, in January I could add a trifle to what I gave you. My Canada journey too my means . . . then. I was very glad to hear there are teachers for the school.

Kind remembrances to Mrs. Owen. The Lord's blessing be on your little ones.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

- - - {messages, etc., come in here} - - -

{copy}

Mr. George Owen

Compton Terrace

Cannonbury

North London

England

CBA 149

{Post Mark: Guelph, Canada West}

February 10th, 1863

Dearest McAdam,

I feel the seriousness of the Crisis or position in which the Testimony of the Saints of God is placed by the Controversy which is going on. It has in a certain sense come on me by surprise and I am perhaps better able to feel it by being at a distance. I am in no hurry, but I feel it very sorrowful on one side, and very encouraging on the other. When the Tract came out on "the Righteousness of God," I had not the remotest idea

of the tumult that would ensue, nor, I may add, of the low estate in which the Evangelical body, as such, stood. God, I am well and thankfully assured, will never leave His own, but the Professing body seems to me to be breaking up into Puseyites (who as the Pope said to some of them lately, not all “are as the Church Bells, who peal the people into it, but are always outside it themselves”) on the one hand. And Rationalists on the other. While the Evangelicals are incapable of holding with power any truth to maintain what exists. This brings out any true Testimony if made public by their attacks. I believe it to be the one true Scriptural ground of the Church of God. And with that, the true full Gospel of Grace. That I have felt, as all will know, for years. But this breaking up of what (Establishment or Dissent) held the public place of profession, even if on lower ground, brings out the matter into that place, not as assuming it, but as the necessary consequence of the Attacks against it. But I do not think we have any thing to do but to pursue peaceably onwards the testimony we have, seeking above all its realization in the devotedness and practical separation from the World. No part of the Testimony of God is more important than this – a greater witness that we are not of it, that we follow Christ. I dread the Saints getting tired of unworldliness. It was the first decay of Christianity. It is always our danger. It is often what gives falsehood its power over the conscience of the world, they see motives that Master what masters them. This may be imitated to propagate error, but Truth and goodness should . . . it naturally of the Lord. I feel very anxious as to this for Brethren. I do not doubt that I feel Truth and Grace is the weapon of God, but the vessel that carries should be the devoted effect of the Grace and Truth it speaks of. This, and that the Word should be held first in all its integrity.

Multitudes, I doubt not (and indeed so have heard) who would reject the stupid inanities of the “Essays & Reviews” or of “Colenso”, yet have their natural unbelief set free. And the Word of God has lost its absolute authority. This works in two

ways. One, sets reason that is human will above all. Many may believe this or that, but he does not believe God. Or in the weariness of the want of some authority, some rest. Men turn to the Authority of the Church and are degraded from reliance on a Holy God, to reliance on corrupt man.

The acknowledgment of God now and our security through the revelation of a Personal God we trust, known through Jesus, is eternal life and blessing.

I am daily more struck with the connection of great principles on which my mind was exercised by, and with, God when I found salvation and peace and the questions agitated and agitating the world at the present day. The absolute and divine authority and certainty of the Word as a divine link between us and God if everything (Church and World) went. Personal assurance of salvation in a new condition of being in Christ. The Church as His body. Christ’s coming to receive us to Himself to complete one being in Him in Heavenly places. And collaterally with that, the setting up a new earthly Dispensation from Isaiah 32 more particularly the end. All this was when laid up at E. Pennyfather’s.

The House character of the Assembly on earth (not the fact of the presence of the Spirit) was subsequent. It was a vague fact which received form in my mind long after. That there must be a holy and new order of things if God was to have His way, and the Craving of the heart after it, I had felt long before. But the Church and Redemption I did not know till the time I have spoken of. But eight years before, universal sorrow and sin pressed upon my spirit. I did not think to say so much of myself, but it is all well. The truth remains the truth. And it is on that we have to go. But the Lord’s dealings with the Soul connected with the use of Truth have to be noted.

I have nothing very new to Communicate as to the Work. I have been pretty occupied here with the death of two beloved ones brought in since I was here, one converted. The sweetest

deaths and most perfect distinctness of grace and peace you could see. A witness and edification to all. I was kept by the brethren from starting for the Bush, as we had no snow for sledging. Meanwhile the beloved ones went. One aged, the other leaving four little children. Sunday week and her soul found peace and is now in Communion. But this has kept me from the more direct sphere of my work. I have . . . of course, all the same.

I am sure with patience, and looking only to the Lord, there must be blessing.

From Germany and France, I have generally good news. So I have from Hamilton here, since I left. That was perhaps the most interesting sphere of work, though many and divers souls were getting deeply interested in Toronto.

We have had 52 degrees below freezing point, fine, healthy weather, but it stopped my preaching at a place I was much interested in when there before (Acton), where I found many hungry souls. It is astonishing how many souls a simple, full Gospel filled with Christ and His love finds famishing. The train did not arrive till too late to start. Now we have a foot of snow and only a few degrees of frost. D. V., Thursday we start for the Bush, 40 miles off, where there are a great many brethren, godly, intelligent men, some six or seven years ago, a place of bears and wolves.

I have heard of one Indian lately converted and now confessing Jesus, through one brother Grant's (ex Clergyman's) last visit to them. He has been up to the far Bush for some time. I rather hope to meet him at Mr. Forrest's. He is a little farther north, but at a post on Georgiana Bay, Collingwood, having a door open there.

They kept 400 of my answer to Colenso for this country. They appeared the other day, all were gone Saturday, and no more to be had though enquired for. Kindest love to the Brethren. You say nothing of your affairs. I called on the H.'s,

but no result.

Ever affectionately yours,

J. N. Darby

CBA 275

{Postmark: Guelph, Canada West

Received February 27th, 1863}

Dearest Stoney,

Every Christian owns the Lordship of Christ. It is the very distinguishing mark of a Christian.

C--- I saw at Quebec, but he is the essence of neutrality and looseness. I have sent a couple of papers to the "Girdle", and hope to do so . . . As regards commentaries or criticisms on tracts, there are many I pay no attention to, but work on with the truth. *Hostile* ones I am glad to have: they show where one may lay oneself open or where there is something defective, or immature. But work is done by WORK, if we work with God.

Here, though at present shut up in snow and by two deaths (most precious and blessed ones, both among brethren since I came here, one converted), yet I have felt continually the Lord with me.

At Toronto and Hamilton (large towns where I have chiefly worked) many souls have been interested in the truth and are yet.

We have had 52 degrees below freezing point. Cold, of course. My beard which I wear here, an icicle with my {health} but all . . . and healthy. Now a foot of snow (greatly longed for) and I start, D.V., for the Bush Monday. Should leave tomorrow but for the death of one dear old Brother. He was most touching, praising God while he had breath, alone and with others: "Is it not sweet," he said to his son, also converted, "to die like this?" No cloud was there. It was Brethren's books and tracts circulated widely. The truth lays hold of many souls. Acting on it, of

course, requires faith.

Poor --- , I think the firmest course is required with her. Kindest love to your own wife. The Brethren are growing in numbers in the chief places. And I trust, in a steady consciousness of the place they occupy. There is considerable intelligence among them. Some twenty or thirty have been gathered in since I came.

But the work that interests ME most, is the truth reaching souls around. And this -- for peace -- the Church -- the Lord's coming -- is the case with many souls.

Yours, dear brother, affectionately,

J. N. Darby

{copy}

{to} Mr. Stoney

CBA 26

{postmarked Sept. 26, 1864}

Monday, Mr. D.

Beloved Brother,

The reprint of "Daniel" is not begun.

I regard the book as mine certainly. It has been my happiness (in God's grace, I doubt not) to have printed and published it at my own cost hitherto; and, shamefully low as I am spiritually, I have still a little jealousy left of the honor of being so employed.

Yours affectionately,

John R.B.

CBA 536e

October, 1865

My dear Brother,

The first remark I have to make is, that the outset of Mr. Walther's statement as to what I hold is the exact and evident contrary of the truth.

I find it a very good exercise for myself to have patience with these men.

I say, "of Israel *awakened, quickened and upright* in desire;" he says, the exercise of "an *unconverted* soul".

Next, I distinctly say that the blessed Lord did in Gethsemane go through the deepest exercises with the judgment of sin before His eyes, when He was not drinking the cup, for He asks that He may not drink it, so that He certainly was *not* drinking it. Yet He was fully exercised about drinking it: it was the hour of the power of Satan's darkness, and His soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death, which is Satan's power. All this I believe, because Scripture says so. The sense of God's smiting was upon His soul, though the smiting was actually accomplished on the cross; and besides atonement, He had to know what it was to give up under it, all He had a title to as Messiah, and take Israel's sorrow instead. "In all their affliction He was afflicted."

He had the full sense of what their guilt was upon His soul, and what it was to drink the cup when He was not drinking it. This is evidently true; and the very essence of His suffering in Gethsemane: He was not drinking the cup then -- He says so -- for He prays not to drink it. Was He not suffering? Was He not suffering in view of judgment, of guilt to be borne on the cross, of wrath when He was not actually under it? What was He suffering then?

In the next page I find another false statement of Mr. W's. I have said, "All this exercise Christ entered into". Mr. W. says, He had then exercises, He entered into them. This just makes all the difference. His having them implies it was His own place; His entering into them implies that it was not.

Undoubtedly He underwent the whole power of evil as a trial. Satan at the beginning tempted Him by allurements; at the End by the sorrows of death in His soul; both to hinder His accomplishment of the work, and both in vain, thank God, but not in vain for us. I wish it to be fully, clearly understood that Gethsemane was not drinking the cup, and that there was the pressure of death, the anticipated cup (i.e., Satan's hour of darkness), on the soul of Christ; because it is written. If Mr. W. does not believe Christ entered into all these sorrows, so much the worse for him. Scripture is quite plain as to it.

As to the next statement, it is Mr. W. using his own ignorance to draw a conclusion contrary to my positive statement.

I have stated that it was specially after the supper the Lord entered into this sorrow, though, doubtless often anticipating it, because He says so. He was now to be counted among transgressors, the things concerning Him having an End. He formally makes the difference (Luke 22:35-37). Mr. W.'s conclusion from Luke 9 is simple ignorance. It was Christ's last journey up to Jerusalem, and so stated 9:51: "And it came to pass when the time was come that He should be received up, He steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem". What follows in Luke to 22:35, is almost all teaching without any date.

I distinctly believe that Christ did enter into the sorrows of Israel, besides atoning for their sins, and that in His sorrows in Gethsemane He deeply felt it all. Wrath was before Him and smiting. It will be before them – they will escape it because He did not; but He entered into it because they will be looking forward to it, and fearing it, and so was He, only He really bore it, which they will not – and all this I have stated. They will suffer, certainly they will not make atonement, and Christ did, and can enter into their sufferings besides making atonement. No one thinks Ps. 69 is not a crucifixion Psalm; but it is not only that, it takes up Christ's sorrows even from the beginning (see v. 9). And all through, other sufferings (even on the cross), which

are not atonement, are spoken of. Reproach breaking His heart is not atonement, though not separated in time from it. The judgment of v. 22 shows clearly that it was not as atonement it is spoken of.

Does atonement bring judgment on men? Read from v. 22 to 24 and see if it be atonement; yet it is suffering, and on the cross too. I am not going to give up blessed Scriptural instruction as to the sufferings of the blessed Lord to please those who, I believe, do not know what atonement really meant, nor what it cost.

I bear, and ought to bear, with entire ignorance as to the Jewish remnant, and Christ's sufferings in connection with them. It does not trouble me. Thousands of beloved ones know nothing of it; but the denial of what Christ did suffer as stated in Scripture, I will not accept because I am falsely accused. Certainly in Christ's case the government of God does not become wrath against sin till atonement is made. And it is only Christ's atonement which prevents its being such for Israel in the latter day. But His looking forward to it enables Him to sympathize with them when they are (though in integrity) looking forward to it. It is more than sympathy, it is (as He did for us) being tempted in all points as we are, sin apart, that He may be able to sympathize.

Mr. W. is denying all the most precious truths we have after atonement: that is all! Did not Christ suffer so as to sympathize, and not merely sympathize in a divine way? I repeat, Mr. W. is simply denying here the most precious truths of the gospel. "He *suffered, being tempted*, that He may be able to succor them that are tempted."

The only question is, did He do it in a special way for Israel? I believe He did.

It is totally false that the 69th is *solely* a crucifixion Psalm, though it be one; but this has nothing to do with the matter.

I believe Christ had in Gethsemane, when He was not drinking the cup (consequently not vicariously nor

accomplishing atonement) very real, and true sufferings Himself, and *that* in view of the cup and the sense of the smiting, so as to be able to succor them that are tempted, who will never have the final wrath on them because He had borne their sins. Christ was meeting indignation and wrath in Gethsemane; He was occupied with that; praying it might pass, that He might not drink the cup. Yet it was not His expiatory work: *that* was actually drinking it on the cross. It was specially indeed only the cup which occupied Him in Gethsemane, His sorrow and anguish flowed from that, yet He was not accomplishing His work of expiation.

They are incapable of distinguishing between His sufferings from God because of atonement (which is the work of the cup and brings only mercy) and His sufferings in Gethsemane where He was suffering all the sorrow of death and the power of darkness, with the thought of that cup before Him. I believe both. We *are* far here beyond looking at the sufferings coming from man. He *was* meeting indignation and wrath but He was *not* yet drinking the cup (that is suffering especially from God for atonement, or because of atonement for sin, i.e., as accomplishing it). Nothing can be more certain than both from Scripture; I think therefore p. 11 is plain English and quite right. The Jews do not know then what it is to be reconciled to God, i.e., they fear His wrath. Satan's full power is let loose upon them.

Christ in Gethsemane had gone perfectly through what enables Him to sympathize with them: wrath was before Him and far more deeply than before them. He feared it righteously, and Satan's full power was let loose upon Him, the power of darkness and death; but He was not yet drinking the cup: I believe this fully.

Mr. W.'s conclusion is only contradicting what I have taught, and he has quoted. Almost all Mr. W.'s statements are entirely false and not found in mine. I have never for example said, that "The indignation and wrath of God Almighty upon

Jesus in His approach to the cross not on the cross, and not expiatory, nor vicarious." I have carefully and diligently taught *exactly the contrary*. But it was the cup that was before Him, the indignation and wrath were the cause of His agony in Gethsemane.

Why, Mr. W. heedlessly says, "In Gethsemane He looks into the cup He came to drink"! "Gethsemane was indeed much more than the shadow of the cup", but He does not find terrors or wrath endured. Put so, as to wrath, it is just what I have said: as to terrors, we find sorrow even unto death, fear, agony, power of darkness, all used as to it; and He sweat, as it were, great drops of blood through conflict. There was strong crying and tears. Nor do I see that terror is not a very appropriate and natural word as borrowed from Ps. 4:5, and analogously 66:3 and 18:4. I have not the most distant thought of giving up this most precious truth to my soul.

The man who could assimilate the doctrine that Christ was born under it as a man and sought to escape it and did escape a great deal, with the statement that He was born the Object of His Father's delight in perfect acceptance and enjoying it, and then entered into it in grace in the End, must be, to say the least, an ignorant man indeed. The first would have absolutely precluded the second. I see nothing whatever to withdraw in what I have written, extracted by Mr. W. I dare say it might be better expressed, particularly for persons who seek error in it; but the truth contained in it I hold. I think Mr. W. wholly wrong in his views: though *he holds*, if he knows what it means, what he condemns in the tracts. His complaining of my saying, "Nor was this merely sympathetic feeling," is very *serious error* indeed on his part. It is the false doctrine that Christ did not really suffer in order to sympathize.

Islington
31st March 186?

My dear Brother in the Lord,

May I ask your mind upon Numbers 21:8 and 9,

John 3:14-17,

John 20: 31.

I mean as to the divine *order* of the work of God in the soul as to *Faith*, *Life* and *feeling*. Do we not gather from the above scriptures that Faith takes the precedence and that by it Life is communicated to the soul, and experience or feeling or joy follows. So that we might say: first *Faith*, then *Life*, then *Feeling*.

These things are written that ye might *believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that *believing* ye might have *life* through His name.

If you will pardon my liberty and *write* me I shall be thankful

I remain, dear Brother, yours affectionately in the Lord,

Thomas Aldwinckle

For an additional letter, see end of **Notes Written by William Joseph Lowe (1840-1927) about early days of the Brethren movement in Switzerland and France** (below).

{Date: 10 Jan 1873}

CBA 150

{To C. McAdam}

{Postmark:

Halifax, N.S.

2 April, '77}

Dearest Brother,

Christchurch was a source of great sorrow to me. I was blessed there but in leaving quite felt I left elements of dissolution though I did not think it would have been quite so bad, but as I told you at the time, felt I left my work unfinished. While I was there it went on so far all well, though incomplete. But I do not meddle with it. All I have done is when written to today, I owned nothing there at all, nor have I any intention of doing any thing. If there I might act, but absent I only look to the Lord. Elsewhere the work is going on pretty well, but there greatly needs an active efficient workman who works from the Lord. Deck has not the strength and health to do it though loved and blessed (somewhat?) and really useful. I was very glad to see him again. I have a letter from poor Kelly who is naturally in deep sorrow. We have had a similar case in Germany. For my own part the present infidelity seems to me superficial, but we know that only God and His grace can keep the heart straight. I find when examining their arguments they are superficial. I do not say untrue, truth rests on other grounds. On the antiquity of man question, there is a capital book by a man named Southall of Virginia, thoroughly versed in their favorite subjects, and has pulled them all to pieces. I had read their principal books, Gelkie, Haus, Procter, etc. and come to the same conclusion, noting them, but Southall is master of the subject. I think it has been noticed in the Westminster Review, but I have not seen it. Smith's article which merely copies the learned Germans is a very poor one. Yet the state of things is very serious, but it is a break up of that which can be moved that what cannot be moved may remain, and the Word of God abides for ever. The brethren have the place, if God gives them grace to use it, of maintaining the testimony for the truth, not by extraordinary learning which is very rare, reading is not, but by holding the truth of God from Himself. Faith and knowing the Scriptures which are able to make us wise unto salvation. I do not like brethren from outside meddling in

sorrows of gatherings to settle them. God's way is to rouse the conscience of the gathering itself. Advice or stirring up the conscience, they may be used in, but all settlings I have seen have done mischief, because not God's way. Not one of those who went to Ryde knew anything about the matter. The evil is 20 or 30 years old and even as to the immediate occasion they did not know the parties concerned. My impression is all will have to be begun there, I only hope nobody will be in a hurry. Here the blessing is very evident, really encouraging. I came . . . being come to N. York. It goes on at N. York too, so that I shall now have to return. I suppose, D. V., that I shall return to Europe very soon, all well stopping to see them in Ireland. They want me West but unless the work flags in N. York, I do not see how I can get there. *If I did*, it might be July before I crossed. I heard from Belfast today. Valise was going to stay awhile in England. Kindest love to the brethren. I hear dear Amos is gone, a constant faithful man though never putting himself much forward, but always serving. Kind remembrances to Ellen and Mr. Maynard.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. D.

CBA 415

{to H. Frost}

Aug. '77

My dear Brother,

I do not think the plans mentioned in your letter as pursued in the case there referred to, calculated to produce the cooperation desired at Bristol. The way to have things go on unitedly would be to have one (or two brethren if preferred) from each of the four meetings and capable of adequately communicating the needed information in each case, meet in some place agreed upon outside all the gatherings, the proposed admission and exclusion or whatever else was a common body of interest there communicated and conference had upon them, and the result communicated to all the gatherings, not as a thing decided for

them, but as the conclusion which those who had conferred had arrived at and presented to each of the gatherings. Generally speaking if the brethren who met were agreed, the matter would be concluded. If one of the gatherings dissented, there should be delay and the Lord waited upon to make all clear. Better to wait on Him than to do things in a hurry. Mr. McAdam is ill in bed and sent me your letter begging me to write to you.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

CBA 416

{to H. Frost}

Aug. 15, '77

Dear Brother,

The care of the poor would, unless the union were more intimate than it is, rest with the local meetings, because they know their circumstances better, but then it would be nice as probably people are better off at Clifton that they should give any surplus after caring for their own poor to the general meeting to be sent where there are more, according to the spirit of Corinthians which treats this subject. The general meeting would know where there was any special need at the time. The local gathering would inquire locally in some meeting of brethren for cases as to persons desiring communion or cases of discipline and the names and results of enquiry carried to the general meeting where, if all were clear and without further difficulty, the result would be forwarded to all the gatherings and given out, not as decided, but as the result arrived at and if the gatherings acquiesced the matter would be decided. If there were any serious question or difficulty anywhere, the matter would have to be further gone into before the Lord. In general the first local enquiry would settle it, but not always in places so near as those in Bristol as more might be really known of persons in another gathering. Such has occurred in London, but here from the

immense size of the Town, it is less frequent. No public announcement at all should be made till it went to all the gatherings from the central care meeting. If confidence is established many preliminary communications may take place well before a local judgment of a case, as when a person has been recently living in another neighborhood, or has had transactions there, still the local gathering where the admission was sought or question of discipline raised would first look into the case. The motive of common action before final decision is simple. If you receive at Clifton, you receive for all and if it is one town their consciences are all immediately concerned in it. They met in houses in Jerusalem, but the 5000 were all one assembly. I had read Mr. Stoney's letter which goes just on the same principles as what I have said, only leaves it in an abstract way instead of saying what to do but it is exactly the same with one word a little stronger but coming to the same thing exactly in result.

Your affectionate Brother in Christ,
J. N. D.

CBA 408 {Copy} {Received Nov. 11, 1877}
Dear Higgins,

I had read the tract sent to another up here. I do not like it. It is over fine drawn analogies in which he fancies he has discovered much, settling a very serious case which must be settled and those who dare to deal with it on broad plain ground. I am not satisfied as to Ryde. I set aside the separation paper of which I think very badly, but do not go further into here. But the 4th and 5th of William IVth makes marriages within the limits of forbidden consanguinity absolutely void. That is since 1835. Till then it was only voidable by an ecclesiastical suit in the life of both parties. The act validated all to that date (some cases actually before the ecclesiastical courts) and made all subsequent ones totally void.

This case is 29 or 30 of the prohibited degrees. Other points if I had to judge of the case, I might have to enquire into: the date (which, however, could hardly be beyond 42 years), whether he were converted, and in general what might concern his case. But they have owned their children, I am informed, are illegitimate, her father having settled something on the children using her maiden name, not her married one. Now had they been married before the church, I should hold them bound before their and the church's conscience, but they never were. Another question arose in my mind whether, though indictable for perjury, it might, having been celebrated, be *de facto* valid, but this was not before the church, and the only authority which makes it marriage at all declares it is to be absolutely void. The question too would arise, was he converted, for at first the perjury point was what pressed me. But at present the woman he is living with is not his wife at all. Whether again the church of God should hold it such though declared as marriage by those who made it on the ground that consent before witnesses is sufficient (as in Scotland) is a question which may be raised. Not being called upon to act, I have not touched the matter.

I have seen a letter in which the acceptance of their course in discipline in Cook's matter was made a *sine qua non* for admission for one who had gone out with the others. Now I have decided nothing except not to meddle, but this kind of haughtiness is very misplaced. I do not feel at ease as to it and I pronounce no judgment and feel the matter needs much weighing before God, but, assuredly on their terms, I should not go there. I think the reasoning on p. 5 of the tract invalid. These cases, and I know of four (one not under the act I have referred to) make the question a very serious one. In one case they got married abroad whence another question arises, for I do not, though I should submit to law, think it decides for the Christian conscience.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,
J. N. D.

CBA 9

Copy of a letter from Mr. Kelly.

Blackheath
March 10, 1878

My dear Brother,

I do not wonder at your deep concern about the line of conduct pursued so unrelentingly by our brother at Ryde. It has shocked Mr. Stoney, Dr. Cronin and myself exceedingly; and the more so, because by working on the feelings of some older brethren of more or less weight outside Ryde and in London too, he uses their names with the utmost zeal as an endorsement of his measures.

The meeting, as you know perhaps, forgave Mrs. L. and welcomed her to the table after her confession of grave impropriety, short of criminal converse. Nobody was warmer in this than Major McCarthy. But soon after, when in the north of England he got a confused note from Jackman, on which he put an exaggerated construction, took it into his head that there was other evil and worse unjudged in her case, and without even a show of conferring with the Ryde meeting, wrote to her a bull denouncing her as a wicked person, and calling on her to be away from the table.

{On} his return he worked unremittingly to have her put out, as did Mr. Kingscote, Higgins, etc. A meeting was convened for inquiry; and I went down at the instance of brethren. It was soon clear that the fresh charges had no real foundation, as proof of evil; so that the Major was obliged with Mr. Kingscote to fall back upon the original matter of scandal (Hessman) and though they had forgiven and received her back on public acknowledgment, *to put her away for it*.

This bears the stamp on its face of improper action. Several of the gravest there (Jackman, Tunley, Glenny and I know not how many more but these openly) protested, but were quiet as the

rest insisted. Mr. K., it is said, going round and telling them they would be disowned by brethren if they did not. On Lord's day Bligh stated that Mrs. L. had been put away by the brothers!! on the preceding Weds. Glenny then spoke out, as well as Adams, who had agreed; and even Halsted publickly owned that it was not valid action as not having *the assembly* with it.

It is not that I should advocate agitation, but I dare not withhold my judgment that such proceedings are of the flesh and, not of the Spirit. Mrs. L. is not, nor ever was, a friend of mine; but I must say that I have never known her in so good a state of soul as before and since they have put her out. She is out *de facto*. I could not say more.

We may leave dear Mrs. Peters in the hands of the Lord. She has taken the vindictive spirit of Major McC. too much to heart. He would have no doubt put her out too if he could, but this was too much even for the poor brothers of Ryde, jealous as they have been and radically disposed. I cannot but think Major McC. is but half sane, which tempers the moral feeling one must otherwise entertain of ways and words so uncomely.

Ever yours,
W. Kelly

CBA 34

Clevedon

W. Bristol

17th April, 1878

Dear Mr. Darby,

It is alleged that the quotation from Plato given by you in "Eternal Punishment" is of no weight as showing what was the classic meaning of the word *aion* in its fullest force, inasmuch as the writer is simply giving his own definition or idea of the import, or that of his school, and that it does not at all follow that

it was the generally received import of the word.

Can you kindly give me reference to the Passage quoted or the Piece in which it is found, and say whether the word is used as alleged.

I am, Dear Mr. Darby,

Faithfully Yours,

S. L C. Cossham

{to} Mr. J. N. Darby

CBA 532

{Last will of J. N. Darby}

I, John Nelson Darby of 3 Lonsdale Square, Islington, Middlesea, make this my last will and testament as follows, revoking all other testamentary papers. There stand, at present, in my name in new three pounds Government Stocks in Ireland four hundred and seventy nine pounds three shillings and seven pence (479:3:7) which I hold as entrusted to me for service. This sum therefore, or any part thereof which may remain indisposed of, I leave to Christopher McAdam now of Cambridge Gardens, Notting Hill, and John Oliphant now of Luton House, Grove Lane, Camberwell, or the survivor of them, their executors and administrators. Further there are three hundred pounds in the hands of Mr. Brockhaus in Brussels of which Messrs. Löwen and Nordsieck (the latter now deceased) paid the interest: my will is that the amplest time be given for the payment of this sum and that in no case they may be sued for it. Arthur Wells of Guelph, Canada, owes me two thousand six hundred pounds sterling and on which no interest (save £ 100) has paid for now some four years. I have a mortgage for it on his property in Guelph. This is in the hand of Mr. Thomas Bell, Merchant in Montreal, Canada. I desire that Mr. Wells may be allowed ample time for the

realization of what is due. Leave my books also to Christopher McAdam and John Oliphant named above for their and others use.

Signed by me this 22nd day of April, 1878. John Nelson Darby

Signed by the said testator as his last will in the presence of us present at the same time, who at his request in his presence and in the presence of each other have subscribed our names as witness:
A. Pemberton Gipps, 14 Lonsdale Square, Islington

A. H. Pollock, 4 Lamb, No. 3, Temple Barrister

{The following words evidently were written on the back of the will:}

I, John Nelson Darby, appoint as the executors of my will written on the other side Christopher McAdam of Cambridge Gardens, Notting Hill, and John Oliphant of Luton House, Grove Lane, Camberwell, and declare this a Codicil to my said will.

J. N. Darby

Signed and declared by the said J. N. Darby, as a codicil to his will on the 23rd of April 1878 in the presence of us present at the same time who at his request in his presence and in the presence of each other have subscribed our names as witnesses.

A. H. Pollock, 4 Lamb, No. 3, Temple Barrister

A. Pemberton Gipps, 14 Lonsdale Square, London

{The handwriting of the will and codicil appears to be that of J.N.D., the notes about witnesses to be that of A. P. Gipps.}

CBA 17

37 Mellen St.

Cambridge, {MA,} July 22d, 1878

Dear Mr. Darby,

I do thank you for your letter from Geneva and I thank the Lord that you could do so much for our comfort as a family.

I just wrote out from the manuscript book which I keep for the children and myself some of dear husband's sayings during his fearful illness from Jan. 31st. I do bless our God and Father, that he did not sense his sufferings all that time. I am so unwise. I did ask that his reason might be kept clear but He knew that it was not best. I thank Him now.

I though you would like to see his last saying. If you think it worth the while, you might show them sometime to mssrs GJW, Mr. CJ and {Clare?} or any who would take interest in them.

Mrs. Hard is now with me and wishes me to wait there for her. I would only magnify the grace of God. I expect His grace to our family, but often have to bring my unbelief for Him to put away.

F.A.H. is true, faithful, devoted, young and dependent; he is with us yet. All goes well, I believe, in Boston, feebly to be sure, but God is for us. I am perfectly content as to the "Tract Shop", etc.

Yours gratefully in the blessed Lord Jesus,

S. H. B.

My children would respond to your "kind remembrance", but they are not in while I am writing.

I enclose a notice by Owen, ed. of "Messiah's Herald". We sent him "Sound Words" and he sent "M. Herald" in return. I thought he should know of Mr. B's departure and informed him myself. What he says you can see. I think all that I said to him he put in, although I've forgotten. He is responsible for what he said. Mr. B has not received or heard much from the "Herald" for a long time. I think Mr. O. Very kind in feeling.

GONE TO HIS REST IN PEACE

Many will remember Elder F.G. Brown, who accompanied Elders Himes and Hutchinson in the English mission of 1846, and who by preaching and writing proclaimed with us the speedy coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. For some time past he has been identified with those best known as "the Plymouth Brethren" --- among whom there are many very godly people. From the following notice which has been sent us it will be seen that, after years of feeble health, he has "finished his course" and, like Paul, awaits the coronation day (2 Tim. 4:6-8). He was an interested reader of the *Herald*.

"Fell asleep in Jesus, at his residence, 37 Mellen street, Cambridge, Mass., June 15th, F. G. Brown.

"Forever with the Lord!

Amen, so let it be:

Life from the dead is in that word,

`Tis immortality.

For thirty-five years he has never been known to doubt the doctrine of Christ's second advent -- it has been his hope. His change of views as to the order of events has never led him to say in his heart, 'my Lord delayeth his coming.' Among his last expressions was "I want to go to be with the Lord now --- at once: I want to see him on the Father's throne." And he has gone *to wait with him* until He shall be revealed from heaven."

During the night of Jan. 31st, my dear husband had an attack of paralysis from which he gradually recovered {from?} He {is} able to walk about by the assistance of others and that he did even on the day of his disease but he was unaccountably restless day and night requiring care and watchfulness lest he should fall or otherwise injure himself. From this time mentally he was like a person in a dream, not sensing his true condition often declaring himself well and able to do and go where he pleased. His

appearance at times approached idiocy, then childhood, then rationality as to questions and answers. Twice he came to himself for a few moments. The first time, he looked around surprised and asked “What has happened; what has broken this spell?” On being told that he was ill, he replied, “Where, how, when? Oh, it was when I went out of the house.” He told me that {he} was not afraid . . . Canada and around here. His eyes filled with tears as he answered “Satan has much to do with all this.” (On the second occasion, he enquired “Why did you not shake me and make me know what I was about? Tell me all about it tomorrow.”) For the first few weeks, his former professional life, with all its weight of cares, pressed upon him. He was consummating marriages, traveling to meet appointments, lecturing, and holding various religious meetings.

Gradually, the blessed Lord and His truth engaged his thoughts. When he wished to speak of it, he would break out in a shrill protracted cry with “Blessed Lord Jesus.” He seemed to pass through every variety of soul exercise before God. What he said was to me like the light of heaven breaking through the darkness that enveloped his poor brain, that being lulled into quiet that the soul’s condition might be seen. Such seasons were generally followed by silence, and often by sleep. His expressions overwhelmed my mind, when they were uttered, so that when I committed them to paper I could remember {his words} . . . They were so unexpected – so full of comfort so really of God according to His word, that my heart said, “What can I ask for more? It is enough.” His sayings are consecutive although day’s often intervened between their several utterances. The first bears date of March 22nd, at evening, as he sat in his big chair facing the west and just after sunset: “The sun sets and we look for it to rise again, but the time will come when to set, it will not rise, but God will not forget us. He will take care of us! His word is sure; it is not man’s word. Hold on to His word! The foundation of God standeth sure. The believer is in Christ. He is Righteousness; and so is the believer in Him, and shall be in His glory. It is our

privilege to be waiting for His coming! Oh, they laughed at us, once, but they will be disappointed, we shall have a rich reward. Poor witnesses have we been indeed, but He accepts it.” Later he added, “No home down here, but we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. It is our s, bought by the blood of Christ; no one can touch our title to it. It is sealed by His blood. No thought can conceive what . . .and praise. Very often he said, I want to see the <Lord! I want to go to the Lord now – at once! I want to see Him on His Father’s throne!” “Sing, ‘Glory unto Jesus be,’ yes, oh! That I had a world to give Him. Be faithful. I need mercy.” “I would not dishonor the Lord by crying. I am foolish to cry. I am so low-spirited!” “Do not dishonor the Lord; follow Him no matter what it costs.” “We can do little for Him; He died for us; do not be ashamed of Him. He will soon come again.” “Hope al of M’s family will serve the Lord.. Tell Mr. A. and H. to be witnesses for God during these last days. I have been a poor witness to Him.” “Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, blessed is he whose sin is covered: do not forget the Lord. He will soon come to take us to Himself.” “My whole soul praises the Lord. May everything praise Him; get up and praise Him, will you?” “I am poor and feeble, wish I had faith. The world is a {like a?} pot bubbling and boiling!”

“How did I get away off at such a distance from Christ! Little by little, Oh, I would get near. To trust Him in the dark as in the light.” “Still my hope and expectation is in God. Oh, do shield me from Satan, he is all about me; protect me from him. Look me over and see what is the matter with me. Don’t let anything hurt me.” “I have been talking about faith. I want faith to trust God’s blessed word. Yes, I know all you say about it. I have felt His power and presence. No, I do not regret what the truth has cost me, but such a poor witness I have been to it. I would be like Christ.”

“I cannot be away, away from the Lord! Oh, my unbelieving heart. I have such dreadful thoughts: I would not have them. I

will trust Him and not be afraid, not be afraid.” Oh, what a Lord is ours. His loving kindness endureth forever. As long as the hills remain, I will trust Him though the mountains be removed.” “I think I am done with earth. I want E. and all he children to serve the Lord. I would go to be with Him. His unbounded grace! In thee, oh Lord, do I put my trust.” “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity and in whose spirit there is no guile: Look and see if the Lord is coming. I would go to Him.” “I am so selfish. I would not be unblessed, Lord Jesus. Oh, that I had been a better man. Why did I not do more for Christ.” “I wanted to take the reins into my own hands, and this is why I am brought to this. No will but God’s will. I do want His will done.” “Oh, I can’t be so far from God. How came I to get away so, little by little, out of communion: now I’ve no friends, no God – all alone. I . . . do pray for Jesus to come to me.”

He repeated much scripture and many hymns. The following lines were often on his lips:

We would and, oh, confirm the power,

With meekness meet the darkest hour.

“How little have I done for God. May He bless His truth sent forth through the books and tracts to the salvation of some souls.” Give my love and blessing to all my relatives. I love them all and am sorry not to see them, and bid them farewell. I comment them to God and to the word of His grace. I am sorry not to have served Him better.” “To love the Lord, honor Him, God will take care of us. We need not fear. I want to . . . not my will, Father; Thy will be done. I am a poor creature. Look up, Oh, look up, to Jesus, the blessed Lord upon the Father’s throne. I do want to see Him up there. I wish He would come.”

Many, many times his eyes filled with tears as he said, “Give my love to the saints, to all who love the blessed Lord. I did hope to see them once more; give them my benediction, my parting blessing.”

May 12th, at evening, having passed a very restless, he took

both my hands in his and prayed. He gave thanks to God for giving us being, for sustaining us. He surrendered himself, the world, his will. He asked that I might be comforted, guided and guarded, leaning upon Him. That the children might be supported, cared for, and that God would be the Father to the fatherless, that He gave and He took and He had a right to do so. That if we parted this night, we were not afraid to trust ourselves in His hands. If we parted here that we may meet in eternity: father, mother, children, all saved by Jesus Christ. That the entire household might be blest. That the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ may be upon this household for His names’s sake. Amen. . . . to die! Do you take charge of me, be wholly on my side, protect me.” “I know what God’s word says. I know it all, but I want its power in my soul, I want Christ. Do go and pray for me, presenting me to God. I want God’s Christ. I have had such joy in Him! I want it more again. Come, Lord Jesus.” “I shall be satisfied when I awake in His likeness.” “Oh, let us praise God together, the triune God: Father, Son and Holy Ghost.” “I would have God’s will done. I am poor and feeble, so feeble He . . .

He was very quiet one evening, while taking his supper (a very unusual thing) we soon notice that he thought he was “breaking bread,” he wished the children to come and asked if the nurse would not like to partake with us. He then knelt down and gave thanks. Having been helped up, and on to the bed, he repeated:

“Salvation! Oh, the joyful sound.

’Tis music to our ears,

A sovereign balm for every wound,

A cordial for our fears.

May 13th, He called the family to pray with him. He knelt down and commended himself to God as clay in hands of the Potter, submitting himself to leave the world at whatever time and in whatever manner God his Father should choose. He expressed to leave all in His hands, since He was ruler of the universe, and of

the inhabitants of earth. He rejoiced in Him to know that He was our Father. He commended his family to God (bursting into tears) confessing that to faith the way looked dark respecting them, but he placed them in his Father's hand and asked all for Jesus sake. Amen. He prayed with us all several times, ending by saying "Good-bye. God bless you." "I am so sorry I have sinned and been unfaithful since professing to follow but I want to confess and forsake it all. I want the children to love Him."

May 19th, he said give my love to my dear children. Tell them to love and serve the God of their father and mother. To trust in Jesus Christ for the pardon of all their sins. I would gladly give my live for their soul's salvation, but this I cannot do. Tell them to lead virtuous lives." (Turning to his son and giving him his hand) "Good bye, E., be a comfort to your mother, love and serve the Lord." "I wish my testimony for God and the truth had been better. I did hope to give a dying testimony, a better one. I am sorry for every thing that has been counter to that. Oh, I am so sorry not to have done more or given a greater testimony." On the evening of May 20th, he called me and said, "I am sorry not to have conversed more with you, but I could not. I wish I had testified more clearly. Oh, do not fail of being faithful. Hold on to God's truth. The unity of the Body, its oneness. Leave everything in the world – let it all go, but don't fail of holding on to God's truth!" He took my hand, kissed me and with many tears bade me "Good-bye."

He became weaker in body and mind after this date, so that I stopt writing down his expressions, gestures and outbursts of tears with broken sentences were the only means by which we could gain any knowledge of his spiritual exercises.

June 15th, about half past four in the afternoon, while sitting in an easy chair, in {Harold's?} room, where we all sat sewing . . . he was suddenly seized with convulsions. He was laid upon his bed in his own room and everything was done to bring him to, but at just nine o'clock, he quietly fell asleep. Dr. says that he was wholly unconscious. At the very first, he put his hand to his

head and said, "Ache" to the nurse, and when he ran to bathe it, he spoke faintly "Wife, wife."

Death was robbed of its terror for the Conqueror was present. Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of His saints."

Mrs. Edward Barker had called in that evening, and witnessed it, and said to me the next morning, "I never saw the like, it did not seem like death at all!" I did thank the Lord for this, from her lips. Mr. Johnson, the Baptist minister after having viewed Mr. B. and gladly accepting an invitation to the burial, if he could do so simply as a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, spoke to the people and told what little he knew of how God had spoken through him, notwithstanding the darkness of his poor brain.

I said to thank God for this, for it was a greater testimony from his lips, that it could have been from Mrs. Crain's. The latter was much helped of God at the funeral. We telegraphed to Mr. Taylor, but it was our Father's good will that we should lean wholly upon Himself, nor did He fail us.

S. H. B.

CBA 61

Wingfield Villa

Ryde, I. of W.

September 23, 1878

Dear Mr. Darby,

Thank you for your kind letter.

I feel more convinced than ever that the views you take are Scriptural. I am desirous to come amongst you but am distressed to find all in confusion here. What do you advise? I could never break bread with those meeting at Temperance Hall and I believe the action of those who left it to have been right. Could you not come to Ryde and try to settle the unsettled here?

If you should hear of any pupils to be prepared for the universities or public schools, I should be so thankful if you would mention me. Having resigned my Curacy, I have no to depend upon this.

With kind regards. Believe me,

Very truly yours,

Howard B. Finch

{to} J. N. Darby, Esq.

CBA 35

Dec. 27, '78

185 Brixton Road

SW

London

Beloved J. N. D.,

Your letter to me was as considerate as it was loveable in you. The substance and spirit of it, too, will refresh other hearts also. I sent a copy of it to Fl--- for the Park St. People. Yes, it is very good at all times to be found handling God's book and to my heart, in translation even more than in any critical study. Although I'm sure that God has His good pleasure in its old and new things being brought forth. My satisfaction, however, in the multiplicity of bible books and tracts, opens as they . . . and make me fear that they too often rob our bibles of time and thought. That is its due: then there is the thought that there is money making, as a motive too.

I have more prayer and pleasure in your present work, that in any other since your German N.T.

May our God bless it and you and your yoke fellows with strength and consolation in the Holy Ghost.

Dear G.V.W. remains much in the same way, as when you

were here. I was with Dr. Carter last night, who described his state to me. When not in stupor, he is restless and delirious. As he continues to take food in moderation, he may hold out some time, if improved little.

We hope to meet on Thursday evening to commend {Gen. Steward?} to the Lord, on his return to N. Z. He is in good heart godward without a thought to follow the example of Mr. King of France. Mr. Gardner of Ventnor goes out in the same ship for a 6 month visit. Finch of Ryde writes to me, that as these seeing no probability of there being any breaking of bread in communion with the two parties there, that he has taken one of the small rooms attached to some Institution where he and some of his converts assemble on the Lord's day morning to break bread. He writes that he has sent round a notice of this to all the meetings in the Island (I enclose a copy). What may come of this, I have no idea. God knows. He can and does use all sort of means in man's emergency. If I am in Ryde on a Lord's day, I am not sure but I should not be with them. F. and his young converts he tells me assemble.

McCarthy and Kelly between them have stirred up S. Peters to bring again to the light filthy reports of Mrs. Lowden's sad ways. It is very grievous to the loss of even discerning. Both of the . . . of this matter are greatly to blame, but "God over all. Christ blessed for ever."

Have I your godspeed in having a reprint of "Is nature dead?" It is excellent for "the present distress." I have had a long letter from Cluff, but clearly avoiding any thing definite and all of Irish affection.

Ever yours most Affectionately,

Edward Cronin

How unlike this letter of mine to you, but as is the man so is his strength. Love to {. . .} from other fellowlaborers. Excuse my scrawl. I am getting blind as well as . . .

CBA 36

{Date: Feb 1879}

{copy}

Dr.'s statement

A few lines to inform brethren of what I have been doing in Ryde last week 8th to 17 February, 1879. I left home with my wife on Saturday 8 February for Ryde under strong feeling of pressure and pity for the 20 or 30 of the Saints who had met for the last two years on the Lord's Day morning without breaking of bread. The cause for this state of things is so well known to most brethren that I do not enter into it. Neither the few left of the original meeting nor those who had gone out of it were acknowledged to be in any state which could present the Table of the Lord. This assured the company who withdrew from Temperance Hall to be absolutely helpless. On reaching Ryde, I had little before me than earnest desire to see God's hand in spreading a Table for these few, and blessed be His name, He did not allow me to wait long in uncertainty, discovering to me that He had Himself, in His oftentimes singular way, gone before me. I found a meeting, H. Finch (the ex-curate of St. Ives) at his lodgings, that he had broken bread for 3 sundays previously with his landlady, a Christian, and half a dozen young women to whom he has been blessed. His wish previous to breaking bread alone had induced him to visit Mr. {Deut?} at Lyndhurst who brought him to London and introduced him to brethren and Mr. Darby, who gave his name with Mr. Deut for his reception at the Table and he was received at Ebury St. the next Lord's Day without the ordinary previous week's notice, {marginal note: Finch writes I was received in London and I believe that is all delusion.} thus rendering to his great distress, his reception informal and thus too making him feel he was still unrecognized by many as in communion. To my mind God's hand was plainly in this causing H. F. to wait for himself before God on the one scripture, "Do this in remembrance of me." I believe this was honored of God in the state of disorder at Ryde to affect through that simple act of faith both heart and conscience by that word. In the dreariness of the prospect of the blessed day following finding

his poor hungry and thirsty children without His Table, I felt free to cast in my lot with them, disorderly as it must have seemed and disorderly? {inserted between lines: disowned?} as it may be. A practical difficulty arose as to receiving one and another to the Table of the Lord. H. F. being the only brother; when most unexpectedly and graciously the Lord inclined the heart of one of the younger brethren (Maurice Jackman) who had been in communion in Temperance Hall to ask to be proposed for fellowship. To me this was an uncommonly sweet testimony that God was with us. We were fully of one mind that the meeting should be entirely a fresh one, admitting in no wise any of the questions and disputes that had existed in the other 2 companies nor receiving on the ground of anything past. Every name alike to be proposed and to have 2 or 3 witnesses of faith and conduct and allowing a week to intervene before reception. The meeting on the Lord's Day morning had indeed a savor of the Lord's good pleasure. About 9 sat down in H. Finch's Room including my wife and exclusive of the young brother, this brother who was proposed. During the following week there were meetings every evening for prayer and reading the word, one evening being devoted to confession and humiliation with thanksgiving. Nine gave in their names as willing to break bread, one being fresh from the Establishment, on the following Lord's Day sat outside, joy beaming through their tears at being once more in the presence of the Lord's Table.

Edward Cronin's account of his doings at Ryde in February, 1879

CBA 37

Marine Villa, Ryde

I. of W., Feb. 15, '79

Beloved J. N. D.,

I have been here with my wife for about a week.

I wrote a long letter to you before starting about G.V.W.'s funeral, as well as referring to what brought us here. I did not send it from wishing to send it on from this poor place. I had an impression that perhaps God in one of His exceptional ways was intending to use the hasty step of young Finch in some way or other to help some of those poor scattered Saints in their dispersion and distress. I heard from 2 or 3 credible witnesses, both from Temperance Hall and from West St., that the violent outbreak of anger among themselves against the West St. people was worse than ever as well as their fixed determination only to admit young Jackman's return on his submitting to their terms, of course, which I think that you are aware of.

In utter hopelessness of any healing in this state of things, induced me (I think with God's sanction) to suggest a meeting "de novo", irrespective of the debris of the former meetings altogether. After prayer on Saturday evening, both Finch and Jackman fully consented to this suggestion for Lord's day morning. I and my wife met with them in F's room where they had broken bread for 3 sundays with 7 or 8 of F's young converts to whom I spoke after the meeting. Each one that desires to break bread is to have their name given out as is done among us, giving a waiting time for any to object; I was happy and so was my wife and I have seen many from the T. H. as well as from West St. It is understood that it is fresh start, having no reference to the endless strifes that have been going on. We took our place in fresh remembrance that to us amenable to the recognized order of inter-communion., but in the peaceful assurance that the great Shepherd was well pleased in an act which enabled many of His sheep to be fed from His table after two year's absence: the Lord knows where this step may lead to, but we have taken it advisedly and if wrongly we know that His chiding is as a father's.

It seems sad and strange for an old going-one-80 should have something of the same work and reproach on his heart and hands as he had some 50 years ago.

Most affectionately yours

in Christ,
Edward Cronin

CBA 45b

Moorgate Grove
Rotherham, Feb. 20th, 1879

My beloved Brother Cronin,

I have been so struck with dear J. N. D.'s letter to you, just now published, that I cannot help having just a word with you at this time. I have scarcely named it to any one, but I have been impressed lately that there is an undermining spirit, at work amongst us almost every where. And so similar and so persevering, that it seems to me a direct work of the enemy. It assumes a good deal of the holiness from High pretension as to guidance of the Spirit, resists both close orderly study of the word consecutively and undermines personal devoted ministry. And in some cases where there is distinct blessing, will so act as to hinder. This in a variety of ways, and some there are who only hinder and scatter. Much even of what is right is done in the flesh. And, dear Brother, much of this seems to be a developing very fast. Both all the work of one evil spirit the young very liable to be misled or turned back. We have traveled on clear ground many years now, but I have never been so conscious of the enemy's hatred, and work. Hence those remarkable words of dear J. N. D. to you are as a voice from the Lord to me.

Well what I am writing for is this. Am I dreaming, or have you, beloved and aged Brother, noticed the same thing? I thought if you had, we might cry to the Lord together for special grace and wisdom to meet all the wiles of Satan.

It is so blessed, with the Father of lights, there is no variableness, neither shadow of a turning. We are indeed set apart unto the obedience of Christ. But, oh, the depths of mercy also to the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus.

Yours waiting for Him,
C. Stanley

CBA 39

185 Brixton Road, London

Feb. 21, '79 SW

Beloved J. N. D.,

I think that God in His grace intended to soothe an anxious feeling that I was conscious of through your letter: not that I had a misgiving thought, as to His good guidance, of oftentimes an hasty and mistaken Child. I have not spoken or written to any one in or out of my house (except, Mr. Coles, after my return) so that I had no certainty (neither have I now) as to how the brethren may feel called upon to treat me. Yet, be that as it may, God knows all and will do all that is good and blessed, causing things to take a right course. I had a letter from Ryde this morning describing a Prayer Meeting (16 present, on Monday evening) having a freshness and power such as had not been for years. G. W. Young, a servant at Westwood, in fellowship for many years, but never opened his lips, prayed and gave out a hymn in liberty and joy. Poor E. P. who at first seemed glad to have a table again next found that there was no exception as to the usual giving out of names and the waiting interval so that with this offence and the fear of not being received elsewhere if he broke bread at Ryde, he called on me before I left Ryde to decline coming to the table. This is no grief to any one. His absence most probably allowed liberty to his servant. Mrs. Lowder, my wife and I believe to be repentant and seemingly enjoys salvation and Christ as never before. I have a sort of an undefined feeling that God designs to effect some great alteration in our present state. "We wait His time." 21st. Beloved Brother, I read your letter afresh last night. It awakened much in my heart and thoughts that I should find it hard to define. That

our God is very mindful of us in our past and present condition as from the beginning of His ways with us. He has marked our purposes and plans that they have not run parallel with ours, I have long felt. He called us to know and show forth "Jesus and the resurrection" in the power of individual faith and life and as members of His body the Church. The manner of our maintaining and manifesting this (as in measure) I think, you know, I have long been uneasy about, and this now increases, but I am not restless nor uncertain as to whose truth and Church it is. Ex. 16:10.

I had no object in mind as to my visit to the I. of W. but a full persuasion that I was in unison with Christ's heart over that handful of sheep without a table, for which they earnestly longed for two years in that dry land. Indeed except among a few, whom I need not name, I am sure that most will rejoice as well as yours and my dear Mr. L.'s in my bold act. I have not a misgiving as to our dear tender Lord.

Ever yours most affectionately,

Edward Cronin

I note enclosure on the William will be a variety from hard handwork.

CBA 38

{Date: 10 Mar 1879}

185 Brixton Road

SW

Beloved J. N. D.,

I must write to you: any thing is better than a certain sort of silence.

The effect I had had on the mind of brethren by my act at Ryde is far deeper and extensive than naturally it need be. In suggesting having a table for those who pined for one for two

years (yet having done nothing amiss), often if any coming about them even as to any prospect of restoration pressed in heavily and continually on my heart that "I could no longer forbear" a strong word for the Apostle. Well, as you know, on my wife and my visiting them, I felt assured that we had light and liberty from God to take the step that we still judge He sanctioned. This we, with those who wished to be proposed individually, and not as having belonged to either party, counted the cost of being refused intercommunion with other gatherings and, of course, so did myself and wife. I mention this, that perhaps you might feel free to write to C. McAdam or {someone?} else that the assemblies, so long as I myself and the others at Ryde are outside it, need not be a question that in any way (but sorrow) that calls for discussion.

John Oliphant unwisely brought the matter forward on Saturday evening before Kennington had made any communication about me and brought on, I am grieved to say, a painful and unprofitable discussion.

The agitated state of feeling abroad generally reminds me of a ground swell auguring a storm.

I do not feel in the least guilty, as awakening this but feel assured that God is purposing a sifting among us all. Do you remember Heb. 12:27?

Ever and always
your oldest and worst
brother (yet perfect
in Christ Jesus),

Edward Cronin

10th March

1879

CBA 45a

{Not in J.N.D.'s handwriting, this document is marked: "Copied 13 March 1879", but the first line above the salutation appears to be in J.N.D.'s handwriting.}

If my letter seems harsh, you must take it as the proof, not the ... , of affection.

My dear Cronin,

I hardly know how to write to you, save that I am very glad you thought of writing to me. You have my letter as to the bearing of your act. But I must fairly tell you your whole judgment as to it is utterly and totally wrong. There are two questions: Ryde and the state of the brethren in connection with it; but starting a course of individual action, perfectly blind to its bearing on breaking up the existence of brethren has been the evil from the beginning; but for this I trust the Lord, and say nothing about it. But as to Ryde itself, the most striking point in the whole matter to me has been not one trace of dealing with individual conscience, you and Mr. Kelly taking one view and seeking to carry it through, and others taking another view and seeking to carry that out. The whole thing was contrary to all scriptural ecclesiastical order, settling for a gathering instead of awakening up its conscience. Such has been your action now, complete contempt for every body else and acting on your own personal judgment. The gatherings in the Isle of Wight had written to Mr. Finch to say they could not own him, so had even Dent, though quite with the Peters. You go and ride over all their heads and put your sanction on the meeting. It is impossible there could be a more complete contempt of all brethren. You have told me yourself you consulted nobody, mentioned it to no one but Coll. Langford. It is idle to talk of union or sifting or anything of the kind, you have acted on your own feelings, as to a large body in defiance, as to the rest in indifference to what they thought or what they felt. Now if you

had asked me, I should have said that I thought it the very worst thing for them that could be done, setting them at ease before one single serious exercise of conscience had taken place. I do not think anything could have done them more harm, harm to their souls individually, the mere effect in you of the hasty ... you had taken in the matter before. In principle the brethren were all disowned and gone. There was no need of any sifting. I do not know that I need add any more. In regards the brethren generally, I trust the Lord. All that could be done on man's part to break them up has been done. I do not believe the Lord will allow it. But it is in His hands, not {rulers'?). I have constantly taught that the obedience of Christ to which we were sanctified was that His Father's will was His true motive . . . And I of, course, should act on it, as far as I know how. Man lives by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God. I have no feeling that He calls upon me to act or counsel at this moment, through grace it is given me to pray. If ever I should be called on to act, which I never may, I should take up individual conscience as clearly as I could, and deal with it, and not act on what has been done save as this gave rise to it. I had trusted joyfully that Mrs. Lowder was broken in spirit and her conscience right, and have said, indeed written to, without pretending to judge, as I had not seen her, but recent accounts have thrown a cloud over this, which, not having to act, I leave as it is. But such recklessness in the things of God as has gone on, I must say, I never met with. But God is above it all. I hope any sifting He sends will be blessed for His testimony. Indeed I am sure it will and must be. Nor am I, though pained, uneasy, because of His faithful love. I am not going at present to try and settle anything. I believe I am according to God's will here. As deeply interested as possible in all that goes on in England, but awaiting His will, but as you wrote to me I have answered you plainly as to what you have lately done, accepting cordially your kind word of affection and reciprocating it. Thank God, though tried sorely enough, I have been able to keep grace in my heart as to all.

Ever affectionately in the Lord,
J.N.D.

The fact is, Cronin, that your course was such an arbitrary pretension to act on your own fancy in total indifference to all principle and everybody's feelings that it stamps it with a kind of innocence. But if the feeling is as intense and universal as you say, mark this that the pretension on your part had either totally blinded you, or that you chose to go your own way in a case you were not engaged in immediately in defiance of intense and universal feeling. I do not believe if you had been walking humbly with God, you would have been in either case or have done what you did. It is this you have to think of before God.

CBA 30, nearly identical to CBA 25b. Additions from CBA 25b are in square brackets [].

{Copied}

To F. Rowan

Stradbally

[Timahoe

Abbylax

Queen's Co. Ireland]

March 17, [1879]

[{I} believe it should be "man with God"

should have always used, as

{J.}N. D. says at end of that article

{on} New Creation, nor did I ever mean aught than this.]

My dear brother,

I have been confined to bed during all last week with a heavy

cold and so deferred writing. First, let me assure you that I do not hold, but would utterly repudiate as dreadful the thoughts which my inaccurate and wrong expressions have led you and others to draw from them. I believe that our blessed Lord was the same in essential being always. Nor have I ever had the idea that we could have any participation in His Deity. Indeed I feel it dreadful to have even to assert this – the bare thought seems so terribly derogatory to His glory and the honor of His Person. The Lord forbid I should ever do aught than acknowledge and lay aside any expressions or words that could convey such thoughts. Therefore your help, or any one else's, I should receive with gratitude who will show me the wrong expressions so that I may withdraw them. All this I can the more readily do, because I feel I have no thoughts, hold no doctrines, in these vital subjects which I do not know are fully taught by such men as Mr. Darby and Mr. Stoney. I hold that the Lord Jesus when on earth was identically the same as He was, and is, and ever shall be. I believe that as Man, He did take "flesh and blood," sinless – perfect, that He might die. Then rose, as Man, into a new condition – beginning (where we begin with Him, having Him as our life) a new order of things. So that it can even be said, "Henceforth know we no man after flesh etc. Yea, if we have known Christ after flesh, henceforth know we Him no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, there is a new Creation." He thus ended for us our old state, and brings us into a wholly new state as Man.

I dare say I may not have even expressed myself in this very accurately, but I trust you will take my words as I seek in my mind to convey them. I have no desire to defend any expressions, as I have said, that could convey wrong thoughts, but I feel wholly clear before the Lord as to having any thoughts of life in the believer other than as risen with Christ as Man, we have received life from Him and in Him, yea, He our life – but I see that many of the expressions you quote can bear very wrong meanings. The expression "Man (that is, of course, Christ) in God" I have used simply to convey Col. 3:3. Christ is hid in God,

as is also our life. I meant the word "man" to be understood only of Him. Is He not hid in God? He is not manifested yet to the world. And such an expression as "Where Man in God is dwelling," was intended to convey the same idea – speaking of Christ's own Person. Remember, I am not seeking to defend the expression: I am simply telling you what I meant to convey. The expression "The incarnation of the God-man" is certainly wrong – it is contradictory in terms, for Christ was God incarnate. What I meant by Christ ending Himself as a Man after the flesh and beginning a wholly new thing, was, that He actually left the state, for us, and closed the history of man before God. He rose the very same Man still. I do not believe it well put.

I will write again, please the Lord, and go over the quotations, as I have said, not to defend any of them, but to explain what I intended to convey. The most serious I think is that one from "The altar that measured the Cherubim." The history of that is as follows: I was reading an article of G.V.W.'s in "Food" for April, 1875, "Stand Therefore," p. 185 lay before me and the unfinished poem was in my pocket. I tried to put the thought on that page into verse. I meant by "Deity" going back into God's eternity. That the Son, as Man of Counsel, has in His person "the gap" filled up of which G.V.W. speaks. I believe the way I have put it, with allowance for poetical license, could quite give the thoughts you take from it joined to the other extracts. This is the unvarnished tale.

It has humbled me exceedingly that I have given cause, in this way, for you and any others to suppose, arguing, of course, from what you read, that I must hold thoughts such as you have expressed to me. All I can do now is to correct in every way I can these impressions and acknowledge fully how inaccurately I have uttered and written. I am learning more and more what a blunderer and failing one I am.

Affectionately yours in Christ,

S. O'M. Cluff

You rather hindered than helped
by quoting “then, lost in God.” I do not
see how this is wrong. See “Food” for Oct. 1875, “The New
Creation.”

CBA 25c {Copy. Received 21st March 1879}

Timahoe
Abbeyleix
Queen's Co., Ireland
March 19, 1879

My dear brother,

The seriousness of the results of these inaccurate and wrong statements of mine which you have been helping me to detect, makes me most anxious to gain the aid of Mr. Darby and any others you can find; will you also communicate to me. How humbling it is that I should be the means, unintentionally it is true, but none the less injurious to truth, of stating things in a way which may give the Enemy cause to triumph.

I fear you have had an idea that I wanted to convey some negations or false doctrine in some secret way. Rest assured, my dear brother, I have not, nor never had, any such thought. The Lord only knows the deep pain I am going through as to it all.

All this will render it unnecessary at present to go over any more of your quotations in trying to explain what I meant to convey. I believe there must be something more done than mere withdrawal – something must, if the Lord show the way, be done to hinder any further spread of the misconceptions of truth my statements have given. Can you help me as to this? I shall with gratitude hail your aid. I am so distressed too about having injured Mr. Stoney, that dear servant of the Lord. Surely He will enable me to do something to exonerate him also. I wait on the

Lord as to results. He knows how I desire all this and much more.
Affectionately in Him
S. O'M. Cluff

CBA 25a

Red House
Sevenoaks, March 22, 1879

Dear Mr. Darby,

I hardly like putting all this extra work upon you, reading these things and answering them perhaps, but I don't know what else I can do than sending them.

Salutations aux accus.

Yours affectionately in Christ

W. J. Burton

Cluff seems to breathe a nice Spirit. I hope Rowan won't badger him too much.

{enclosed were CBA 30 which is the same as CBA 25b and CBA 25c.}

CBA 42
Psalm 141:5

185 Brixton Road
SW
March 22, '79

Beloved J. N. D.,

I cannot write about this trouble! I wrote three letters about it to you, but destroyed them.

Your last, exaggerated things in cause and effect (save in all

that you say about me).

Sure I am, that the man of the lost sheep would not be angry with me!

The effect on brethren's minds is very morbid reminding me again of Heb. 12:27 as well as of Matthew 12:7, but "Thou shalt answer Lord for me" as Herbert says. W.K. knew nothing of any thought or purpose of mine as to Ryde. I had no one to consult, knowing to a certainty that I would be opposed, or afraid to agree with me. Going against sought counsel would have been worse!

I took the step, beloved J. N. D., as (I believe assuredly) from the Lord and with the Lord and now have nought to do, but leave the consequences in His wise and holy hands and well I know that the man of the stray sheep was not, nor is not, angry with me.

How sweetly were we of one mind, when you wrote that letter in "The Treasury" which I sent to Mr. Lowe yesterday! One elder brother told me yesterday, that "the Voice of the Assembly was the voice of God and to be heard above the voice of consciences"! I only replied, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

To be cast off from inter-communion at this closing days or yet worse at the Lord's coming is sore sorrow, but for "God, who comforteth them that are cast down."

Yours, never more affectionately than at this moment,

Edward Cronin

CBA 41

185 Brixton Road

SW

March 24, '79

Beloved J. N. D.,

I am aware that it is very cool of me, under present

circumstances to ask your judgment upon a personal matter.

Would it not be expedient in hopes of calming a very disturbed and conflicting state of mind among many of the Saints for my wife and myself to withdraw from communion?

If you should dislike answering this question, I shall accept your silence as an answer.

Yours ever affectionately

in the Lord,

Edward Cronin

24th March

CBA 40

{April 1879}

185 Brixton Road

SW

Dearest J. N. D.,

I can't help writing to you! Your silence is worse than your scolding.

One thing, that I want to say to you, is that I am in a measure made happy by the assurance that sooner or later, you will find that you have an exaggerated judgment of the heinousness of my act at Ryde and that God will cause you to see it so, in good time. Any how, "Mercy rejoiceth against judgment," and supposing my act was as bad in God's sight as it is in yours, vide p. 32 in "Brief Exp. of James by J. N. D." Now, what can you say or do, contrary to that excellent little treatise? I knew and know that it was a bold stroke and my gracious God whispered into my soul, "Fear not, I am with thee," and surely did I know that the prize, the double reward, of trying for (through God's gracious help) Christ's pasture for some of His poor pining sheep would in His eyes be very good and pleasing to His bowels of compassion. He gave me

to see and taste this with a little company of glad hearts and weeping eyes, besides this I had sight on that memorable etc.: the two separate Meetings, {I} felt that what words and letters had not done, for years past, the Nazarite's vow being broken, commencing again was the case. This told wonderfully on both parties, for it is our God's way, ever, not to mend, but to make anew! Aint you pleased that Mrs. Peters on her return home will find neither West Place, nor the T.H. (as I assuredly believe {it} has got its death blow) ready to receive a "lady bountiful" again?

We were and are in a very inflammable state. Indeed, when such an act by a poor, old uninfluential Party could raise such a conflict among brethren!

The strength of a wall in Christ's Church is not shaken though a brick is extracted from it! But as you say, God has have {sic.} His eye and thought upon some state of things among us, not yet brought to the surface. For a long time, I think that I know at least one vital failure among us, which has slowly , but surely, been creeping in among us, but "We wait His time so shall the night be turned to"

Ever yours most affectionately
in Christ,
Edward Cronin

CBA 43

{J.N.D.'s undated reply to E.C.'s letter of April 14, 1879}

My dear Cronin,

This has ceased to be a personal matter and I have no intention of communicating with you or any one as if nothing had happened. You have put all the brethren in London in distress of spirit in a considerable degree, in England, perhaps all over the world in

confusion and distress and you come with incredible levity, talking about the system of Lady Bountiful without even a thought of the {will?} of her Lord. I do not believe you have an easy conscience. But now I have only warning. Not you but others are at the bottom of this matter and if it come to an issue as was wished, though not what I expect, I do not think you would be at the top but find you had been made a tool of. But further supposing you gather around you a coterie of dependents on you, and as is very possible other baptist partisans, it would be a poor compensation, even in this world, for the loss of the esteem of every right minded, right feeling Christian acquainted with the facts. You have gone far enough in that direction. My judgment is quite unchanged unless its being strengthened is a change. I do not believe in any favored private inspiration for what you did. If there was, I have no doubt it was from the enemy.

Yours truly in the Lord, J.N.D.

CBA 46

{Not in J.N.D.'s handwriting, this document is marked: "Copied 16 May 187[9?]" and another handwriting dates it as "10-5-1879", i.e., May 10, 1879.}

Dear Cronin,

We have heard that you have given up brethren. It may seem strange to you that I should write to you now, but as this breaks all question of ecclesiastical link, changing the sphere of without and within for this world, I feel free to write to you personally and say that my heart has grieved over you all the time. It has been no diminution of personal interest. I believed and believe that the whole question of the testimony of God at this time was at issue. Christ's glory and the truth. This commanded me absolutely. And now I come to entreat you to retire with God and judge the things themselves in which you have been engaged and see whether they are of God. Do not seek to make your point

good, but put yourself before God and quietly ask yourself is this all of Christ. It was not for me an individual question at all, but of the existence of those called brethren. I believe Mr. Kelly has done quite as much as you to ruin it, but the difference was yours was an open public act and he kept himself from that. Think of it all over before the Lord when you can be quiet. If it came to my turn to serve one of your children, I should do it as anxiously, perhaps more so, than ever. I think you have gone utterly astray and for a long while, but this does not hinder me from going out after you as one washed in the blood of the Lamb.

Yours affectionately in the Lord,

J.N.D.

CBA 16

25, South Stree, Thurlowe
South Kensington, SW
May 14th, 1879

Beloved Mr. Darby,

I trust that your love will bear with me in what I am about to say. It is with deepest pain of heart I write you.

Having occasion to call on Dr. Cronin last Saturday in the course of conversation, he told me of a circumstance which greatly grieves me, and I feel sure, will equally affect you. It was, that expressions in your letter, concerning him had been widely circulated among Christians (not with us) in the neighborhood where he has resided for nearly 40 years, and that it will utterly ruin him *professionally*, as those whom he had attended would now no longer consult him.

I cannot believe this sad state of things was ever intended or counseled by you – indeed I feel sure, your very nature would recoil from such wrong. Still, as I am informed, (and there seems

proof) that it has been done, how bitter is the wrath of man, especially when engaged in religious things. Granting that Dr.C. has been mistaken, is he therefore at 78 years of age to be “utterly ruined”? I feel sure, you never could have contemplated such a thing being done. Satan has been let loose in our midst and the consequence is that the bitterness and hardness of the flesh is displaying itself everywhere.

Forgive me writing so plainly of what has come before me. I believe a word from *you* would help to stop such a painful state of things.

Believe me,

Yours affectionately in Christ,

James Brown

CBA 60

{copy}

May, '79

Pau

Dear Mr. Finch,

Ryde in my judgment has been in a bad state these thirty years. I had myself great difficulty as to Cook's marriage, and it has been made a handle for the Peters and others leaving, not I think righteously. But I had been 3 years out of England and had had nothing to do with what had passed. The meeting, Temperance Hall, was owned by brethren in general and I had no pretension to disown it, but I had too much positive difficulty as to Cook for my own conscience to feel free to go there. Meanwhile Mr. Kelly and Dr. Cronin used every effort to build up the Peters party who had separated, and when it did not succeed, to ruin unscrupulously (and are still) Temperance Hall. Nothing is left unturned. With all that I never meddled. Further evil was discovered in Cook and he was spoken to (and this by

the intrigues of W. Kelly's party), but made the matter clear. He left and the brethren at T. H. pronounced him outside but Mr. Kelly continued to do all he could to discredit and ruin them, with others. The only thing I had to say to it then was Mr. Rickert of Derby came and asked me if there was anything to hinder his going to T. H. He was thinking of sea bathing at Ryde. I said I knew nothing of the state of the meeting but there was nothing in their standing that I knew that made any difficulty. Since then two difficulties were got up, and in presence of all their virulent and watchful attacks, unprincipled as they may be and in my judgment are, one has to guard everything. One of these from previous enquiry, and more definitely from a letter received by the same post as yours is wholly unfounded. The other may have been negligence but at the utmost would have to be rectified. Mrs. Cook, or whatever she is to be called, has not broken bread for a length of time, I hear, for some two years; the statement made was that she was still breaking bread; this was not true, but when Cook was declared out, she was not named with him, but he was and neither have anything to do with the assembly. At the utmost all that would be needed would be to say that having been long away, she could not return without application. You see it is or was not so easy to say yes or no. If a person thought Cook married before God, there was nothing to hinder a person going there, before the other things were found out (he was actually sitting back for his case to be considered when the seceders left). At present I know nothing to hinder any one's going though it might be right to rectify the neglect as to the woman. Cook's case was thoroughly judged, the denial of its being so was unprincipled. I may add that a most godly sober brother is, I hear, going there, perhaps is there, and you could not do better than be in communication with him. Unless rectifying the neglect I referred to, I know of no hindrance to going to T. H. A question would arise with you possibly in some consciences from your having set up a separate table of your own, whether this would not require to be looked into. I pitied you having to get into such a broil as had arisen at Ryde, just out of the establishment, and

had no desire you should. As I said, if a person thought Cook really married, there was nothing to hinder as to principle. I was not clear and could not have recommended a person to go there, but did not judge but kept away. The course of Mr. Kelly and Dr. Cronin I look upon as relentless partyism, and I must add unscrupulous, but you joined with him in it. He says now he went down as a protest against Temp. H. I have stated all these details that you may know where I was and am. I know nothing to hinder any one's going to Temperance Hall, only desiring the defect I have stated to be {rectified} . . . stated to me was not true. I have mentioned it to the brother I refer to as going down, Mr. A. Pollock (an ex-barrister) that he may see about it. The objections now brought up I do not believe there is one atom of conscience in, but it is better the assembly should be above all ground of objection with relentless enemies such as it has. As to my letters, you are welcome to show them with only this condition that you send them or copies of them to me first. Indeed if you would send me copies of them at once, I should be thankful for they are trying to make a handle of them and of course I can meet that better if I have them in hand. The only advice, my dear brother, I can give you is to stay quiet for a little till you see clear in your way. If a man walk in the day he stumbleth not. When your own soul is clear, you can walk in sure steps and peacefully. If it is a relief, leave the island for a little, otherwise being in God's presence is what makes us clear. A heathen could tell us: *Coelum non animam mutant qui trans mare current.* {"Heaven changes not the souls [or, winds] that run across the sea."} Patient waiting upon God is what will put you under the easy yoke. What has happened has shown that I was not very wrong if I did not encourage you in taking any step. But while Cook was there, I could not come to a conclusion for myself. Forgive me if I take things more slowly than you. T. H. must be the Lord's Table or not, but it does not follow that I know whether it is; and if it were, I might have difficulty and not go there as Paul did not to Corinth. I did not at that time go to the Island at all, not to raise a question, or rather decide it as far as my act went by not going

there. Possibly more faith might have gone, but I could hardly act till I was clear myself. Now and for a good while, I have known nothing to hinder as I said to Mr. Rickert. The two objections I referred to have been raised since: one groundless, the other insubstantial, but in the presence of relentless enemies a thing for godly care.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

{Not a Sibthorpe Collection Letter; Date: after May 19, 1879}

{The following was transcribed from an old hand-written letter. The first two lines are in a different hand-writing from the body of the letter. The signatures are in the same handwriting as the body of the letter.}

On the decision of May 19, 1879 by Kennington as to Dr. Cronin

Copy of Letter to J. N. D. about the middle of May/79

Beloved brother in the Lord,

We write on behalf of the saints at Kennington, who as you are aware, have been deeply & painfully exercised about the act or acts of our brother Dr. C.-- at Ryde in connection with the new meeting at the Masonic Hall.

We have been desirous of coming to a decision guided by the Word of God, a decision to which we could attach the authority of the Lord's name & the sanction of the Holy Ghost.

This Assembly therefore decided on Monday May 19th/79 to rebuke Dr. C-- in these terms "In order to clear the name of the

Lord at Kennington from the independent act at Ryde, this assembly disavows all association with the meeting at Masonic Hall, & that we as an Assembly do solemnly rebuke Dr. C-- for his action in setting up a Table & breaking bread there, which we consider to be a breach of fellowship in the Spirit." We are thankful Dr. C-- has written to say that he renounces all association with the new meeting in the following terms, "Out of consideration for the conscience of the saints, I renounce all practical fellowship with those assembled at Masonic Hall, or wherever they may now meet," & that he has also confessed that he was wrong.

Our present object is to ask if the rebuke satisfies your conscience with respect to the 4 charges in your prior letter, namely "The course of Dr. C-- has been clandestine, untruthful, dishonest, & profane."

Will you kindly reply as soon as possible, --

Yours very affectionately in the Lord,

Job Collier

John Downs

George Black

Charles Cooper

Thomas Moore

Henry Cornelius

P.S. We enclose copies of two letters received from Ryde on the question of intercommunion, & we think it right to add that they are quite in accordance with Dr. C's statements made here from the beginning.

CBA 131

{Date: after 19 May 1879}

My dear Brother,

I do not think that this decision of May 19 {is} enough. I was very glad their consciences were awakened that far. The reason I do not think it went far enough to be what was right was this. Dr. Cronin had gone twice or more to Ryde and had never declared he would not go. They rebuked him, declared they repudiated communion with Masonic Hall, but he had not confessed the evil nor repented of it, nor ever said he would not go. How can I say we have given up communion when the leading brother in the place has not, but has openly gone, never repented and never even said he would not go? Long after that he said he would not for *their* consciences. Supposing a brother was constantly going to communion where evil was going on and he encouraging them in their evil course and two or three more went with him, how could the assembly say they had {mercy}? And if brethren be so allowed to go, whether one or six there is no difference, as to the assembly its allowing it is the evil, and rebuking and allowing it is saying we know it is evil, but allow it to go on. And if one was allowed to go, why not allow six? Some thought that by accepting this decision it might have sufficed provisionally, and if he had gone again then insist on his exclusion. But at any rate the evil would have gone on meanwhile, because the conscience of Dr. Cronin was never reached, nor was there any confession. There was no restoring his soul from what the Kennington brethren felt was evil and declared was a breach of the unity of the Spirit.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

Either Dr. C. was out by his own act or the assembly decided it would not put him out. If it did the assembly was not clear of it.

CBA 47

{copy}

185 Brixton Road

21st July, '79

To the Brethren at Kennington,

I own the wrong of my irregular action at Ryde, and as I have said on and since the 17th May have no intention of repeating it.

Yours affectionately in the Lord,

{Sig.} Edward Cronin

{“irregular” changed the same day to “ecclesiastical” put before wrong}

{EEW}

CBA 196

{Date: mid 1879?}

Dearest Neatby,

I sympathise with your feeling with all my heart, only I have passed through it all already and await the Lord's working, but one thing strikes me: you complain of those who leave, but what of those who have caused it? At the time the judgment of Kennington was being read Dr. Cronin was at Brixton, his party being doubtless strong enough to force himself on the meeting and persisted in spite of protest and when we suffered from such scenes a quiet sister and {he} went to, I suppose, Collier's Rents but {they?} do not know to be quiet; there was the same scene and half the time spent in discussing whether they could receive him. This I heard here. And this he is doing under the express advice of Mr. Kelly counseling not yielding at Kennington and after awhile to go everywhere now a good while ago. Is this kind of disgraceful course to be thought nothing of? Humiliation is the very thing needed, but how could you expect people to go for *common* humiliation *honestly* while this was going on and the people to go supporting Dr. C. in it? I care very little as to Dr. Cronin's being put out. He has lost all moral standing with me. Mr. Finch declares his statement as to what he proposed to do not

a true one and I think him justified. I have seen four different accounts of his own as to the motives which led him then. Two, it might be urged, might coalesce. It was Henry Witherby begged me to see Mr. Kelly after the monthly meeting in London. I did so in all kindness, proposing it to him. But it only brought out more dishonesty. As to myself I bore everything. But Dr. Cronin's act brought it all out into a public question. If God sees good to bring what I have labored in 50 years down, I bow to His will. I shall not have labored in vain, but He does not mean me to accept iniquity and dishonesty. The brethren have been long demoralized by what has been going on and this is only the outbreak of it. That demoralization, nothing with God's help will induce me to acquiesce in. If I saw a sign of breaking down in Dr. Cronin, if he had bowed to that rebuke, had said openly I will go down to Ryde no more, then I might interfere, but hitherto there has been no sign of it. I have added "openly" because I have just heard today that he has said so privately; let him do it openly and something might be done. You may be sure I have felt it who have been working in what they are destroying before you were born and which I fully believe to be God's testimony.

CBA 414

{Date: mid 1879}

Dear Dodd,

I cannot, just arrived, say my hand in the letter, but it is very possible that I confounded your insisting it should be read and its being read through your so insisting on it, with your reading it as one and the same thing, and who in fact read it physically is not very important. What I heard was that Mr. Ogilvie proposed it should be read on a subsequent week day, and that you wanted it should be read then. Which I suppose is in substance pretty much the case. But my observations on it remain the same. It is perfectly astonishing to brothers in the way in which Dr. Cronin does just what he likes with you all. The passage that came into

my mind was ye suffer if a man beat you, etc. To tell a meeting which had rebuked him for doing wrong, afterwards that they were incapable of judging his case and therefore he should come among them or go where he thought proper, whether they thought well of it or not, has never been seen in any gathering yet. And it has characterized the whole case. You say his withdrawal was not accepted; did he ask you whether you accepted it, or when he withdrew it, did he want to know whether that was allowed? He will consider your consciences by not going to Ryde, but of any movement of his own I see no trace. But I repeat, Dr. C. has declared you incompetent to judge, that is, not an assembly, for it *has* to judge them that are within. If it cannot, it cannot maintain the holiness of God's house. I am told since that you got him to say he would not {come}, indeed you say so. But I did not at first understand at what {report} when asked that? It makes an assembly, forgive me the word, ridiculous, but my objections go far deeper than that. I am told I said a rebuke sufficed or meant it. I never did: indeed I never meddled being away, but I have plain proof of that, if a letter I wrote be preserved. I am told it is said I have exaggerated in my charges. I have *not* exaggerated, but carefully confined them to what was necessary to the point. I stated the proof would be easy and I think I have them all still by me. But I gave it as my testimony. A testimony of whose truth and importance I am more convinced than ever and the proofs are before every body's eyes that has got eyes to see. The Lord deliver the poor brethren and make them see how they are deluded by the enemy.

Your affectionate Brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

As it then stood a rebuke left the assembly in full communion with what it justly denounced as evil. I found the letter: it is said a brother named Drew produced and read the letter. May I ask how the committee was chosen who found Mr. Oliphant's charges without foundation. . . if correct on this God's ways. From one signant of . . . at Blackheath. I hear . . . though now . . . author . . .

to the brethren at Kennington in whose name the letter was written to me was never allowed . . . to get beyond that save to . . . of the . . . proof ask of Ryde . . . This if . . . was not fair dealing, they . . . God is light, my brother, and all will be brought into light.

CBA 319

{Date: mid 1879?}

My dear Brother,

I cannot allow myself to be drawn into any discussion of the merits of the Ryde case. What you underline is unquestionably the case. It is possible the act making it express perjury may have been passed after Cook's marriage. I think there is some such act. But it was tantamount if this were so, {they} were not talking of Cook's case particularly. There are other cases and I said we should be forced to look into them. I do not remember any exact words, but I know my mind and what I meant and have acted on very well. The seeing the act of parliament had strengthened my conviction and this I expressed, and further having been very reluctant to meddle with the question on account of the guiltless children. This feeling, for it was only that, was greatly weakened by finding in two cases that settlements were made in the maiden name of the women on the children showing they were perfectly aware where they were and . . . bastardized their own children so that my scruples at doing so were naturally weakened. What I have done as not . . . my self was to avoid going to places where such cases were. Hence, I did not go to the Isle of Wight at all: to have gone there and not gone to Ryde would have been a kind of public rejection of Ryde. At first my mind was not clear: the act of Parliament etc. made it clearer, and as not committing myself, I do not go to break bread where such are. I would not at Blackheath where Mr. Kelly is, if asked, either. But I reserved my judgment of the case till called on by God to act on it. De facto, I do not, nor would not, break bread where these cases are, but

refrain from going to them that I may not have to decide, but if I doubt I am judged if I act. The apostle did not go to Corinth though he might have higher reasons than mine. So that such a course is scriptural without breaking unity. I do not go and actually break bread with them because I do not choose to decide till God calls on me to act. The reading the act of parliament did make me feel more strongly about it; because in point of fact these people are not married. Then comes the question and {they} own it by the settlement on the children. There comes the question how God views it. Under these circumstances, I wait and avoid what I am in doubt about till God call on me to act and then I can expect His guidance.

Your affectionate Brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

I leave the reception of you all to the assemblies who I presume would everywhere receive you. If as I stated before, Cook came up to where I was, I should be forced to look his case in the face for myself or go elsewhere if I knew it in time.

CBA 312a

{Date: mid 1879?}

Dear Mr. Dodd,

The ways of God are remarkable and this leads me to write to you, though I cannot say it is with much hope that you will listen; you will at least know how it strikes me who is outside it all. *I am informed* that you read out in the assembly at Kennington a letter from Dr. Cronin to the effect that as the assembly had no power to come to a decision, he should no longer sit aside but feel free to come to Kennington or go elsewhere next Lord's day. See where this puts the assembly. It has no power to come to a decision in a grave case of discipline. A brother would have kept the letter for a meeting for common consideration. You insisted (in which I see God's hand) in its being read there and then; that

is, the assembly has heard Dr. Cronin declare its incompetency to act as such and tacitly acquiesces, and you could read this judgment pronounced upon it and not sink into the earth or denounce it as a calumny. You perhaps do not see that it is denying that it is an assembly of God, for one incapable of spiritual decision in a case that concerns itself and the Lord's glory is not an assembly . . . that has the Spirit to guide it. How could an assembly receive from another which declared itself incompetent to decide as to right and wrong? It is impossible to conceive an assembly more degraded as such than to accept it from one of its members that it is incompetent to judge between good and evil, and the individual then with singular consistency take his place in it without even asking brethren whether they would or no. I see the hand of God so singularly manifested. He whom you have been idolizing has trampled you under foot. But though he has thus publicly judged the assembly, it does not follow he cannot make use of you. He gets upon your shoulders as his stepping stone to go to other assemblies to produce the confusion and dishonor into which he has thrown you and the person who does this is one whom you judged required an open rebuke for his conduct and an entire repudiation of what he had done. It would be a sin to despise individuals and I have no such feeling, but if ever an assembly has sunk itself, alas deemed itself as Kennington has done. This was accepting the judgment of its incompetency from one whom it has rebuked for evil. Many things may have happened since this, but they do not alter the fact that the meeting accepted the declaration of one of its members, and a rebuked one, of its incompetency to act and who goes out when he pleases and comes in when he pleases.

CBA 312b

{Date: mid 1879?}

My dear Brother,

If it were only a matter of sympathy with Dr. Cronin, I should

be the first to go along with it. His practice was declining (from no fault of his that I know of) before these questions. So his causes of this I do know, but they are merely such as common worldly history explains and still more God's ways with His children. A good deal of the practice he has lost has fallen into the hands of his son, at least so I hear, Cronin not going to . . . and both he and the dentists are good sons. But I should feel much for an old man thus maligned by the world. It is not, alas, uncommon and, I believe, when he had it he gave. I do not believe brethren of any way of thinking would leave him in difficulty. But it does not beguile me as to what he was seeking to do, nor does Mr. Ratcliffs or Mr. Haslam alter the meaning of the absurd quotation of Heb. 12:27, and getting some out of brethren and some out of other sects as materials for a new testimony of God. I confess I do not see anything very ambiguous in this nor in removing the things which can be shaken. Grace and kindness towards an old man my heart can go heartily with. But with this pretension I do not. The question all through with me was if God was going to set aside brethren, not Dr. C. (though his overt act brought him forward) and I must add demoralizing brethren. Nor do I think this last completely cured: but I trust God for it. But for all that, it is strongly before my mind: I did not leave the Establishment, poor thing as I may be, to walk in close communion with unrighteousness.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 269

{Date: 1879}

{to J. Harmar Smith}

Dear Brother,

Unity was gone in London by the failure in Kennington to exercise discipline because Kennington refused to act on one plea

or another. They finally asked for another week and were given it and {stretched} the matter out by . . . which . . . and many different gatherings, some before Park St., had to act for themselves or continue an association with wickedness. What I think the statement you refer to failed in was not the fact but faith in God as above the fact, and He forced Kennington at the last moment to declare Dr. Cronin outside . . . which they had always refused to do. This being accepted by London the isolated action ceased and unity as to common public action was restored. But there is a large and bold party in Kent who really favored Dr. Cronin. I had nothing to do with the going out at Broadstairs or Ramsgate. I told Mr. Field, now they were out, he had better not go back till they were sure those who stayed behind were clear of the evil and I think that right still at Ramsgate. I should not go to those who remain were I there, though am thankful I am not. What has passed there I look upon as simply violent party action. And all the circumstances have revealed a state of things in Kent, which has nothing to do with London, but of looseness and self-will which can inspire no confidence with any godly person. I have no intention of meddling with it, but look to God to act in grace, in restoring healthful peace. Their excommunications I do not receive as an individual or I should separate from those excommunicated which I do not. They are for me violent party acts and no more. No one that I know of thinks the sending out of Park Street's notice wise or right, but it has revealed a state of things in Kent which God alone can treat. I may tell you that Mr. Wigram thought it all over with brethren, and that without hope since Mr. Kelly and Dr. Cronin had got together. Dr. Cronin was acting on this ground and indeed avowed it. I did not agree with Mr. W., but only because God was above it all. And He has been above it all in London and forced Kennington after months of resistance to declare the Dr. outside. I hope God may restore him . . . and Mr. Kelly who I am told has practically yielded all save personal accusations and giving himself a letter to Ryde. But turning the holy discipline of God's house into a party weapon I cannot accept. As to independency, it is all nonsense: no one

thought it; some, I think, through failing faith, thought brethren were reduced to individual action with which I do not agree. To man's eye, it might seem so, but faith counts on one who is above the power and working of evil and in this case has shown Himself so and I am assured yet will as to Kent. But as I have said to another, it is not party violence but God's grace which will do it. And be assured the going out {of} their brethren, if done in haste, has been the means of revealing a state of things in Kent long a matter of anxiety to others but now openly made manifest which will require the grace of God and patience of man in grace to heal. And further, a question of positive evil and demoralization has been raised amongst brethren and no use or abuse of church forms will have power to make some at Ramsgate walk with evil.

CBA 311a

{Date: mid 1879?}

Dearest Brother,

My mind is in no way changed as to the evil, nor how far it has gone. It made my staying with Brethren an anxious question before I left London, and I well knew Kennington was its cradle and Mr. Kelly behind. My question was as to the mode of dealing with it, confining it to Dr. Cronin when the guilt was deeper and wider. So little thought have I of acknowledging Kennington in its present state that I had written before your letter came to a person *at Kennington* who had been present at your Brixton meeting when Dr. C. was there and wrote to me to know what to do. I took care to tell her that I could not go there and that she could stay at home or go to south London where she had long been; she knew nothing much about things, had better keep out of it, but that this might not seem indecision I added that I did know and would not go there. I am thankful that Kennington had gone so far as to condemn Dr. C. and refuse communion with Masonic Hall. It was/is for exercise of conscience. And had he gone to

Masonic Hall, there would have been ground on their own decision to go farther. I have doubted since about what really did take place: it was a positive statement of J. Harris who did not think brethren would be satisfied. I told them I judged things as I heard (at present very little, being intentionally private) or if there were aught {much} more though that that was not the question. But that the real conflict was elsewhere, and if they had judged the evil, Cronin's position was not the question for Finch's act had blown upon all his doings. As to falsehood, I have, alas! proof enough. Another thing was not perhaps adequately before me, that Cronin was the battleground though Kelly and *the state of things* was the real question. It was not the fact of evil that distressed me, but there being no power to meet it. Where are you all in South London and elsewhere? I am very glad you stopped Mr. Horner, but it was not Kennington was in question with me, save glad if their conscience were beginning to awake, but the public action of North London as to the whole state of things. I shall write to Mr. Horner and not having any thing printed, but leaving him to show the meaning in M.S. if he likes, not destroy the postscript, for in fact now I do not know where things are. But if you put Cronin out you must not think you have done; you would have Kelly and a good many more besides on your hands. He kept Blackheath in London to have his hand in there. But I still think the Lord is working and for good and am content to leave it all to Him. Lowe is as clear as to the evil as I am and wrote very faithfully to the Cronins.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. D.

CBA 311b

{Date: mid 1879?}

Dearest Brother,

This is all part of the Lord's will and ways with us. I have long felt the state of things and, I think, seen not to the bottom of

them, but at least what was at work, and God is working, I have no doubt. I did nothing till something positive was done and as Cronin wrote to me, went into it fully with him. I wrote little because I object in principle to much meddling of those not directly engaged by being present and because they are in such a state (though it is ever true) that we have to take heed that every word and every act be of God, and we must be near Him and lowly to know it. What makes me write now is to recall to you though you know it, that one must be careful to keep in charity. The heart may revolt at what is dishonest but the wrath of man does not work the righteousness of God, but those who are God's children we ought to think of as such and we shall yearn over them for their good. This does not give indecision but makes us see more clearly what we have to deal with as from God. I feel I have to watch myself in these conflicts. I have more than once asked myself, not in this case, how should I feel in meeting such or such an one at the door of heaven. All I know will be perfect there, but it tests us now. We ought to be able to pray for each one though in view of the whole state of things, not falsifying the state of things, but what characterizes good in God as towards us is that His good is above evil. We have to keep near Him that it may be so, but then it (His presence) sustains us through all. I was very thankful to hear you {take} a little better account of Mrs. Oliphant. Walk in patience doing only what God gives you to do. He is, I doubt not, working and He does things much better than we can. But in patience and letting God act, be as decided in conscience as possible for, I doubt not, Satan is doing his best, nor can I say that anyone has deceived me in the part they have taken. Many I did not know to destroy, by morally undermining it, the testimony of God. Walk in peace, but we must be before God to do it.

Yours affectionately in the Lord,

J. N. D.

I am somewhat overcharged with work (not of the Lord, what He gives, we can do) but well again, for I have been very unwell. But

it is an additional reason for not much communication. But I believe quietness is a great point now.

CBA 315a

{Date: mid 1879?}

Dear Brother,

I am not aware of Diotrephes having gone and deliberately connected himself with meetings outside the body to which he belonged and the unity of the body. Nor even for his tyrannical conduct which was quite another thing. Could you tell me what the apostle would do? But now let me tell you another thing. It is you all who are really in Judgment. A condition of things had grown up amongst a large party of brethren which was infecting the whole; a blindness and in some cases indifference to right and wrong, which it may be, you seem to think so, the brethren could not get rid of. It is possible it might have come to that. God in His great mercy did not allow it. But the way would ere long have become intolerable for honest people. I have seen it going on, I believe near 20 years, but brought it only before God. I have not an unkindly feeling towards Dr. Cronin, quite the contrary, but he it was who *publicly* acted in contempt of everybody in carrying out this system. A body incapable of clearing itself from evil is not a body for an honest man to stay with. It is you that are now tested whether this is true or not: all the reasoning about details is very little to the point. The broad question for me for this two years has been: Is the testimony of God gone or become one which is an underhand destroyer of uprightness. You may try and prove that you could not, had no right to get rid of the evil. Be it so, but you can understand what effect, if you do prove it, that would produce upon me. You may ask me what are you going to do. I answer: nothing, save pray to God. I am away. Things are done before I hear of them. After full correspondence with Dr. Cronin, I did what cleared my own conscience. Now, Dr. Cronin is out; that though a sorrowful one is a relief as to the

circumstances: so far it was not the act of the assembly. If my conscience is called to act again, I shall, with God's grace and help, act. But my place now is to wait for God to act and to see what you all will do. It is possible you may say, and such has been the language of the abettors of the evil, we do not see it to be such. But this only shows that the blindness I think is {alarming} . . . Both your questions show that you do not weigh your questions by scriptures held with God, but I have answered them; but as you returned to the charge, I have told you what for me is the question which God, and, I fully trust, in grace, and not Kennington, will decide.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

Do not suppose I have an unkindly feeling. I have none towards any but as you thought well to put questions to me I have given you my plain answer and really in kindness to you and if I give no advice the question is can you clear *yourselves* from evil, but poor dear Dr. Cronin, he is outside. Since I wrote this, I have heard he withdraws his withdrawal. I do not understand brethren wheeling out and wheeling in again at their pleasure. It makes an assembly a farce not a place where Christ is. But I have nothing to say. I hope it may all turn to good. It certainly will to those who love God. It must be remembered he gave up Brethrenism. Is that withdrawn? My conviction is, in which I should most gladly be mistaken, that he had given it up a long while ago. But I leave it where I find it, hoping it may be all right to act on my conscience when my conscience by the word of God calls on me to act with God's right and help. At any rate this return shows the *peremptory necessity* of having a definite act of the assembly whatever is done.

CBA 315b

{Date: mid 1879?}

In the first place the statement is all a mistake. They must be

naturalized first, not married and naturalized. That is, wholly cease to be English subjects and then married as Swiss. But if they be not *first* Swiss subjects, the marriage is never good in this country. Without this the marriage is against the Swiss law too which positively forbids marriages where they are not legal in the country they come from though this is constantly evaded in Neuchatel and Geneva. Perhaps in Vaud, but I do not know. If they are naturalized, they are Swiss, not English, and subject to the military service which all in Switzerland have to go through.

I am cognizant of the Glasgow case and those concerned are, I believe, in a really healthful state of soul about it. Having been written to by another as to it, I answered that I hoped they would not be in a hurry because having been married in Church, it is not clear whether they are not *bonâ fide* married already and a Swiss marriage would be denying their English one. The great difference depends on what follows.

To be married at the registry, you must take oath there is nothing unlawful. Unless the cases of Bassingstoke and Plymouth, in all the cases the persons have been either rejected, or if in communion put out, simply and solely on the ground of the false oath. In Ryde, it was not for the marriage Cook was put out at all. Of this there is no possible question. Bassingstoke's case I do not know how it was done. In Plymouth, the circular of the gathering in Ryde awoke the conscience of one who was in the equivocal position, and they were exercised in their own conscience and withdrew. What was done thereon, I know not. At Blackheath the person who had been asked to sit back (who had been married according to the proposed Swiss marriages) and being moved to do so and {I} have been told he withdrew from communion and was then declared to be no longer in fellowship. Before that they had not come to any conclusion.

In no respect does the paper represent the opinion of brethren generally. They have never had the subject before them. Exercised they may have been since the hubbub at Ryde. As to London, the subject has never been before brethren. Many have

been refused or put out at the time of their marriage on account of the false oath. In the only case which was at Blackheath a very strong one as it was done two months after his wife's death, in spite of the strongest remonstrances of brethren, he was never put out, but asked to sit aside on his return from his marriage in Switzerland, and subsequently withdrew.

The Tuesday meeting you refer to had nothing to do with the question at all. Anstey mentioned that he had received a person from the Ryde meeting, but had been rated for doing so. I said he was quite right in receiving for without judging the Ryde case at all he had no right to reject a person coming duly recommended from a gathering which has never been rejected by Brethren. Mr. Kelly then made a very long speech against the Ryde meeting, the main point of which was not founded in fact. Discussion arose as to Ryde but the question of the validity of such a marriage before God never came up at all. I abhor such marriages. And it seems to me that each case must be treated on its own merits. I believe God is interposing in mercy in a most knotty and painful question. But of this people may be assured, that a Swiss marriage does not set aside the laws of England unless they give up being Englishmen first and become wholly and permanently Swiss. I am quite aware that they evade the law, paying in Neuchatel £5. There is a different arrangement in Geneva to effect it. The terms of the Swiss law are these:

“If the intended husband is a stranger to Switzerland the publication (of the purposed marriage) is made only on the presentation of a declaration of the foreign authorities competent, establishing that the marriage will be recognized with all its legal consequences. The Cantonal government is authorized to dispense with this formality and to admit, on failure of the required declaration and the sufficient justification.”

This last clause opens the door to evading the first. But such marriage is not in any case recognized in England. It is by fraudulent practices in the local cantorial jurisdiction founded on “sufficient” that the marriage is celebrated and the general law

evaded. At Geneva a man has a house on purpose, sells it to the bridegroom, who as soon as married sells it back again. In Neuchâtel, they take a house and pay the taxes for a year. But this does not make it a marriage in England, only satisfied the authorities there. There is a company in England to take the needed steps. But to have the marriage good in England, they must have ceased to be English and be naturalized Swiss subjects. The question whether they are married before God is untouched by this and each case would have to be gone into. Dr. Rossier, moreover, knows nothing of English law. That they will marry in Switzerland without asking any questions, I have long known. I have copied (translated) from the Swiss law lying before me. My experience is that you would not find two brethren agreed as to what would be right before God. I have no doubt in each case God will guide brethren before the Lord if they wait upon Him. In every case till now the false oath was the ground which was acted on. At Blackheath, they could not decide what to do.

You have, dear Brother, above my reply as to the facts and law of the case. Save that by the law of England 4th or 5th of William IVth all such marriages are absolutely null and void. The validity of the Alexander's marriage depends partly on a judgment formed on the force of a {refrain} in an English prayer book. It is unequivocally legally void, but before God, I doubt it much. I hate such marriages, and they were not acting before God at the time: she was converted; he not; but it is very easy to separate other people and if they are not man and wife before God, they ought to separate or provide somehow but it is a very serious matter. I quite agree you must not confound the sin and its consequences, but unless they . . .

If they were never married at all, they might for the Lord and the brethren's sake give up every English {tie} and make it a marriage now. But these Swiss frauds is {sic} not the way to do that.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

CBA 318

{Date: mid 1879?}

L--- , on my way

My dear Brother,

I cannot write much but as you ask me to write, I must write plainly. I earnestly desire peace, but your act of reading out I do not the least accept as a valid act of an assembly of God. It bears on the face of it an untruth, when your own statement is read. It is an attempt to cover a violent party act with the color of the godly discipline of God's house. It was not a "usual assembly". More than half, two thirds, of the assembly had left and when some had returned it was little more than perhaps . . . half. Not only that but the assembly as such had been broken up and the previous Lord's day those who did not go out had not broken bread at all. To say, therefore, the usual assembly was not true. The pretension to read out only the leaders is a poor color which hides half the assembly, and those whom you admit, at any rate the chief leader, to be a most godly person, being read out by the other half as if you were the whole. You had no title to judge their particular right more than the rest, but that would have betrayed the fact that half the assembly was outside of you. And who can tell me that it is the godly ones who remain? If there was haste in the 60 leaving, there was far worse haste in the remnant of the assembly reading them out. Your act is to me merely the sin of cloaking a violent party measure with the holy name of the discipline of God's house. *You* have no ground at all to stand on. You were not at the assembly: you tell me yourself and there was . . . no conscience of your own in the matter on your own showing. You admit that personally you did not know what to do. Nobody that I know of thinks the sending out the first Park Street notice a wise or right thing. I more than doubt it was really the act of the assembly though I have heard it was mentioned to them, but talking of

independency is all nonsense. No one thought of independency. And the only part of Park Street's notice which looked like it and which many objected to in London was not accepted by those who went out at Ramsgate. But in London no one had such a thought. It is a got up charge for, on the face of it, it was on the part of those who went out, identifying themselves with London as one. I find the same charge got up at Broadstairs. When Kennington had refused to act, the gatherings in London had to act each for itself, or continue connected with evil and a great many did and more were prepared to do. When at last Kennington did act and {the} partial acting was needless or fell to the ground. In sending out their notice Park Street or those who sent it out went beyond this, but that is past. I have other evidence to my mind that it is a party act, but I take Ramsgate by itself. And to me it is so far from an act of God's assembly that were I at Ramsgate it would entirely prevent my going to the meeting which, if it be the meeting's act, have done it. But this and other acts have revealed a state of things in the Kent meetings which not party measures but God's grace alone can remedy. With this London has directly nothing to do; as to its actings indirectly, it may by persons coming up to London. But I trust God for His grace to heal in Kent as He has united in London in great mercy in that which publicly made their difficulty. The question in Kent is not the source directly as in London, but it needs God's healing grace as that did.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,
J. N. D.

CBA 321

{Date: mid 1879?}

The brethren still meeting at Kennington having acted and excluded Dr. Cronin, the ground of the notice of Aug. is taken away, and while fully maintaining, as we do, our judgment as to

the evil which gave occasion to it, the notice itself falls to the ground.

It appears that the form has given occasion to some to allege that we have taken independent ground. Writing to say we had not, nor have, any such thought, the refusal of those of Kennington to act forced us as it did other gatherings to clear ourselves from connection with the evil. This is all we sought.

We cannot but regret that there is nothing in the notice from the brethren assembling at Kennington which might express sorrow at having by long delay in doing what they now see to be right been the cause of months of distress and trouble to saints among themselves and in all London. [But Dr. C. being put out, we trust that God in His own way may in grace now bring peace in righteousness at Kennington and minister to union and unity in all London.] In all that may arise or call for judgment, we trust we may be enabled to follow the Lord's guidance in concert with brethren.

CBA 326

{Date: mid 1879?}

chez Monsieur Lafaurie
au Buisson
par les Ollieres
Ardèche
France

My dear Brother,

I am anxious that the brethren who left Kennington should not think that they were not seriously taken into account in the matter of Kennington and Dr. Cronin. You know that the notice from Kennington was sent back that they might confer with you, thus recognizing you. This, if it was not in the most gracious manner, they did and (though as Mr. Oliphant told me you had

resolved to go) you refused to meet them. This obliged brethren to take up the Kennington notice as it stood, which no longer concerned the state of Kennington, but all London. It was London, on the proposition of Kennington, declaring the Dr. out of communion. You had refused to go, and it was then a question of London's holding Dr. Cronin to be outside. Up to that, they had always dealt with Kennington as such when going obstinately wrong, and it would have been strange to refuse their act the first time they went right. For my part it weighed with me and I doubt not with others also that morally you came in to give weight to the decision, for you had purged the evil, and they up to a certain point were acquiescing with you. So that the judgment of those that remained was really backed by that of some 60 others though they did not outwardly join, and this, I avow, to me was of very great importance. You know that some thought you precipitate in leaving (of that I do not judge, for had I been at Kennington, I know not how long I should have been able to stay myself). I have the fullest sense of the evil that drove you out, perhaps stronger than you have yourselves. But the question was whether *London* should reject the proposition to declare Dr. C. out because 17 brethren at Kennington who thought he ought to be out, declined meeting those who now proposed to hold him so. This could hardly be rightly done; leaving him still in, and all in confusion. I wrote strongly to Dodd as to their way of acting. Nobody, I think, liked their notice, but as a public act concerning all, the poor Doctor is outside, at least all I heard of in London had accepted the notice and a public act of this kind has great importance in God's sight. Locally they have acknowledged they could get no good of the Dr. and what are called the moral charges are outstanding, expressly so, if he seeks to be restored; I trust the Lord will guide you locally in your relations with these brethren and that you may be enabled to act in grace without compromising in anything your judgment of the evil, remembering that what you sought, namely that the Dr. should be outside, is attained. I have not a thought of ill will to the Dr. in my mind, but the judgment of right and wrong must be

maintained.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

{copy}

CBA 135

{Date: mid 1879??}

I beg all my beloved brethren to see what matters are brought to now. Dr. Cronin declares Mr. F. is mad and insupportably clerical, and Mr. F. has broken with Dr. Cronin. Some three weeks before Dr. Cronin alleged what he has since insisted on that he was led by the Holy Ghost in a special way to associate himself with this same person whom he now pronounces mad and insupportable. Is it not to make the solemn and holy things of God contemptible and this pretension to be so led still worse? The course of Dr. Cronin but still more this pretension to be so led and I add for it is no time for compliments, the course and acts of those who supported him in his self-delusion and an utter want of spiritual judgment. The allegation of tender care of Christ's poor deserted sheep and special divine leading is nothing but the vulgar party spirit which has long sought and still seeks to put down an assembly offensive to the individual. I have not an unkindly feeling towards any, but the testimony of God has to be vindicated from such things, and it is impossible for any one having his spiritual sense awake not to see the contemptibleness but mischievous delusion of the whole thing.

J. N. D.

Since this was written and ready to be sent off, I hear that Kennington has shamed Dr. Cronin and rejects communion with the Masonic Hall. I look at this as a gracious intervention of God and thank Him with all my heart for it.

CBA 133

{Date: mid 1879?}

My dear Brother,

I am not quite sure whether I am right in sending what you wish but the postscript is so innocent a morsel that I suppose I may. I doubt because the whole thing has been withdrawn. I sent it originally to be circulated among brethren. There was then delay and I used it to ask them to let it alone as to printing, but show it to any brothers. What you have seen I suppose, but which I have not, was then printed and subsequently the circulation stopped and I wrote to say that was all right. It had lost its opportuneness. The postscript was tacked on at the moment of sending it, referring to news we then had which after all were premature and in this sense not true. It was as I felt, the brethren, as I said to you, were being tested as to plain judgment of good and evil, to express my satisfaction that they had gone at any rate so far as to repudiate communion with Masonic Hall. If Dr. C. had gone after that, it would have put the meeting in the necessity of doing some thing. At present all is changed and I send it that you may not think there is any great secret in it. The Kennington brethren wrote to me since and I replied fully to them. When I believed what the postscript refers to to be true, I hoped God was arousing the conscience of the Kennington brethren. The information was after all incorrect. The postscript is as follows:

“Since this was written and ready to be sent off, I hear that Kennington has {shamed?} Dr. Cronin and rejects communion with Masonic Hall. I look at this as a gracious intervention of God and thank Him with all my heart for it.”

But the above lines were not written for Kennington particularly but for the matter itself as concerning all the brethren and the glory of God itself so that I still send it out.

I still see the question not to be merely one of Kennington discipline, but whether brethren are to be a testimony of godliness or that the highest truths can go on with what is ungodly. With

the public discipline I did not nor could not interfere. As I have said, things were done before I heard of them just as here what I heard was incorrect and I heard very little; but not to walk acquiescing in ungodliness is a settled point. What I was thankful for was that I trusted God was come in to arouse conscience.

I judge pretty much as I did then though the information was incorrect. But I think my sense of the evil is deeper. But I trust God is working.

Not Sent.

CBA 24

{This letter is similar in content to JND *Letters* 3:10, dated 8-26-1879}

To Burbidge

My dear Brother,

I am much obliged to you for writing to me. My personal recollections are only of the kindest intercourse and the tone of your letter leads me to speak openly with a desire from which I have not . . . though . . . and grace may . . . I have answered letters from Kent but have had absolutely nothing to do with the course pursued anywhere there. I thought and I think the sending out the Park Street's first notice a great mistake. I know of any but one that does not. Save in the very last meeting at Cheapside and the second Park St. notice, I never went to any meeting {at that} time. I was at Pau. The questions lay deeper with me than any local discipline and I gave my testimony and then cast all on the Lord. As regards the first notice of Park St. (not the sending it out), it must be remembered that after months of waiting those who acted at Kennington had declared formally they could not go any further. Their first notice that Dr. C. was out was not refused at Cheapside but given back to them that they might communicate with a very large body who had left. These refused

to meet them about it and then their notice was put in the paper to go round to all London as it did. Kennington's long refusal to act had forced a very large number of the gatherings in London. . .to be mixed up with what they thought evil or to act for themselves and they had declared Dr. C. was out and others were prepared to do so. He being in immediate connection with Kennington, the initiative belonged to them, but they would not act, and this threw each local gathering on its own responsibility. Park St. was not the first in that and for the public common act they still waited on Kennington. But the first notice was not resolved on till Kennington had declared they could go no further. But though other saints (i.e., not of Park St. habitually) were invited, it did not meet as London. Indeed, some of these strangers were stopped when they objected as they did to the third paragraph which was quite logical but seemed to break with London, which however it was declared they had no thought of doing. I say logical because if Kennington came to Cheapside and they had the rest of their resolution, {it} had no sense but I was not at the meeting and had nothing to do with it, only had a hand in its being dropped the next Lord's day. But nothing pretended to be London's act til the Kennington notice had gone in to London. . . this as applying to the question of London and London so-called. And now as to Kent in fact, I have not meddled save in replying plainly when written to, once when {visited ?} partly because all through I felt the whole matter had to be left to God whether he would deign to preserve the testimony, or no, and confirmed by my being ignorant how far those who rejected the seceders were thoroughly clear from an evil, from which I should separate if there were no other remedy which I trust through grace there is. Had I been assured that those who have acted with you, being decided in Cronin's matter, I should very likely have written to you for it came into my mind. But further, dear brother, the ground had been, and I believe a good while, prepared for division. I speak all plainly to you here. I avow distinctly that I am too ignorant of facts to pretend to form any judgment and I have been very little indeed in Kent. I refer to it as bearing on the

state of things, but there was an impression in a considerable class that since your school began at Broadstairs, the world had gained considerably on the whole state of things and seaside places are always specially liable to this influence and with those with whom you were more closely associated, another class had little cordial communion. Thus disposed, it was not merely London by itself but a door opened for a long active tendency to show itself openly.

I desire that restoration of peace heartily but as God's work with no lowering of conscience. This in the present state of the brethren is essential. I do not think the exclusion at Ramsgate was a matter of conscience. I had nothing to do with the secession, the breaking of bread or the ceasing to break bread. But I do not admit the action of the smaller part of an assembly shutting out the larger part when they themselves had ceased to break bread for a Sunday (for talking of only shutting out the leaders only made the matter worse) was the action of an assembly of God at their usual meeting. And there were other influences at work and no dealing that I can learn with them excluded who were confessedly as a body, godly people. I do not accept it as an action of God's assembly putting out a wicked person. Next at Faversham, the only statement is, first that they accepted (not London) but Park Street whereas at Kennington who had then refused to do any more as to Dr. Cronin and that they have no fellowship with those who had, and then when London (not Park St.) had accepted the action of those at Kennington they withdrew this as Park Street did. If you had broken with this evil, their notice did unhappily to you. You call it an excommunication of them at Herne Bay and cutting them off from fellowship. In your letter to me you tell me you never had a thought of re-opening fellowship to them. I understand both at Broadstairs and Ramsgate they own haste, but not evil. I do not judge any or anything (except the act of excommunication at Ramsgate) nor do I approve any act save that in answering one at Faversham, I said in withdrawing their notice, they had done what was needed.

Only you will remark in your joint letter to Faversham you put yourselves into the class of them who had communion with Kennington as refusing to exclude Dr. C. for that was the express ground of the notice of Park St. which Faversham accept and ground their action on that. The action at Park Street and at more than half the meetings at London was confessedly irregular and Park St. was not the first and that even Dr. Cheatham's private letter to you recognizes to keep themselves clear when Kennington would not act at all. Sending out the notice seemed to me to go beyond this, and the word "this assembly" plainly states the fact that they did so act locally. When those at Kennington acted, then common action could and did take place. I am not here excusing or blaming but clearing the facts. Faversham associated themselves with that first as of Park St. and then as of London. When you said you had accepted Kennington's action before they did, you took up the local action of a local assembly of London, and then say London so called. I may have mistaken the force of this, but when you received Kennington's action alone and then spoke of London so called, it was very like ignoring London and putting Kennington on the ground of an independent meeting competent to act for itself. Park Street did not call itself London, nor a dozen or more other meetings who acted from necessity and as testimony to clear themselves. Faversham definitely made the difference. On the other hand, there were, I believe, some though I only have it from hearsay, who took the ground of beginning afresh as individuals. When I answered a letter, I referred to this as ground I rejected, but there were some despaired of getting on sound ground of testimony again. Still action was precipitated by {Congreave ?} defending Dr. C. I say this merely that it be taken into account. It is hurt as to this and the violent action calling itself the usual assembly's action at Ramsgate {that} are what mainly stand in the way of healing in Kent. Confidence may be a work if time and God's grace would produce it if all were humbled before Him. I distinguish . . . assembly action and personal state and this I see in Corinthians, though of course it is to be desired they should go

together. You will understand what I meant by adopting independency. The accepting Kennington's action by itself and their speaking of London so called. I am very thankful you disown it and accept what you say. But it seems to me your ground as to Park St. and Faversham fails as to this point. Look at the two notices of Faversham and see if Park St. and London are not clearly and distinctively put in their place. I quite admit the danger in moments of excitement and heat taking things crooked. I constantly find myself in danger of it, and clearing them up sometimes takes hindrances out of the way. I do not need say much more. I attach great importance to owning, at least prima facie, the action of an assembly bona fide acting in Christ's name, and I fully believe God does. But I cannot own, in the best reflection I can give it, the action of those who met at Ramsgate as the action of an assembly of God exercising its legitimate functions. I look on it as very evil and you will find, I am persuaded, that sober godly Christians will have great difficulty in doing so. I do not say the others were right in leaving. I have left this whole matter in God's hands but being another to try any of them who stayed behind in Ramsgate. I replied as plainly as possible that as an individual I could not. I further add that Herne Bay and other bodies having, as I understand, accepted this judgment of Kennington and London as to Dr. C., that public act is valid to me as a public act, but as a matter of fact, the conviction that they rather favored him is an obstacle to confidence. As far as I can speak now I have no intention to take any active part in what concerns the assemblies in Kent but to leave it to the gracious God who has helped us thus far and will infallibly make all thing work together for good.

. . . {reported?} by those who have seceded that up to the last Dr. Cronin and his actings were defended and justified and that they should be ready to receive him. This does not apply to all. You may remark that your letter states you declined acting on Aug. the 10th and asked for time waiting for London. Now I avow to you that if all the meetings in England were to put me out for it

I would not go where this evil was accepted. It is not for me a question of Dr. Cronin.

Thank God I have not an unfriendly feeling towards him or towards Mr. Kelly or any one I know of. God's testimony and the difference of right and wrong or indifference to it are the question with me. Allow me to remark that the greater part of your letter has mixed up with the general history, has nothing to do with it or . . . us in London we were all just not as much as you. Nor have I heard that there was any. . . when they were. . . their news. Having said this much I turn to some details. I have supposed that God saw Kent needed sifting and so allowed what passed at Park Street more or less to bring it on. For restored peace God might have to go deeper but He is full of mercy to those who love Him.

Your affectionate brother as I trust,
J.N.D.

CBA 4a

{Two copies of documents 4a and 4b exist, in two different handwritings. Some minor differences between them are put in brackets, like this note.}

{Copy of a Conversation between J.N.D. and J. H. Boddy}

37 Tresillian Road, St. John's, London

Aug. 30, -79

Beloved Brother,

After writing my letter this morning I went up to see J.N.D. and he told me he thought that the Park St. gathering in their declaration had been guilty of Independency and {that} unless they agreed with a notice which I will append at the end of this note he would leave Park Street gathering. He was going to read it from the Table tomorrow and at Cheapside this evening.

He maintains that Kennington gathering has put Dr. C. away

and that that affair is ended. Also he maintains that {the} Park St. declaration recognizes Kennington and that Kennington having acted, Dr. C.'s affair is ended.

I told him what we had done at Lewisham and that we were purposing to break bread tomorrow which he strongly advised not so {that} I am in a tremendous condition. I do not want to act in independence and I don't want to be mixed up with sin. I do want to do the Lord's will. I must confess I am greatly perplexed and {that} as far as I {can} see I shall not break bread tomorrow at Rowland's house, but what to do I don't know. Signed J. H. Boddy

To Mr. Jull.

CBA 4b

{Date: after 7 Sept 1879}

{Copy of a Conversation between J. N. Darby and Thomas Aldwinckle}

Mr. Darby sent for me to ask me if I would agree to the paper which he had drawn up, now called the second notice from Park St. I read it in his presence and said I thought I could agree to it. But I asked Mr. D. three questions.

First. Do you consider that the meeting at Park St. on the 19th of August was an Assembly meeting really and truly? Answer: Certainly.

Secondly. Was that declaration properly and fairly arrived at there and then? Answer: Certainly, and no one had any right to object afterwards.

Thirdly. Do you intend by your paper to ignore, overthrow, or deny the principles of that declaration? Answer: Certainly not.

Then I said I can agree to the paper.

The exact words that passed between Mr. Darby and Thomas

Aldwinckle, a Park St. brother.
copied Sept. 7th, 1879

CBA 535a

{Date: 1 Oct 1879}

{The following additions belong to the letter published as *Letters* 3:30.}

{Ellipsis in last paragraph of p. 30:} ; the opening prayer on Saturday {W. S.} was honest and hearty confession,

{First word of paragraph at top of p. 31:} Cronin

{End of paragraph at top of p. 31:} He may break down such an attempt, but otherwise we shall have Cronin raising up a body of his own pretending to be a new testimony for God. I warned Brethren about it long ago, God having removed the Brethren as that which could be shaken.

{The following words are part of *Letters* 3:194, a letter without a date.}

{Insert after the first paragraph:}

I do trust Mr. Miller may get clear, he is as to Abbot's Hill, but Satan has made great efforts by means of those who had to give up A. H. as evil and were sore about it to save their retreat by attacking G. H. But patience and exercise of conscience will do nobody any harm. Nobody defends the first acts of G. H. party --- it was a mistake from false notions and the adversaries in a party spirit profited by it cleverly and without heart and conscience. The attempt now made by Mr. K. and his friends only reacts as a testimony to them, but enough. God has all the rest arranged, I know not how. Three brothers according to the flesh, clergymen, have lately come out, the youngest argued a bit and was preaching for an evangelical society and thus rather inclined

to loose Brethren, but God cleared him as to everything. They are very simple. Two at least have gift.

{Insert after the second paragraph:}

Snell and Stanley visited Mr. Miller, it will be a great trial to him, because he thought himself wise in keeping things at a distance.

CBA 111

{Two handwritten copies of the following letter were compared. Words in square brackets were found in only one copy.}

Oct. 21, 1879

{Received about Oct. 27th/'79}

My dear Brother,

I believe God is sifting Kent as He did London, and we can trust Him. He that has patience and grace will come out of it with His approbation. I cannot doubt that Mr. Burbidge, one whom I have always personally esteemed when I used to see him, seeks to carry things with a high hand, but he is not alone. But there is a [hand higher, or higher hand] than his, and a haughty spirit goes before a fall. I have answered those who wrote to me, but do not intend to meddle voluntarily. It is a kind of effort to avenge their ways having been abortive in London. We have only to do patiently what is right in what is before us, and not go beyond that.

The sending out the first Park [St. or Street] notice was, I think, I believe all think, a mistake, though the notice was abstractedly logical. I can hardly call the sending it out the act of the assembly though it seems to have been mentioned to them. Jull and Field acted I think with haste on it but they were in spirit wearied with what was around them, and which under God's

hand this has brought out. We must wait upon God for clearing it all up, and I do not doubt He will do it. I can only tell you how far I have got individually, I look upon the excommunications of the residue as worse [,and worse] haste than the leaving, a violent party measure sought to be covered by a pretext of discipline, and as they wrote to me, I told them so in my reply. *For myself* I do not own the act as an assembly[’s] act at all. The whole thing was very bad. But I went further[,] and told them at Ramsgate I should not go there in consequence – if I were there. I leave to every conscience their own judgment in this. Faversham I should assuredly receive. How far gatherings can ecclesiastically disown the remnants or Herne Bay[,] I leave to them[,] as I should their receiving those who went out, but personally I should go [in the, or on in] full communion with these last. For one third to shut out two thirds, and hide it under color of excluding the leaders and calling the Assembly the usual Assembly where the breaking [of] bread had been wholly interrupted with them the previous Lord’s day, is dishonest and violent, not God’s judgment in a regular assembly at all.

When Burbidge was in London, he denied there could be any excommunication but delivering to Satan, people must leave if it [is, or was] too bad to stay. His letter to those [out] at Broadstairs is intentional contempt thrown on London, but the only effect with me [of, or on] all this is to leave it to God and pray to Him. Only it is settled that I should receive Faversham and those who are on the same ground, and I should not go to those who have taken [open] part in the act[s] of those who remained at Ramsgate, Broadstairs and Herne Bay. But I do not meddle further. God has helped us hitherto in the path of leaving all to, and casting all on, Him and that I purpose going on with. I trust Him. That it is the power of evil and the enemy I do not doubt. But the state of the Brethren had opened the door to the enemy’s attack. It is a great point not to go faster than God, and in this all have done it, at least the first actors, but God makes all things work together for good to them [who, or that] love Him, and this

is not an exception. Violence will never baffle Him. There is an effort to unsettle and [to] have their counter act, but it does not trouble me. God is above all that. The great point is to be quiet and wait on Him. Act with the gathering[s] if anything arise[s] and consult God, and do nothing before you have His mind. Save in Kent, as far as I know, all is tranquil, save personal efforts in London, and in Kent there was that going on which troubled many saints before this arose and led to it. All this violence will produce nothing, only we must leave it to God. This is very little counsel, but I have told you fully how far I have gone myself.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

{signed} J. N. D.

I think Lowe and Bevir [think and feel, or feel and think] as I do about the matter, and the true character of their summary excommunications.

{To Mr. Keen of Folkestone.}

CBA 193

{Copy}

{To Th. Neatby, 30 Oct., ‘79}

My dear brother,

Seeing a letter from you, my mind was not to answer it, not from any want of respect or kind feeling towards you, but to have done with discussion. One sentence makes me answer it. For it is an astounding letter in that respect. You tell me not to say all is wrong. Now as regards myself (for I say nothing of your views of things, which would be discussion) there is not *one single statement* except the fact that I wrote a letter that is not *entirely untrue*. Your own father-in-law admitted to me that everything had been done to win Dr. Cronin, but that he was so obstinate, it was no use. I give this only as an example, for I am not going to defend myself. I do not doubt you believe them true, but it shows your state of mind: for, I repeat to you, *not one single statement is*

well founded, save the fact that I wrote a letter from Pau. Everyone that I know of felt the sending out the Park Street notice a grave mistake, but all I had to say to it (I was not at the meeting) was to get it practically withdrawn the next week. God is above these things and I have seen His hand in these matters. I am a poor weak creature. I certainly have no confidence in myself but I do not think I ever walked so close with God as in all this matter. At any rate, you should weigh the fact that somehow in a long letter alleging me with all sorts of things, not one of them is true as a fact.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

{signed} J. N. Darby

CBA 304

{Copy}

{To Edward Wooton}

1 Inverness Terr.

Broadstairs, Kent

15 Nov. 1879

My dear Brother,

I was very glad to get your lithographed notice which I showed to our brother Lowe. We both liked its tone and spirit. There were facts too in it which I had heard, but which needed definite certifying from where they took place. My judgment is unchanged. As to the book of meetings, I take no notice of it, as I *always* objected to it altogether. Very convenient, no doubt, but it is a counting up of a company, and as your letter shows is looked at as conferring a kind of authority and representative character, given by whom? Those who are going to a place can easily find out those they seek with a little trouble. Dr. Cronin's name is still in the book, and I knew of a place where there were three, and the order of the names being changed caused the greatest displeasure to the one who was no longer first. But I am sure God is working,

and will bring about the result which He can take pleasure in. I have feared meddling in it. Indeed, from the first, having given a plain testimony, I have only cast the matter on God. And I am thoroughly confident He has acted and will act. I said when in England, when asked if I thought He would give deliverance, yes when He judges the brethren adequately humbled. As regards Kent, which He saw needed sifting and where all went on without my having anything to say to it, I have also left it to God save answering the letters written to me, and I wrote as plainly as possible that as an individual I did not accept their excommunication which I thought a party act, and to Ramsgate that the effect would be to keep me from their meeting were I there. As I said, my judgment is unchanged. I told them also that talking of its being independency was nonsense, but I feel, dear Brother, that God must bring blessing about in His own way. The evil was deeper than mere present circumstances or I might have ventured to write. The only thing I dreaded was some taking the ground of making a fresh start, that all was now individual. In measure it must always be individual. But beginning anew for a fresh testimony apart from what God had raised up was just what Dr. Cronin wanted and attempted to do, and a denial of the one there was. I was long and deeply tried before it broke out, whether I should leave brethren, feeling the state of things long before it broke out, but I felt it would not be faith, and was held through the storm. But God has evidently wrought and is working in rousing brethren, and putting an end to what I long dreaded in many details. He has wrought in Switzerland, in France, in the States, in Canada, and I hear in Ireland, New Zealand, to say nothing of Sweden and Norway, Italy too, and had been giving fresh blessing, since all this in London. I have no doubt through mercy, Kent will partake of it. It is no question with me of being satisfied with Kennington. All I see is when there was not a common judgment and a large body insisted on discipline and left, then those who resisted discipline were obliged to yield and pronounce it themselves. The others had declared their judgment by leaving. My confidence is in God only, and there we can be

assured, if looking to Him in the way of His will. The attacks of those who are unfaithful I have not even read. I believe in God's acting. All I seek is not to go beyond His leading. Nothing that I can conceive of would change my judgment of the action of those who shut you out. That I see clearly in. God, I have no doubt, will bring about blessing. Other gatherings did clearly act on the Park Street notice, Faversham avowedly, Ramsgate partially: they left out the last clause. But my confidence is in God. His government never fails, "though He may bear long with them," and I trust it will be in peace and blessing for all. Accept my thanks, dear Brother, for sending me the letter, and believe me

Affectionately yours in the Lord

J. N. D.

I find so much printing of papers that I must beg you not to give any copy of this written or printed, or extract. You are perfectly free to show it to any one you think desirable, in fact the important parts are long in the hands of the respective gatherings which wrote to me, at least of those who wrote.

CBA 2

127 High Street
Ryde
Isle of Wight
Dec. 26th, 1879

Beloved Brother,

Your question has taken us quite by surprise as we have never had such a thing hinted at, and can scarce think it cannot we always understood from himself and others that he had been with the brethren in London previous to his being received here. He had been much drawn to Mr. Beaumont's preaching and Mr. B. had buried an infant of his. This may possibly have had

something to do with his coming into fellowship – he certainly enjoyed the simplicity of the meeting without any very deep appreciation of the truth of our position which led to his being so easily turned aside by the Fire of persecution – but I find, beloved Brother, I write too freely for should I have stood better. Since being out of fellowship we have understood that he sought fellowship with those who meet {on?} the {loose?} ground and there is reason to believe he was refused – this was not surprising as the principal one in that meeting never rather strongly draws to {the Lord?} and Mr. B. – I mention this as I think possibly it may have been the foundation for what has been asserted. Your kind expression of desiring to hear of our condition, we accept thankfully as part of His grace to Whom be Glory for ever – would that I could say something to refresh your spirit. Alas, our place and condition is a low one. Would that every heart felt as one should and then I believe the Lord would lift us up. I feel that with a *Name to live* is solemn *without Truth*. How deep is my share in the present condition of things in Ryde. I often feel, Beloved Brother, my only true place is with *the four lepers* outside the *City* of {*Famine?*}. May our God in His Mercy bring in those to the praise of *His Grace*. I fear until it is seen and felt, we hinder His Blessed Spirit working in true and acceptable testimony for Him. I fear I may have confused you with this long letter. May the Lord keep you near Himself, Beloved Brother, is the prayer of

yours affectionately in Him,

John Adams

CBA 44

{Date: 1879?}

What you have to get in your mind is this: that you privately and unknown to brethren were trying to ... getting a person into a place where he must have been owned in Christian fellowship or

... that person being informed by nearly all who were involved in it and the whole matter ... to all who had to say to it

Dear Cronin,

I do not intend to make, nor allow you to make, a personal matter of what was a public matter concerning all the brethren, at any rate those conversant with it. I doubted about the word surreptitiously and thought of putting it out, lest it might vex you, but it points to the gravamen of the whole matter. The central action is a private {act of an individual?} . . . though ... meeting which is less known ... of it. As to plotting or speaking of it to others, there is not a word nor an allusion to it in my note. Many felt very strongly indeed about it only had not the openness to tell you the effect it produced upon them. I am assured that if known beforehand, many would not have come to the meetings, and others told me that many would have put their hands behind their back had he come up to them. This, I saw clearly, would have been the case and you had no right to put an assembly met purely for mutual edification into such a position. The brethren who have felt as I speak and stated what I have referred to as to others are plain and gracious brothers who have not a thought or feeling that is unkind towards you. All that knew it, as far as I am aware, had and have a much deeper feeling about the act than you seem to realize even yet, but I do not know one that has an unkindly feeling personally, quite the contrary. They do feel that such like acts destroy confidence and they regret it and its marring the influence you might justly have at your age. And your making it a personal matter with them or me is a great mistake.

My note was written off at once so that I had not even a copy, the time making it urgent. What you have to get before your mind is this that you privately through ... were getting a person, unknown to brethren, into a place where he must ... Christians ...

Affectionately in the Lord, J.N.D.

CBA 66

Dear Gipps,

{1879?}

It was an anxious question with me in London whether I could hold to walk with brethren to be an existing body or not those mistakenly convinced they had the truth of God and who keep it, with Wigram saying I trusted God for I felt it would be the {privilege,} blessing. He said no, it was all over and more besides, referring to the source of {disaster}. I still trust God. I have always been a good deal alone, though thoroughly in heart with them. As to a {given} question, first I think the Finch meeting no meeting of God at all. Every element in it unites in making me utterly reject it. I once wrote to one of Brompton and I told him as distinctly as possible. I wrote to Dr. Cronin, who has written to me, as plainly as I possibly could. Lowe expressed himself as plainly as possible. Those who have supported him are such only, {except} perhaps one, as I should have expected to do so. I cannot say what brethren should do. I object to . . .

. . . for the very difficulty as to them with me is that they have shown such flagrant incapacity to meet evil. But I utterly refuse the whole thing as wickedness. I quite understand the anxiety to put off and wait, of certain parties. I should expect it to make division and anxiety and then have it {undermined }by waiting is a very intelligible process as a hasty measure, but as an individual I should take care and give the plainest testimony I could of my utter rejection of that meeting and every one who connects himself with it. But I still believe the Lord will show His gracious hand and raise . . . there. I have been quite happy. The real difficulty is the state of those who ought to judge and that God is trying them about {it.} I, God helping, shall not give up any principle nor recognize in any way the contempt in heart and conscience of everything that ought to have acted on either displayed in this matter, nor those who have taken part in it. I repeat, the difficulty is the failure in moral {discernment} which would judge such an act at once. My . . . is what what has tried me before even the . . . I should not go to . . .

{The following sentences are crossed out: . . . Nor should I individually do any thing afresh, would . . . him. I dare say they have no wish I should but they may find that God will decide between me and them. It has long been the case with all the Cronin party here. He lately had come round personally as to this.}

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

The real question is whether that party are so to demoralize brethren as to annul their testimony, or whether they are to submit. The question with me before I left London was whether they *had* rather begged him to let Adams know.

CBA 289

{to Dr. C. Wolston, 1879}

My dear Brother,

I took the trouble to enquire into the case you put to me as to those gone out at Broadstairs. What you had heard was not true. In the present state of brethren, I believe nothing till I know it and then I enquire whether I really know it. In the account sent to me there was added a statement that you had said to this sister that it was well she did not go, as you would not have received her at Croydon if she had. Is that true? I should regret it. In the first place, you must remember you cannot individually decide. I had nothing to do with their leaving and received with . . . the statement that they had. But there was conscience if there was haste on the other side. I do not see any in what I have known of it, nor should I certainly go with them. I ask no judgment of anyone as to it. I leave it in God's hands. But this would have been judging very decidedly and, I believe, without any real knowledge of the case. I fear if the assembly at Croydon had rejected this person for having gone, I should have gone out with

her, not to judge anything nor reject Croydon abstractedly but not to judge a case which I decline judging. Had I been forced when they broke bread being there to decide, I should very likely have gone provisionally with those outside but am glad not to have anything to say to it.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

CBA 134

{Date: 1879?}

. . . does, there is a short means of bringing that to an issue . . . But this leads me a step further: I am away from the scene, I am not an assembly to exercise discipline, and as I have said not externally connected with the gatherings in England. The Lord's work having carried me out of it, so that I could not take part in present corporate action, done often before I hear of it, indeed I have scarcely heard of it at all. But I can be personally subject to the word. And my present relationship with Dr. Cronin is on the ground of Rom. 16:17 and 2 Thess. 3:14,15. But I add more: this whole Ryde affair has brought out a want of uprightness fostered where not acted in by those who have put themselves forward in the forefront so as to affect the testimony and its allowance before God. I speak of Ryde as the occasion of bringing it out and . . . of spiritual demoralization, worldliness, want of confidence, and power to meet evil. There is no hope for myself but grace, and divine righteousness now. But all true Christians own that this grace, if real, produces practical righteousness. I believe fully the testimony of God is with brethren. I do not doubt that there are very many more excellent in God's sight than myself, but in a public testimony it is not simply a question of individuals, if as a body want of uprightness is acquiesced in, God is full of patience, but the testimony is in jeopardy and I am satisfied this is the case with brethren now. I act in the particular case which actually has come before me for my own conscience but I profit by the

occasion to communicate what has long been on my heart.

It may be alleged in the particular case that what I have spoken is not wilful but blindness in Dr. Cronin. I am quite ready to receive this explanation. But if the blind lead the blind. And {it is a} question which reaches to the whole condition of brethren and faithfulness before God.

CBA 136

{Date: 1879}

Though absent from the scene of brethren's anxieties, I take the same part in them as if on the spot, though I have refrained from any manifestation of view or opinion save to Dr. Cronin himself, who indeed had written to me about it, till the path in which he had walked had become a matter of obstinate determination and wide spread anxiety. It is not now my intention to go into general questions. I am not connected externally with any English gathering though with all in the unity of the Spirit and though I have strong feelings I shall refrain as much as possible from expressing them and confine myself to facts and a very brief appreciation of them. A clergyman left the establishment. Humanly speaking he was perfectly free to be an independent if he pleased or an independent baptist. I might think him wrong but should receive him cordially as a member of Christ as I should any other. He began a meeting at Ryde of his own with some who left the establishment with him, Temperance Hall being in existence. He wrote --- it is widely stated under the advice of others, of the exactness of which I cannot speak --- to communicate to the gatherings in the Island what he had done possibly to others. I received a copy of this circular myself. He received an answer from brethren in the island, blaming him severely for what he had done, declining communion with him, and saying they recognized a meeting already in existence at Ryde. This is known to all immediately concerned in the matter. I notice it as the basis of what follows.

Dr. Cronin went down clandestinely to Ryde knowing perfectly that brethren were all against what he was doing, save some perhaps who had not, he thinks, the courage to say what they thought. He went on the ground that it was notorious that there was no meeting at Ryde, whereas it was notorious that many and very many brethren quite as upright as himself held distinctly there was, persons easy to be named. Not only so, the question of Ryde was raised at the London monthly meeting by Mr. Anstey's stating that he had received one from that meeting and had been blamed by another for it. I got up at the time and said he was quite right as without pretending to decide the merits of the case, the meeting had never been disowned by brethren and he had no right to refuse the person on his private opinion. And then Mr. McAdam and others defended their cause. Mr. Kelly having spoken nearly the whole time of the meeting to prove they ought not to be owned, a pretty plain proof that it was not the case yet. The ground on which Dr. Cronin went was a falsehood. He may have thought the meeting at T H. ought not to be owned, but that was another matter. It was not true, and publicly so. But this was not all: brethren gathered in the island had written to Mr. Finch rejecting his meeting because there was another. Dr. Cronin may, of course, think his private opinion worth more than anybody else's, and care nothing for everyone being against his act. But this does not alter facts. The ground he went upon was not true as a fact, it was a falsehood, and a perfect contempt of the weak neighboring brethren whose judgment had been openly expressed. But I do not reckon the enormous self-sufficiency of this. It was not true.

The next thing was that he went down clandestinely, knowing, and because he knew, that all would be opposed to his doing so, professes to change the ground of Mr. Finch's meeting, but breaks bread in their room (private, I believe) with the same people who met before with, I believe, some of the party seceding from the old meeting, at any rate proposing them. The changes agreed to were that each person admitted should be proposed to

the assembly, and that Mr. Finch should be in intercommunion with other brethren. Now this was flagrantly dishonest. He alleged they were to be in intercommunion, but he knew perfectly well, avows it, that brethren as a body refused to be so, and not only this but Mr. Finch had already applied to be so and had been refused so that the falsely pretended change had no ground, nor could it even as the most hollow pretext be alleged that the change of the principle of Mr. Finch's meeting changed the matter because the Island letter to Mr. Finch took the ground of there being a meeting which was not changed at all, and to talk of intercommunion where he kept his going secret because he knew there was not was a dishonest transaction. Lastly, Dr. Cronin takes the ground of being led by the Holy Ghost and a kind of small private inspiration to go and do it. I know this is not true. But, at any rate, private inspiration to do clandestinely what was founded on what was not true and carried out dishonestly is profanity. The course of Dr. Cronin has been clandestine, untruthful, dishonest, and profane. My first statement as to the Island is the common property of all and Dr. Cronin cannot deny the truth of the rest of what I have . . .

CBA 175

{Date: 1879}

Chez Mons Lafaurie
au Buisson
par les Ollieres
Ardèche
France

My dear brother,

I trace with pretty sure conviction another hand than that of those who have signed it in the paper you have sent me. But this is of no great consequence. It is not true. It was not the usual meeting of the assembly. I think, I believe, every one thinks that

the sending out the first notice in Park Street was a mistake. The second was sent out only because the sending out the first made it necessary. Further, I see no sense of the evil in the notice that gave occasion to all this trouble, but a pretentious assumption of place which they have not got. I should pay no attention to it whatever. Had they remained in lowliness, I should have, at any rate, felt for them. They having sent out this notice, I should not go near them were I there. I look upon their act as a mere pretentious untruth. But the state of things will call for patience on your part, as all seems to be in confusion at Ramsgate, and you may have to wait longer from having been in a hurry. But God, if you have patience and wait on Him, will set all straight. But I do not recognize the smallest force in the notice: it is merely fleshly plan and neither grace nor righteousness. Who is Brunker? But I recommend to you patient grace.

Your affectionate Brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

I have shown my letter to Mr. {Guir?} and he agrees with it.

All I can advise is that you should look to the Lord. He has means at His disposal which we are ignorant of. Kennington was not yet judged by London when they came down thence, though a number of gatherings had judged Cronin to be as a present fact outside, but I do not recognize it as the solemn ban of the Church upon you at all – not for a moment, but I repeat, you must have patience. I have only now got your letter. I do not know if it will arrive before Lord's day.

CBA 176

{Date: 1879?}

Chez Mr. Fayard
Au Kiore
Commince de Voy

par Tense
Haute Loire, France

Dear McAdam,

The affairs of Ramsgate have pressed upon my spirit. Milward wrote to me and I replied to him. I send a copy of my reply. But the act of those who have recommenced to meet seems to me to be very bad. Those who went away with Jull as led, on the first notice of Park St. except the rejection of Cheapside, the sending out of which no one, I believe, thought wise, even where they agreed in the judgment of the rest, since it put Park St. itself out of its place. I am ignorant of the details or intercourse with those who remained with those who went out, so that I offer no judgment on their going out or on their discontinuing their breaking of bread when the second notice came out. But the act of those who have begun again seems to me a mocking of the discipline of the house of God. You will see herewith their notice. It is a false statement. They had ceased right or wrong to break bread and he says were shut up, the majority having left. They began again, and then as if nothing had happened . . . “the usual assembly” declare out of fellowship a whole list of men (not women) who were outside them already by their own act and the only ones who then broke bread. Some it appears had gone back to them. But such an act as this is stamped with untruth and pretension, and for my part I cannot . . . reckon it as the act of an assembly of God acting by the Holy Ghost. It is a poor effort of imitation of the judgment of Cronin in the case of Ryde, and a very poor one. I suggest nothing as to any action, but it may affect London as there is so much communication between Ramsgate and London. Perhaps, it has already taken place. I only apprise you of my judgment that I cannot own such action as the true action of an assembly of God and that in the face of their own acts, with the fact that they had ceased to break bread, and the place is as shut up. London cannot act on Ramsgate, but brethren can act for themselves as regards Ramsgate or a number {of} meetings there. We have had good meetings all round these

parts. I have . . . Pau Monday, D.V.

Affectionately yours,
J. N. D.

CBA 90

{Date: 1879?}

Chz. Mr. Schlumberger

Pau

Bapes Pyrenees

France

Dear Sir,

I am not much used to the things of this world, but it seems strange that, writing as a solicitor, there is no trace of the person on whose behalf you write, save the expression, “one of the brethren at Ryde has called my attention.” I might request more. But my place as a Christian is to answer in all meekness. As regards the smaller and second paper, beginning “I beg all my beloved brethren,” which I have never seen in print, it was not printed by any authority at all. Nor indeed did I say anything there of Mr. Finch but merely repeat what others said of him with a wholly different effect. Mr. Finch wrote to the person who had it printed who informed me that he had thereupon withdrawn it. As to the first, I am glad to have an opportunity of saying that I object entirely to attacking any Christian before the world. And that I did everything I possibly could, being absent in this country that this should not have been the case but reach those called brethren only. It has not only never been published or sold, but has not been at brethren’s booksellers, but was printed privately and put into the hands of an individual whose discretion I could trust that none might get it but these brethren and given to such individually. It was printed because it was impossible to copy it in writing for so many. Who has sent it out elsewhere, if it be

going out, I know not. My directions were as definite as possible. The copy was sent me for I have been this six months in France. I have done the opposite to publishing it. I should be sorry to injure Dr. Cronin or Mr. Finch. For the rest I must leave all to God.

Yours truly in the Lord, J. N. Darby

Since writing the above I have heard that my letter not to print the paper first mentioned above arrived too late to act on but it has been long withdrawn as stated. I am glad my attention was drawn to it.

CBA 119

{Copy, 2-1-1880}

Dearest Brother, {to Jull}

I have not volunteered in writing, not from want of interest, but that I felt the Lord was dealing in government and one must leave it in His hands. I was very thankful to hear that you had made the proposal to meet one Tuesday, not breaking bread and then start afresh. We did sorrow at your trial in a something similar case. It showed at least desire of reunion. I showed your letter to Lowe and Bevir, both fine and sober in judgment. They both desired that you might defer breaking bread, both having fully judged the ways of the others at Ramsgate. I have never accepted and do not accept their exclusion of those who went out, nor have I any thought of owning it at all. It is a settled point with me so that I do not think more about it. But this makes me more disposed and able to have patience but I leave it, as I have all through, to God's guidance, only I thought I ought to communicate to you their feeling and there is no hesitancy in their judgment of where the evil is or how great it was. They went at Broadstairs back with the fullest statement that they went back on the ground that the others wholly rejected Dr. C. and all other want of faithfulness in discipline. We have just heard that Biava

is gone to the Lord. I still say trust quietly in the Lord. I do not think so badly of things though they are going through an effort to keep up trouble but there was a want of waiting on the Lord. I showed this to Lowe and Bevir (except line 7 from bottom other side {i.e., "both fine and sober in judgment"}) and they said it was all right and volunteered in saying I hope they will wait. It is now Friday night so I only said that we cannot tell or act in: they may have done it. May the Lord guide you.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. D.

CBA 535b

20 May 1880

Dearest Oliphant,

I trust Mrs. Oliphant may be spared to you and her children yet a while if God allow it by her sojourn on the seacoast. But all is in His hands and He does all things well. It is a comfort to put all in His hands and trust His perfect love. Hooton has some house or relative at Broadstairs and so far has an excuse, but I regret his meddling in Kent affairs. He left Hazleville, which was perfectly sound, on high ground, and went back {greatly}, lost his weight there. The recklessness of some is not a sign of faith, if there had been more waiting on God and less writing and printing, I believe God, it would have been settled now in Kent. I have acted as to Cheapside on what I said in my letter, seeking to persuade no one and God has brought things on farther a good deal than I could have hoped. It must not be forgotten that there were two parties in Kent in pretty open conflict before this and which has shown itself in this. Of the conduct of the excluders both at Canterbury and at Ramsgate, I have never had a second thought. And while the state of brethren disables them from dealing in discipline with positive evil, God is gradually manifesting it in its true character so that it should get its moral place. I have felt this all along. The precipitancy in going out of

those that were in principle right was not faith, and many sober minds felt this as to them. I think I have a deeper feeling than they have as to the evil, but I trust God in spite of it, but it is very painful when it comes to say in spite of them, but I do. All these conflicts bring what in itself is very sad, these persons who oppose will evidence as they really are and their influence is annulled. As to many being under evil influence in the five meetings, it is a fact I have long been familiar with, but what have they done? Von Poseck has his own affairs at Lewisham. Horner and Owen are, if it were needed, better known, Coulter too, and what is the bearing of all this on Mr. K.? It is all very sad. I had not the smallest idea how my proposal would work. I did it because I felt it to be right and truth.

{The remainder of this letter is to be found in *Letters* 3:88}

CBA 535c

June, 1880

My dear Brother,

I have no recollection of ever having said anything of the kind. I cannot make myself answerable for reports of this kind, 9/10ths of which are false or misrepresented. At any rate, I think you perfectly right in speaking to those who were doing it. I look at all that is going on of that kind as the want of principle which was going on and made me so decided. I do not charge Dodd with any untruth, I may have (though I have not the most distant recollection of it) spoken lightly of old sisters personally habituées of his tea table, and there were; surely if I did, at any rate it was wrong. But as I have said, I have nothing of the kind on my memory and I do not think the language like mine. I have had no knowledge of the Croydon invitations. I doubted and expressed my doubt as to having it there as likely to raise these questions, but God has ordered it: His name be praised for it all, these movements and not man's wisdom. . . . I had to stop to go to our reading meeting and indeed have no more to say. It is well

and specially just now to rise above weakness and inconsistency in hope of restoring souls. Keeping oneself pure. I have ever felt that Christianity works by what it brings, not by what it finds. Matters are too grave with me to stop at details of people where my own conscience is not engaged. But God is evidently working on and bringing people into evidence where they are. And there is much to thank God for.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

CBA 1

{A different handwriting adds: "1880?"}

Sundon Villa

Selsdon Road

Croydon

Sep. 28th

My dear Mr. Darby,

Forgive me, but may I ask you to help me? You know we broke bread at Ramsgate and consequently have not been received here. We are shortly to return home and I am so troubled and uncertain as to what is the right step to take. I say "I" because Papa is an invalid and goes to no meetings; and now Mama is ill and not likely to be out, so I am alone, to act alone. What ought I to do? If you only will tell me, remembering that I am ignorant and young, and it is *so* hard to know what to do in these difficult times. I thought Guildford Hall desired to be in fellowship with brethren. Before going there, I asked Mr. Wootton and distinctly understood it was no *new* ground or fresh start, or I never would have gone. I was thinking so much of the happiness of their having the Lord's Table after so long waiting. *Now* I think it would have been wiser to have remained at home to have seen if the Saints were all happy and free about Cp. Hall. In returning

home I do want to act according to God's will and way, but how can I find it? One says: "Every Sunday you stay away from Bstairs {i.e., Broadstairs} you are sinning and are outside the Church of God." Another feels (as I do) that Bstairs and A. Hill are *one* and to return there is to have fellowship with what you know all about at R. and also it seems quite rejecting all those *godly* saints at R. Another says, "Go to neither. Steer for the mainline. Stay at home." With all this I am confused; the path is painful and full of pitfalls. I know not what *God* would have me do. How can I find out? I do not want to be independent, nor to grieve the dear Saints, but I do not *know* what to do. Please *do* help *me*. I *have* tried to understand and remember all the ins and outs of this, but it is *quite* beyond me and I give up, troubled on every side, distressed, perplexed and in despair. With kind love

Believe me to be

your affectionate and young friend,

Sydney C. M. Acheson

CBA 141

{1880}

Dear Dr. Kidd,

I write that I may not seem uncourteous in not replying for I have some thought of discussing the question, I cannot say when. It is not testimony to facts but private opinion addressed privately that the circulating letters expressing it may not be carried too far. But I have let all go on without directly interfering in this matter save my first testimony. I have only to remark that the extract you refer to only speaks of what existed already, is an abstract statement of the effect of a certain line of conduct on persons having certain feelings. As regards the Blackheath meeting, I never had any thing to say to it. I never saw the wisdom of it, never read the account of it, nor some reply which I believe came out. It was stated, before it began, that not more than so many,

and they named, would be firm in their judgment that there was evil in the attacks on Temperance Hall. It never influenced me in any way, one way or another. My judgment was formed in my own knowledge of things and having seen Mr. Kelly in reference to some parts of it. I leave its ecclesiastical effect where I find it, and found my private judgment, as to {a} heretical course which is what I think it, as far as called on by the Lord to have any {judgment}, which I do not feel to be the case at present on the knowledge of facts I have myself. Peace I earnestly desire for all but it must be in righteousness.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

CBA 233

{to Thomas E. Pettman}

{1880 or 1881}

7 Lonsdale Square

My dear Brother,

You will probably know that in my reply to Dr. Harmar Smith I stated that the effect of his letter was such that I could not go to Abbott's Hill. That feeling has been strengthened and increased by all I have learned of what has passed since. I beg you to believe I write in no unkind feeling or party spirit. It is entirely a matter of right and wrong for my own conscience. I do not meddle in any way in the ecclesiastical judgment which may be formed. It is the evil of calling that the holy discipline of God's house which was the very opposite; the accessory circumstances with which I have become acquainted aggravate matters, and I think it right and fair to tell you that not only I should not now go to Abbott's Hill, but not where the alleged discipline I refer to is supported and acted on. I should merely personally abstain to keep my own conscience clear and of that, of course, I must judge before God. Though judging the course of

Abbott's Hill as evil from the beginning, it is only this last two or three days that this conclusion has forced itself upon me. I do not enter into the questions connected {morally} with it. I desire peace, do not pretend to judge all at Abbott's Hill, but I cannot do what I judge to be wrong or join in doing it.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 170

{end of 1880}

I stated at Park Street at the brothers' monthly meeting those who led in seceding knew before the rest of the assembly that Cook was illegally married. Mr. Kelly replied some of them did. There were Mr. Peters and Jackmann. Mr. Peters knew perfectly well that the marriage was void. Two houses were built with Cook's money on the ground of Mrs. Peters, and they were settled, Mrs. Peters being privy to it, on the daughter of Cook under the name of Williams, their mother's maiden name or more accurately on the daughter's, Cook otherwise Williams. When I saw Mr. Peters I told him he had acted very badly as he knew about Cook long before. He replied, I did know a good deal or a great deal.

The celebration of the marriage abroad makes no difference as to the absolute invalidity of the marriage in this country. The person who was put out at Blackheath at the same time for the same thing was married in Lundy Island where it is always done by a fraudulent transaction. When the leaders left, Cook was not breaking bread. He had been begged to sit back till his case was looked into.

{copied}

Mr. Henessey may read and send on to Mr. Morgan.

CBA 54

Manor Cottage

Sevenoaks, Feb. 15 {1881}

My dear Mr. Darby,

If it is not troubling you too much, would you kindly read the enclosed extracts? Some little time ago C. E. S. wrote an article on Propitiation. Lord A. P. C. violently attacked it as error. I sent his letter to C. E. S. who wrote in reply the printed note which I now also forward. This morning I have heard again from A. P. C. who, so far from accepting C. E. S.'s explanations,

charges us with being indifferent to the Lord's honour. If C. E. S. is defective I shall be only too thankful to confess the error into which I fell by admitting his article. His point is, as you will see, that while propitiation was absolutely necessary, it could not be said that God needed it because He Himself provided it. I should be so thankful to have your judgment for in days like these Satan is ever on the watch to trip us up and to produce discord amongst those who should content earnestly together for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Believe me, dear Mr. Darby

Yours affectionately in Christ

Edward Dennett

Mr. J. N. Darby

{Attached extract by C. E. S.}

Now we are not to understand by this that God needed to be propitiated by the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, in order to reconcile Him to us. We, not God, needed the reconciliation (Rom. 5:10,11; Col. 1:21, 22); and the presence on earth, and the death of the Lord Jesus Christ are a sufficient refutation of such a doctrine. The incarnation, and the atoning death of Christ, both give the lie to it. He came, given by God (John 3:16), and sent by the Father. (1 John 4:14.) It was God, rich in mercy, who for the great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in

sins, quickened us with Christ. (Eph. 2:4,5.) Of us we read that we are reconciled to Him by the death of His Son. God, too, commended His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. (Rom. 5:3.) So wrote Paul, concerning himself, and those who with him shared in the salvation of God. To speak then of propitiating God by sacrifice would be to belie the teaching of revelation, and to deny what He is whom we know as our God. Such a thought would do for a heathen, but not for Christians; and the fact that the heathen have such notions only indicates how utterly man, by the fall and its results, is astray as to all true knowledge of the character and nature of that Divine Being.

But if He needs not to be propitiated, and can pass over sins, and forgive them, does He think lightly of them? The death of His Son on the cross, and His being there forsaken of God, when made sin for us, sufficiently shows what is God's abhorrence of sin, whilst the giving up His Son to die for sinners, proves, as nothing else can, the greatness of His love to them. To be propitiated on their behalf He never needed; yet propitiation was requisite, for He can only act in grace consistently with all that He is. And propitiation by blood is the only thing that could meet the case; for blood is the life of the flesh, and by it atonement, of which propitiation forms one element, is made for sins. Propitiation, therefore, had to be made, though God needed not to be propitiated. The ground had to be laid, on which God would be righteous in accepting a guilty person before Him. For when one thinks of propitiation, we think of that which has to do with God's nature, and God's throne. It is not the meeting of the sinner's need, though that results from it, but the providing that God should be able to act in grace to the sinner, without compromise of anything that He is, that is meant by propitiation. Hence the making it was an act God-ward, not man-ward, and one done in the sanctuary, when the high priest was alone with God. And intimately concerned as Israel were with all that was done on the day of atonement, the first work in the sanctuary had

relation to the claims of God's holiness, and not to the need of the sinner. By whom propitiation really has been made, and the abiding value of it, the New Testament teaches us; but in the Old we have traced out for us in type how it was made. To this we would now turn.

{Partial Reply (?) to the extract from "Propitiation" by C.E. Stuart}

Nothing can be graver than the question of the offering up of propitiatory sacrifice to God; for to God only can sacrifice be really offered. Now worship in sacrifice, I in no way surely reject, thanksgiving, praise, all this I own: Scripture speaks of it. But the first question is the basis of the relation of him who thanks and worships with God. Is he a sinner? Can a sinner come to God as well as if nothing had happened? God is love but God is also light and the light makes all manifest and can man's conscience think that He who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity and cannot look at {sin}, can see all the sin in him who approaches Him and be indifferent to sin? Is he going to show indifference to evil, and what all . . . so that it should be God's rest no longer? You will tell me God will purify him who comes, but Christ came by water as well as by blood. And can we *sinners* come to God?

{J.N.D.'s reply to Edward Dennett is given in CBA 55, which is to be found in *Letters* 3:135-136, where the *Christian Friend* of September, 1880 is identified as the source of the article by C. E. S.}

CBA 20

Osburga House

Broadstairs

April 4th, 1881

Dear Mr. Darby,

{A different handwriting adds "1879"}

I beseech you to bear with me in again asking you to give me what information you can as to the ground of the second Table set up by Mr. Wooton and others in Broadstairs if it has your sanction and fellowship. I am now as much in Broadstairs as in Herne Bay, and may soon D.V. be wholly here.

Your deep spiritual knowledge of the Word and your vast experience are available, I trust, for the feeblest and most unworthy of the flock, and in asking for your help my desire (weak as one is) is not to forsake the grand principles of truth which I have, however imperfectly, learned, chiefly through your instrumentality.

On those principles saints were meeting here till, and suddenly and without warning, the Park St. declaration was sent into these parts.

A second table was set up at St. Peter's and Ramsgate to put outside all who could not submit to its terms without deliberation, investigation or prayer. Where were the consciences of saints the prime question in discipline? Utterly ignored – the table at St. Peters was maintained some time after Ramsgate ceased.

The brethren here, after waiting a fortnight, notified that all at that second table were out of fellowship. This notice was subsequently withdrawn on a clear explanatory letter to them and they returned with this written statement, signed by "E. Wooton and for Mr. and Mrs. Field, Mrs. Cooper and a few others" and addressed to "Brethren gathered to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Assembly Rooms, Broadstairs"

"Beloved Brethren,

We accept the open door to return to you again to remember our Lord Jesus Christ in the breaking of bread.

We bless God that all that we value as to the ground of gathering is maintained – the truth of God and the glory of Christ – for you absolutely refuse Dr. C.'s schism – unholiness and untruthfulness. Etc."

What follows is about "things said", "personalities", etc.

This letter is pretty plain as to the ground I was staying in Broadstairs at the time of their return and broke bread at Abbots Hill on the first Lord's day of their return, and with them at the Assembly rooms on the second. Others too went and came from that meeting. Mr. Pettman was constantly at the week night meetings and they shook hands with us some most cordially. They knew all.

In a few months they went out again. Why? I know not and cannot discover. Abbots Hill is named, but they came in to it with their eyes open. Surely they should say why they go out. – Any way the facts remain. In or out, in and out. Is this our fellowship? Honest Christians outside are amazed at the inconsistencies, the world jeers and we are made ashamed.

I tell you these things to show you how deep one's need is of light on such a tangled scene as they have made it.

I trust you will have grace to give me what help you can. Many want to know what you really think of the pass matters have come to, especially after your letter to Mr. Jull, since printed.

When you proposed to go to Ramsgate and see Mr. Pettman, etc., I was glad, and your calm dispassionate judgment given after that visit in your letter to him of Aug. 14 commended itself to many. Abbots Hill acted upon it *as you advised*. But with what results? Alas, Mr. Jull grew angry at your "grace," and you refused them, and imposed on them his terms.

I know you have done it for the best, and if this ceasing to break bread was not to *give up God's work*, in drawing them out as he did (some years ago) and gathering them to His ground, His Christ, and to hand themselves over to *man* for him to put them together in a new meeting, I could even wish they would cease. It is touching *God's work* I dread. It seems to me the worst feature of dissent: man's making churches. Granted that there should be a new meeting, which I question, the *same* people as a whole

would be there only newly grouped. What then? Let us remember how Ahab offered a *better* vineyard, but Naboth died rather than give up what the Lord had given and died by false accusations, too.

Do, dear Mr. Darby, give us some help {else} will you leave the saints if the Lord tarry or you fall asleep.

I am your deeply indebted brother in Christ,

W. Burbidge

CBA 179

May, 1881

My dear Mr. Miller,

I do not know what bad company you have got into. But it is the first I ever heard of it. I know of no movement of paedobaptists to leave, and most assuredly I never hindered their doing so as your friend says, but solely because I never heard of it. There was a movement to leave though never definitely formed because of the corruption that was at work which I did refuse to go with, not formally because it never came to me in that shape, but practically. Your friend, of course, may believe it, but there never was a thought of separation on the ground of infant baptism and I challenge him, whoever he may be, to give the smallest proof of it. It has been put forward individually by baptists. It was declared 2 years ago in Kent that there must be a division on that ground, but by a hot baptist. Many observed that baptists as a party supported Dr.C. and Mr. K. but left it there. There were those, I do not doubt, who did so from no other motive. But I defy any one to show an individual influenced by infant baptism to attack either. I was most thankful that in Park St. the one active in the movement for Dr. C.'s exclusion, though an excellent brother that we all esteem was a hot baptist and the 2 other baptists, though mild ones, and his one great supporter I learnt to my surprise not very long ago was a paedobaptist. I did

not before know what they all were. It never came in question. With poor dear Cronin, it was a perfect monomania so as to make his own friends laugh at him. You know very well you propagated it diligently. Where {Sandford} labored, they would hardly allow one who was not a baptist to come. If not refused, he was ill seen. If a person spoke in favor of infant baptism, it was a crime. I believe both at Ryde and at Ramsgate it had to say to it, but it was violent party baptist views. I have no doubt at all that it was at the bottom of Dr. C.'s move for something new. Now it was not any discussion on baptism that brought infant baptism to the front again, but the doctrine of the house. When that came out, Mr. Kelly said at Mr. Gipps' we must change all our views on baptism and Mr. G. was quite excited about it with him and he did change twice over and for a good while would not baptize over again those who had been as infants, and then changed back. You will remember my saying in my letter that you were drifting in that direction. As to children of believers being holy which you note as something awful, you must remember it is the language of Scripture itself. Any allegation of a movement of those who baptize infants towards separation is a fable or a falsehood. And you must allow me to invert what you say in your letter that if you do not leave them as free as you are, you are adding a new condition to communion: that of holding your views on baptism. I challenge any and everyone to produce an instance where such a thought was entertained as bringing in the question by those who baptize infants as had to do with communion. They have been incessantly harassed and attacked by those who held baptist views but a move or an idea of making their views a question of communion I defy anyone to produce. It was all the other side. I do not deny that it had to do on the baptist side with the questions which have arisen. Mr. Mackintosh's language at Coleraine put out a paper that they met as baptists but deceived others on sufferance, and I remonstrated and declined going *on sufferance*, no baptizer of infants ever dreamed of such a thing. This kind of pretension and the spirit of it ran through their ways as a party may have galled the paedobaptists but I

never heard a whisper of any leaving on such ground. I believe it is just practical ignorance of Paul's special teaching which came from {the} heavenly glory of Christ and resting at furthest in Peter's which came from resurrection but this is no ground for leaving them. P--- brought it up too at Hackney but I was not there. The existence of brethren is the application of Paul and John's teaching to a great baptized body. You need not be the least uneasy as to my leaving on this ground. This is entirely on the baptist side and did work largely in what has passed in them, and in this instance has not connected itself with uprightness and unworldliness but in this last respect, and in all respects indeed, there is enough to trouble us all. And highmindedness on any side, as far as I am concerned, I should resist. I insist in principle on righteousness and a spiritually minded baptist will be more my friend than a worldly paedobaptist. Christ is everything. I am afraid you are suffering more than you were.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 308

{Date: mid 1881?}

My dear Brother,

I was glad to get your letter. The question of Dr. Cronin is, I trust, decided but has not been formally before any assembly that I know of. . . . As regards Kennington itself there are difficulties in many minds because of the number that are outside though, of course, many agree as to declaring Dr. C. to be out. And as I warned you, your act in declaring the charges to be groundless while a mass of upright persons see in Dr. C.'s letters compared with his declaration to London the clearest proof of duplicity, is a motive for calling your action as to it in question. And you have to {reason} . . . that Coll Langford and yourself resisted their being where previously many brethren desired they should go now, but all have to look this in the face. Hazelville has taken the

ground of the charges in its notice. I regret the going out of the Park St. notice. I maintain what I stated in my {first} two letter{s} fully, but this has nothing to do with the public question. But our present point is Dr. C.'s being finally outside. I have had no doubt he has been seeking this two or three years to upset brethren, and make a party of his own. This for now a good while has not been concealed from individuals. And you cannot be surprised if your long efforts to screen him affect the minds of many who are suffering from folly under its consequences. Many in and out of London feel and say {that} with an ordinary person, it would have been at once settled.

CBA 323

{Date: mid 1881?}

My dear Brother,

God gently clears the way, I believe. From the beginning I have felt that God was sifting the meetings in Kent, and when that is done adequately in God's eyes, there will be peace.

But the evil that was at the root of all this, besides a party spirit which had long existed, was that there were brethren, and dear brethren, who, form what I believe was want of faith, judged it was all over with brethren and London broken up; and that they must as standing on higher ground start afresh as a new body.

Now I admit that the brethren had got into a low, worldly, sleepy state, but I do not think it was faith to think the Lord could not rouse them up, nor, that it was grace to set up to be themselves the cream of all; and this connected itself with the existence of a party in Kent which I do not think were walking in the mind of God. I cannot say, sorrowful and humbling as it may be, that I regret that the sifting has come.

It was from the hand of God because in grace He saw it was needed. My judgment as to the Abbott's Hill party is unchanged. Mr. Jull and his friends having acknowledged they did wrong,

Abbott's Hill has acknowledged they did wrong in taking church action under the circumstances. I am as far thankful for both, and under God's hand, it will, I trust, lead to more --- but there is no relinquishment of the claim to be a competent assembly, no conscience as to the evil state they were in. Their documents so far as I have known them have been cleverly drawn up, but cleverness is not conscience. Conscience deals with evil, not with mistakes of judgment; nor do I think that Mr. Jull and his friends have adequately estimated the false pretension to be more excellent than all their brethren.

This feeling was stronger at Broadstairs than at Ramsgate, and the party feeling with which it linked itself stronger at Ramsgate than at Broadstairs, but both were at work. I look to both being melted by grace from their pretensions.

While I acknowledge in the party that take the ground of purity many dear and true saints, some to whom I am even personally attached, and their uprightness as to the governing principle of their lives, I do not believe faith or grace to have been the source of the pretensions I have referred to.

The enemy profited by the evil which I admit, to produce the pretension and schism of heart, varying, I acknowledge, in degree and form. The course of Abbott's Hill I still judge to have been thoroughly wicked, and I have not seen that their conscience has been reached. That I await for my own action. The assembly left at Broadstairs identified itself with Abbott's Hill on the occasion of Mr. Hooton's visit; God has allowed all this that all may be brought out clear. I should not go to Abbott's Hill nor to those at Broadstairs till they had cleared themselves from it.

I should be very thankful to see those at Broadstairs who went out acknowledge that their pretension was false, while I don't doubt they did it in good conscience.

I believe God is working, but He does not heal slightly the hurt of the daughter of His people, as Jeremiah says.

I do not believe that hurry in action is the way of God. I look

for consciences being reached and so the root of the evil, then there will be lowliness and the path be plain.

As to going to prayer meetings with those who seceded, I should feel no difficulty. I do not think the course of the seceders was faith but pretension, and there you all were more guilty than Ramsgate, but the conduct of Abbott's Hill was, I judge, wickedness, and that is the difference for me between the two. Canterbury, though generally connected, was a little different from both and I say nothing of it here but reply to your letter.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

{signed} J. N. Darby

CBA 171

{Date: mid 1881?}

{to Strange, et al.}

My dear Brother,

I was spoken to about the sister you referred to who has long sat behind at Clapton and who I hear is a very worthy young woman. This made me think over the matter so that I speak more plainly than I did. The assembly must judge, but as an individual I feel that where a person was then desirous of breaking bread in the unity of Christ's body, it is a serious thing to deprive them of it, assuming their own godly standing. I should recognize no letter of commendation but if the gathering is assured for themselves that the person is a godly believer, they might be received as such, not as coming from Guildford Hall or Abbott's Hill, but on *your own knowledge*. I would *not* receive a letter of commendation as such from Ramsgate. I should apply the same rule to any coming thence founded on *your own knowledge* of them. I pretend in what I have said as to receiving to give my own individual judgment and nothing else. I should receive them on the broad large ground of their being members of Christ's body walking uprightly.

I am not unaware of the objection of not recognizing the unity of the body, independency etc. But where is the unity of the body at Ramsgate? The confusion there forces other gatherings to act for themselves as they have done in many places. As to Canterbury, the case is different. For my own part, I see no reason for not owning those who, I suppose, are called outside, but I leave that question as not before you

CBA 113

{Date: mid 1881?}

{Copied}

Dearest Jull,

Though I have answered the letters written to me, I have refrained from any interference in Kent affairs for more than one reason. First, I felt in all this history it was a question of God's testimony and must be left to God to bring about the result. Next, on principle I believe it is generally important that local assemblies' consciences should be clear and exercised and holy; {conscience} had been so enfeebled and swamped that the weapon sticks to the scabbard. Then as to you all in Kent, I did not adequately know the state of those opposed to you, as to their faithfulness in judging evil, to know whether healing could be brought about and faithfulness fully maintained unless by a . . . sifting; and healing by smothering up consciences was no use. Had I been sure of there being this faithfulness, I might perhaps have written myself. On the other hand, they had officially Dr. C's exclusion (and thus the judgment of London) which in God's sight is of great account. I distinguish a bona fida corporate act from the state of individuals. Then comes your side of the question. The sending out of the notice of Park St. went beyond their position. Clearing themselves I had nothing to say against when Kennington would not clear itself; wisdom in choosing the moment is another question, but neither do I enter upon that. But sending out their notice was not clearing themselves but imposing

their view of the case on others under pain of rejection when they were only part of an assembly. God allowed this to {set} Kent in movement. But I will add though not sufficiently informed to judge of the state of Mr. --- and those associated with him that when I spoke to --- of tracing with little uncertainty another moving spring of action than those who signed at Kennington, I did not at all refer to ---. He was not in any thoughts as to the exclusion of those that received that as individuals. I never received and said so as plainly as possible to themselves and to others, nor do I think the letter withdrawing it a gracious one. Their state is a party and painful one. Of this last letter, of course, I have said nothing having only received it in what I am answering. All I would say to you is to seek (or set) your mind above mere local feeling as to those who have acted badly and think with interest of the whole Church of God and walk calmly before God though not leaving out the looking for uprightness as part of that interest, but the character of God is to be above the evil Himself, though never to allow it. The difficulty with many upright souls is that those who sought uprightness put themselves in a position which was hard to recognize as a normal one. But God is acting and will bring out those that are upright with His own light, though He may chasten them in the way.

Then we have to hear of the patience of Job and see the end of the Lord. The siftings are good for every body. God makes everything work together for good to those that love Him. Assuming the account from those outside in Canterbury to be correct (and it is always right to abide . . . {portion}), that state is worse than yours. Seek God's presence in questions of spirit.

Yours affectionately in the Lord,

J. N. D.

CBA 62

{Date: 1881}

Dear Mr. Franklin,

I suppose you must be unaware that for two nights the case of Abbots Hill, and then one that of Guildford Hall, was fully discussed. And not only all the partisans of Abbots Hill allowed the fullest scope of speech throughout even of London which they freely used and in the judgment of some abused, but they sent for the leaders of Abbots Hill itself who came out, Mr. Burbidge and Mr. Coles of Brentford. And they pleaded their own cause as they had matters their own account of things, the effect of which was that some of their firmest and warmest supporters declared they had not left *themselves* a leg to stand upon and others not yet clear became entirely decided; hundreds of brethren were there. I suppose you are not aware that the great majority of gatherings in London came to the same conclusion. As to your private opinion of Mr. Jull, it has nothing to do with the matter. The question is the standing of Guildford Hall. As to pretending to say what all who fear God will do, I leave it for what it is worth.

As to Schism and leaving and being driven away, it is not the first nor the second time that I have heard such warnings and threats, for that is what they are, but the threat ended the matter and the persons are very . . . where they were. If it turns out differently with you and you prefer to associate yourself with the wickedness of Abbots Hill to being with the bulk of the brethren, of course, you are quite free. The only thing I have had to do with the matter actively was in the meeting where hundreds were at Park St. I saw those concerned but that was privately.

Yours truly in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

CBA 163

{Date: 1880}

Dear Marson,

When I put out my statement as to Dr. C., it was a question whether I should leave the brethren by reason of the corrupting

system that was going on and with which I could not deal, unless evidently forcing myself upon Brethren, for God has judged it. Dr. C's was an overt act so that he was dealt with. He was not more guilty possibly, than others but what now presses on brethren was before a crowd of brethren and for a long time and I was in France and before some hundreds at Park St. where the question was raised as to Ryde and a long speech was made disowning it as infamous and unfit to be owned as an assembly. I was there and declared the statements were not true, so did Mr. Kingscote and others and some who said nothing but knew the facts declared they would have nothing more to say to the person who made them. At the same time, similar statements were made in a pretended question printed and sent over the world of English speaking people. Mr. Stoney refused to lecture at Barnet because the writer of these had, and many godly brethren declined meeting the person any more. I wrote {some} further facts: the person was acquitted by his friends in his own gathering which precluded any further direct action but very near drove away many of the godliest brethren from the body of brethren. Indeed, had I not interfered this would have happened with several. I did not take up this case, save with the accuser of Ryde himself. It was no longer with me a question of leaving brethren and I only refer now to what passed before hundreds of brethren. It would have been putting myself in the place of overseer of which I did not choose to take, nor do I now take up one thing of what happened merely to myself, but what was public. I have not, as you say yourself, made any accusing statement nor do I intend to do so. During the London bridge conflicts I was in France. At Park St., I was present but hundreds were there. I have no intention to do anything but keep myself clear of what I believe to be evil. But I do not think any thing will induce me to come out of the shell in which I have shut myself up as to it.

Ever affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

What passed between you and Mr. Alexander and your

subsequent step may, of course, have cleared your position.

CBA 294

{Date: mid 1881?}

{answer to Hooton}

My dear Brother,

I have not much to say in reply to your letter. The haste you would have is just what put Kent where it is. But your letter does not look to God above it all and there is only one who can answer that; God saw that Kent wanted the sifting and so sent it. I am not unaware that some are trying to slow the fire of discontent because God has judged their path, but it is to our simple want of faith which does not see God's hand. That all is not done, I admit that. I trust He will do. God's government is seen in the state of Kent. But disdaining what God has done is want of gratitude, and those who give up brethren are just doing what Dr. Cronin was. As to any compromise, I know of none. Party feeling against the evil, I have not more than for it, but I know of no compromise nor of anyone who has made it. Paul said there were many in a bad state in his last words to Corinth, but the assembly had acted and his mouth was open and his heart enlarged and I do not think he was wrong. My judgment is that those who complain most now never really saw the extent and true character of the evil, nor consequently what God has done. Some go to Dr. Cronin. It is all wrong, but you will find very few gatherings who are all faithful in this respect. My trust is in God, and the whole is a question of faith. Sending out the Park St. notice all over England was not merely clearing itself. It was judging every gathering in England, nine tenths of whom knew nothing about the matter. It was on that (though I do not think it was all) that Kent acted. You ignore London's action. The public action of the assembly is to me of great importance. The wrong state of individuals is taken up, and common action ignored, but I do not say more because it is a question of faith in God's faithfulness and that I cannot give.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

CBA 310

{Date: mid 1881?}

My dear Brother,

I had a long interview with Sen in London. The only texts which moved him were Heb. 1:3 and the unities in John 17. I answered also a paper of his in which the human life of Christ was beautifully depicted but as a mere man mixed with a kind of pantheism. He is clever, writes English capitally, and attracting but full of himself and political judgments. They would not put my answer in his paper but did in the world. I think of Benares, an Indian surgeon: an Irishman, Candon of County Limerick, was concerned in this. I should every way . . . a dangerous man, not much future as a system, but possibly to get gradually linked with popery but at present more atheistical in a pantheist shape than anything else. He was fêted here and said Dean Stanley was too loose!

Our meetings on Kent are over . . . and the Lord has been wonderfully with us. Owen brought up the Abbot's Hill party who fully pressed all we had against them so that God's hand was wonderfully manifested.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 316

{Date: mid 1881?}

From the first, the brethren got clear hold of the principle of separation from evil as at the root of the question and pervading it, and hence we had to consider not who committed blunders but who was on the Lord's side. And it was happy for us that we had

so clear a principle, for it had the effect palpably of dispensing in our souls a sense of the grounds on which we are gathered to the Lord's name. That our notice does not say we disown all who have fellowship with Abbott's Hill or who refuse to acknowledge Guildford Hall is not owing to any sympathy with Neatbyism or to any looseness or neutrality. Many of us wish to say so but one or two thought it needless to cumber our notice so much (as they thought), of course,

CBA 317

{Date: mid 1881?}

People talk of schism and leaving Abbott's Hill. Abbott's Hill did not exist till the Sunday after. There was no *meeting at Ramsgate at all*. Dr. C. having been declared out those at Almorah stopped breaking bread. Here some particulars are called for. It is stated that the Park St. declaration was refused at the Ramsgate meeting of Aug. 22. This is a false statement: 4 out of some 80 objected, two going away and two remaining to protest. An absurd and unscriptural principle propagated in the Ryde case that there must be unanimity was {what} all but the two left on, there could be no decision without unanimity, and went to Almorah and on Lord's day they alone broke bread, but Kennington having acted, they ceased, and then Abbott's Hill began and there were 9, but 23 came from those who had left with Mr. Jull and the first thing they did was to shut out nominally Jull (a mere fraud) but in fact some 40 or 50 who were not breaking bread. Some half of the 23 afterwards left them and went {back}. The chief open agent in the exclusion was a person who is disowned by all. It was a mere use of the nominal discipline of God's house for party vengeance with falsehood on the face of it. No one received it and it was withdrawn. I refused Abbott's Hill from the first day (for they wrote to me!) not meddling with the ecclesiastical question, but because of the wickedness of their course I saw them afterwards. Mr. Lowe, who was well acquainted with them and whose

judgment I trust more than my own and no favorer of Mr. Jull, wrote to them and saw them and could find no trace of conscience in them. It was only when Guilford Hall at the instance of brethren had ceased to break bread in order to union and Abbott's Hill refused to do so that on their writing to me, I told them I owned no meeting at Ramsgate. The conduct of the party at Canterbury was worse even than at Ramsgate. I did not agree with the way Mr. Jull and the rest left, nor did others and he thinks they were wrong. But Abbott's Hill's statements of desire for union (unless upon the ground of their being God's assembly there) are false. Mr. Jull, before his ceasing to break bread in consequence of being written to and when he was not doing so, proposed that Abbott's Hill should cease doing so and they should have a common day of humiliation in the hope of doing so together the following Sunday, and Abbott's Hill refused. They have cunningly left out all allusion to Abbott's Hill save an invitation to read their letter. They have also left out all the first half of Park St.'s decision, the statement that I had drawn up the notice a fortnight before is not true, . . . the meetings lasted. The statement that I set aside the Park Street declaration at Cheapside is a falsehood.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

{Across this manuscript are written the following words:} Forbid printing, copying or circulating.

CBA 320

{Date: mid 1881}

My dear Brother,

Forgive me if I say that your letter betrays such total ignorance of all that passed and of the whole state of things that it is difficult to answer. I have nothing against Mr. Kelly for anything done to me, where it referred to me as any wrong, I

could easily let it drop and in fact never did any thing. And I insist again: recall to you that I was not even in England nor even had anything to say to far the greatest part of what put him in his present position. {I} was not in the country. I first spoke openly about him when Mr. Miller demanded what made a possible difficulty in my mind as to certain {facts} . . . and that was after months of complaint of those engaged personally in the matter. . . . as to Dr. Cronin, I said there was what I thought as bad of behind him but I do not think . . . being there. In a public meeting, he made a long and studied attack on the assembly at Ryde and that I briefly answered as did others. You say he did not think Dr. Cronin right, did I ever say he did? I do not believe he did. I carefully guarded against and declared I did not believe he was in any plot. You say I returned with the conviction that Dr. Cronin was engaged in a plot. I went out with the same conviction which I had long entertained. Did you ever see Mr. Stoney's letter connected with Mr. Wigram's statements three years before I ever heard them? I am more convinced of it now than I am that you are at Edinburgh. I have very little doubt that it kept Mr. Wigram away and shortened his life; that is mere supposition, I admit. You say it is broken up now. What broke it up? You must allow me to assure you that your letter shows that you know nothing whatever of what passed, of meetings, correspondence, . . . were I to state what these were, it would just be so much accusation or so considered. And I speak here not merely of Mr. Kelly but of all that has passed . . . I have forgotten half the things myself, but why apply to me as to them when nearly all the time I was not even in the country. I did not feel so guarded and shut up as to Mr. Kelly after all that passed publicly as before, but as I believe I said, I only remember once speaking of him when my conscience told me that as a Christian I had better have held my tongue and that was after all was public. If you want to pursue it, I have no desire for it. You should ask those who had to say to it when I had not. It is not now that the desire of Mr. Kelly's restoration to happiness or confidence has to be awakened in me, but I decline making it a personal matter

between myself and Mr. Kelly. I have never said a word to any one about withdrawing from Mr. Kelly. Others have. I have hitherto, being absent from the country, walked alone with God and not meddled in it. I have found wisdom consists in not going before God but following Him, nor dare I take any step till led of Him. When He shows me the way I trust to have grace to walk in it. The greatest mischief that could be done would be raking up the whole matter afresh and do not dream if you did you would have to do with me. It is with others, men of sobriety and weight you would have to do. Unless as accused myself, I should have nothing whatever to say to it. Mr. Miller has already had an interview, I am told, with Mr. Kingscote and Mr. McAdam about it. I decline, as I said, taking it up as a personal question, or doing anything on any other ground till I see my way as led of God. Here I can do nothing nor shall I do anything anywhere till I see my path clear before God. The brethren need quiet and Christ. There are those I know, who seek to keep up trouble, but my trust is in God and I do nothing as to that either. But there are a mass of sober quiet brethren who do not make the noise they do, but have more weight with God, and you would find a large body of such who view in a different way those whom you attack in your letter. The right thing may not agree with their course, so much so that they have been forced by public pressing to withdraw their exclusion of {Ryde}. As to which also it is evident you know nothing. I have no thought of pacification nor reconciliation where evil is confessed. I have no need to be reconciled to any. I am at war with nothing but positive evil. There can be healing. And I know while party spirit may be rife in many, consciences have been widely and happily awakened.

I add a line to try and make it clearer to you. You mistake the whole matter in this. When it merely concerned me, I never took any notice of it. I came abroad and the whole matter came in question partly at Blackheath, partly when the collision for months with Mr. K. and those who defended and sheltered Dr. C. and a large number in England and Ireland had a full conviction

of what they considered unrighteous. Many things I do not know, as I know many things they do not. No discipline was exercised as to Mr. K. but the facts came out. With all this I had nothing to do whatever. Were I to go and what you call make peace with Mr. K., all this remains where it was. If you brought it all up, you would have to do with them and if it was swamped a vast number of the godliest brethren, I do not doubt, would leave altogether, the rest remain with bad and indifferent consciences, and brethren break up everywhere and what remained be a condition of things I should have nothing to say to. Those who seek to shelter evil try to put all on me. A mass of quiet godly brethren know better. You would make it a personal matter of mine. This I decline. I have left it, and leave it, to God until God shows me I can act for Him.

And after an acquittal by his friends at Blackheath, you or anyone brought it up again, what would you or others say? I have told you what I suppose would be the result, but not any facts in the case or . . . or judgment on me.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

CBA 325 {Date: mid 1881?}

Dear Brother,

I have read none of those papers, having personally seen and heard from those concerned and it is reluctantly I read this. In the first place it is not the judgment of Clapham but of the Tomkins and their friends, a very large number have ceased to break bread because of the judgment they have formed upon you, and very few had to say to the original notice, a large portion of them too objecting then or afterwards. The statement as to Park Street is all false. With many other gatherings they received from both for a time whom they knew personally and {heard}. When Guildford Hall did not break bread, and afterwards, when it did, Park St.

and other gatherings received neither, nothing being decided. No table was owned at Ramsgate. The statement as to what passed which gave occasion to the meeting at Park St. is all false. But first I must remark that Mr. Jull's ceasing to break bread the second time or their setting up the table again was so far from being without brethren that it was at the express instance of brethren they did so cease and some having proposed to them to begin again, they expressly sought the fellowship of the saints, coming up to London for that purpose, on the ground that they had given up breaking bread at the request of the saints. It had been proposed to them to cease and they had. At the same time, it had been to Abbott's Hill with a view to union and they refused: they were God's assembly and the only restoration was by the others acknowledging their sin and coming to them and this ground they kept, up to the Park Street meeting, saying they would give up all but that.

I never thought Park Street right in *sending out* the notice as to Kennington. In fact, it was not really the assembly which did so. With the resolution I had nothing to do, was not at the meeting, but the statement of the anonymous paper you send me is entirely false. Kennington had formally notified to brethren that they would go no further, and it was on this ground that Park Street based its resolution. Many, indeed most, then, believed that it was the rumor of Park Street going to act that made Kennington act. They deny this. I cannot say what is true about it. But one thing is certain that Park Street acted on their formal refusal to do any thing more.

The proposal of Clapham for the London elders to meet was in every way wrong and deceitful. Clapham as far as Clapham has acted had passed their resolution when they proposed this meeting and had it in their pockets and were asked to produce it and replied answer our question first. I do not admit it was Clapham's notice: a very great number have ceased to break bread at Clapham because of it. But brethren observe the craft of it. It seemed all fair but they admit that considerably more than

half the assemblies in London had then decided to disown Abbott's Hill and their proposition annulled all that {had} been done with diligent enquiry by the majority of gatherings, that such a meeting would have been a subversion of principle. What had London to do as to pronouncing on Ramsgate? And this leads to the details as to {the} Park Street action. Park St. had to take it up when a letter was laid on its table as every meeting does but as it really, though formally this, concerned all London, they sent it down to Cheapside. I was not there but have no doubt of the accuracy of what I now state. A brother named Olby came up to London with a letter from Guilford Hall: he went to Haverstock Hill and was not received. He then came over to Park St. and was naturally late and the meeting had begun and {was} going on, and was not interrupted to open his letter. I do not believe the body of the meeting knew whether he broke bread or not or even knew him, at least when I enquired could not tell me, at this moment I only suppose he did. After the meeting, Mr. {Hewer} opened the letter and, finding what it was, felt that the assembly must consider it and mentioned it to them and the Park St. meeting was the result. To the adjourned meeting a person who had identified himself with Abbott's Hill brought up the Abbott's Hill leaders and party, and the staunch supporters of Abbott's Hill declared that by their own statement they had not left themselves a leg to stand upon. Col. Binney also stated publicly that he had not been clear till very lately but that it was the {entire} statement of Abbott's Hill itself that had convinced him they were no assembly of God. Mr. Pettmann had written at the time that the assembly was smashed and at the meeting it was declared honestly by one of the four left that he looked round him to see if there were any he would break bread with and there was only his wife the whole fortnight and over, but I prefer drawing it up myself. . . . notice was the effect of brethren's feeling, even when not any more at the meeting, a feeling I had myself.

CBA 129

{Date: mid 1881?}

Dear Brother,

At Malvern they refused a letter of commendation from Mr. K. but they received the woman (a poor woman who came to {be a nurse}) whom they found entirely ignorant of the matter. They wrote to Blackheath begging to know what the assembly's judgment and Mr. K.'s judgment as to Abbott's Hill was. After some delay Mr. K. replied that the clearest answer they could give was that the assembly had never as such come to a decision as to Abbott's Hill. . . . acted in the same way in a letter from Mr. Earle. The details of {the} result did not reach me. At the same time, Mr. K. gave a letter of recommendation to the assembly at Broadstairs which is in communion with Abbott's Hill . . . has professed it and received Mrs. {North?} from Abbott's H., wife of one of the chief signers of the exclusion of the six brethren, two of whose daughters if not more of the family are at Guilford Hall and she was received as a Christian simply, but ignorance in her case cannot be pleaded. Mr. K. had already written to say in reply to enquiries that he considered Colliers Rents and Old Clapham meeting as . . . having the mind of God. He has been down at Plum Lane where those who clung to Abbott's Hill remained when some half of the assembly left because they did and had a kind of . . . Brighton having the question before them, the brothers there wished to know from Blackheath under those circumstances what ground they took as to Abbott's Hill that they might have the judgment of the assembly at Blackheath. They refused to bring it before the assembly. At Brighton they sent a demand from the assembly. I have waited for the reply to this but have heard nothing. Mr. K. has also stated that A. H. was . . . But it seems to me impossible to continue in the presence of such reticence and {sophistry} to recognize Blackheath as guaranteeing any one by their letter or the persons who also are received there. We might receive a person from A. H. who had hoped simply as {a} Christian through Blackheath . . . They have never. . . yet labor only evilly to support it, refuse to bring it

before the assembly so that they cannot pronounce but receive persons from A. H. under these pretexts. . . . this simple Christian . . . has been . . . on its conscience in a London gathering which is right, wanting to receive as a Christian but not from G. H. . . . laboring to . . .

CBA 234

May, '81

Dear Pettman,

When I heard you had given up breaking bread at Abbott's Hill, I was most thankful and was arranging to write to you to tell you so and that though even I might not be able to do much from my age and state of weakness, at any rate, whatever I could do for peace and reconciliation I should do cordially. But the same day a note came up to say the ground you took was that you have throughout been the assembly of God and would now in a body join them. Now I should be glad to know if this were maintained in the heat of discussion or the ground on which your proposal was deliberately based. In the former case much might be borne, if it was the latter you have put yourselves, or some one's advice has put you, completely in the ditch. Can you not see that if you were the assembly of God, giving up this position and deliberately ceasing to break bread is in principle apostasy, and giving up God's ground and Christ's authority and if you were God's assembly, giving it up to join schism? For if you were God's assembly, they were schismatics. Mr. Burbidge told us he would go to the stake rather than give up your being God's assembly, but if he has maintained you in this view he has not gone to suffer at the stake but been the blind leading the blind. He was your spokesman at Park Street and long ago took this ground, so that I have a right to refer to him. If you were pushed into it in the heat of argument, it would not the less be folly to leave God's ground to join a schism, but poor human nature so clings to its long cherished pretensions that if the public act were

not set on that ground, it might be left in every man's bosom for wisdom to grow. I shall nothing the less seek for unity provided righteousness and God's truth are maintained. I have long seen the danger of division, but it will not be what the obstinacy of those who push their pretensions expect. It will be an unrighteous local party and that is all though in certain aspects it may go further than this, {I} think. That I leave to God, only {I} have looked it in the face.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 314

{Received Aug. 18, 1881}

My dear Brother,

I am slow in coming to a conclusion unless I have the certainty of God's mind and would never counsel without that. The separation is made. I start from that point: and being made I advise the brethren on no account to go back, unless indeed the gathering was really and fundamentally changed and avowedly so. *Do not go back*. As to breaking bread, it is a question of wisdom: doing it in opposition is no good. The step you have taken requires not only to be right, but a lowly spirit. If you do break bread, do it in grace for yourselves, never mind ecclesiastical questions, but the quiet seeking of Christ's presence. As regards your letter, I should make it shorter and simpler, and say, if I sent any such out (for they say least said soonest mended): "a brother of those meeting at Deptford having involved us in connection with the Abbot's Hill party, and the assembly having refused to judge his act or to condemn Abbott's Hill, brethren having met three times to consider it, and another case of communion which involved us in connection with sin judged elsewhere, and our remonstrances having been in vain, we have felt bound openly to separate and no longer recognize those

meeting at no. 1 King St. as God's assembly at Deptford, and we have felt it right to let our brethren know it."

I should not send it to the former meeting at Lewisham but to those who have met at Newlands; for the rest, you can judge.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

{signed} J. N. Darby

CBA 32b

{Date: 9 Sept 1881}

Mr. Milward called on Mr. Hope on August 25, '79, and said, "I call as an individual as Landlord of Guilford Hall. I want you to let me have the Hall for Sunday next (31st). Mr. Hope replied, It does not rest with me to let you have it. I do not know how many are with us and with you. Can you inform me, as on this depends very much our requiring it. Mr. M. refused to say how many but asked, How soon I thought by his powers as Landlord he could have possession? I said, "Legally you can, I believe, give us one week's notice but in equity we should have 3 months as you promised some time ago to have an agreement to that effect, but no agreement has been received by us. Mr. Hope knew that the rent was paid at the Table after the collection usually every week and therefore judged that Mr. M.'s power must be acknowledged and consented to the issue of the week's notice. When Mr. H. pressed that Kennington had put Dr. C. out (he read the notice over twice) Mr. M. said that notice was now too late. Brethren would not have it, and added "we are going to be a new lump." Mr. Smyth was present during the conversation and they both gave Mr. H. very plainly to infer that though Kennington had acted the case was hopeless as to their return and our being together again. This took place on the morning of August 25. In the afternoon, Mr. Milward met Mr. Pettman and asked him if he had received the notice which he had left at Mr. Hope's. Mr. P. replied he had not seen Mr. Hope and knew nothing of a notice.

Mr. M. said he had written a week's notice for the Hall and left it with Mr. H. Mr. P. said at once, "If we were to act according to legal rights we could stay 3 months or even 12." Mr. M. admitted they could, but did not say, you may take any notice you please, 3 months or 6 months. Mr. P. also said as we shall have a meeting this evening, I will bring your notice before them and should you hear no further we shall abide by the notice you have issued. Mr. P. submitted the notice to the meeting in the evening August 25th after asking "all in fellowship to stay" and as they understood there was no hope held out of the return of those who had gone out and our being together again, the seceders being determined to refuse Kennington and as Mr. M. wanted his Hall the judgment came to was to give up to Mr. M. and go out at the expiration of the week rather than stand on legal rights if they held it. As to the "motive" for printing the weeks notice without note or comment at the meeting at which the printing of the correspondence was considered, Mr. Hope proposed that there should be a footnote to the week's notice, qualifying it. It was, however, decided to print simply and only the actual documents which passed between the two meetings as any qualifying notes might be questioned and raise discussion and the notice was printed at the head of the correspondence as first in date. It is perhaps necessary to add that Mr. Milward was generally in the habit of consulting Mr. Hope upon some of his business matters and Mr. Hope considered he was giving impartial advice as to a legal notice.

The foregoing is a condensed but true account of the week's notice and why it appeared at the head of the correspondence without note or comment.

Signed Alfred Hope

Sept. 9th, 1881

Ramsgate Thomas E. Pettman

CBA 116

Dear McAdam,

I have thought it well to send you my answer to Mr. Jull, who wrote to me to announce his separation from brethren. Though I sorrow for him, I do not know that it is an evil that the system of which it is the expression is come to a head. The evil has long been apparent to me.

My Dear Jull,

You know nothing of my relationship with Abbot's Hill, nor what I have said or written to them, but that is not the question now, but the position you have definitively taken. No one acquainted with Ramsgate, &c., was ignorant of the two parties there long existing. I was aware before leaving France of a party inclined to separate upon the ground you state. Since my return I have better known its movements, and partially its active members, and one chief source of [its, or the] movement and the steps and channels by which it reached Ramsgate, and I am quite satisfied it is not of God. Your present letter has at least the advantage of being honest; for you know I never doubted the influence these views exercised upon you.

While it was a question as to Ramsgate, &c., I never owned A. Hill. I trusted that leaving it to God the position of those separated might be cleared up. It was a local question. Your present letter puts it on different ground. You identify yourself avowedly with the party I have referred to. My first feeling was not to answer your letter, as I believed the disposition of London was to receive from neither; I had only to let this continue, and leave it all [with, or to] God. Your letter goes too far [for me]. [Further,] you now openly judge the whole body of brethren as unfit to be associated with, on account of their state, while reserving to yourself the right to select certain assemblies and

individuals whom you will own. You and this party are characterized by that holiness and truth which are proper to the precious testimony which God confided to brethren, [or] at least by the love of [it] and fidelity to it, the rest are in a mass [regarded, or rejected] as unworthy.

Now I have not seen that those who pretend to this, are more holy or characterized more by what is proper to this testimony, nor more devoted, nor have the good of the Church of God at heart. Their state does not approve itself to my spiritual judgment, while owning many of those I refer to as dear brethren. I know among the thousands of whom you know nothing, brethren walking in obscurity more devoted, more given up to Christ than those who are disposed thus pretentiously to quit them. You admit the precious testimony of God was confided to brethren, so that it is solely on the ground of their unfaithfulness and your greater faithfulness that you leave them. Now I admit that brethren [have, or had] declined from the unworldliness [and devotedness] which was proper to [this, or their] testimony, and have borne, as God enabled me, a testimony to this effect, and the troubles in London have largely awakened conscience, and I may add, I never met in visiting so great an appetite for the Word. But all this was fully before me, before Dr. C.'s case arose. I weighed before God with deeper anxiety than I can speak of here, the question of leaving brethren, and what I should do. I felt clearly it was not faith, --- "the hireling fleeth"--- and I remained where I was, tho' in some things more isolated. I have not remarked [that] those who have taken the ground you do have advanced in [holiness, or lowliness] and spirituality, rather the contrary, [and] I am satisfied it is the path of pretension, [and] not of faith. The question was fully before me, and decided before any of [the, or these] particular questions arose, though partially occasioned by what brought [about] some of them in result. I therefore, having had the matter fully before me, reject as evil the ground you have taken. Were the movement of those you join yourself to, to break up brethren, --- and I have thought of all that, --- your party, were

I to be with any which I do not think I should, would I think be the very last I should be [with], --- indeed, I should not think of it at all, it is too pretentious for me. I have felt that brethren had got into a low state, and have felt the path [of faith] was to serve them in it. You have judged that they are in a hopeless irremediable state, and judged of God to be unworthy of His testimony. God will judge whom He accepts in this. If God has not so judged them, you are clearly wrong. I shall not regret if He does reject them, having sought to serve them and Him in their low estate.

I enter into no details as to Kennington. It is not the question. Your statement is "I am not free to be in their association, as feeling my great responsibility to the Lord and [to the brethren, or the truth]." I believe [that] under the influence of an evil system you have not been able to resist the effect of the pressure of A. Hill, and what was associated with it. You cannot be surprised if I act as to you on your own statement, and at the same time reject in every way the system under whose influence you are. I reserve to myself as it concerns many besides you, the right to communicate this letter in any way I think proper. I leave the judgment of the question, and of the right path entirely in [the Lord's, or God's] hands.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

{Signed} J. N. Darby

CBA 147

{1879}

Dear McAdam,

I hasten to let you know that I have just received a letter from Jull and quite a satisfactory one, wholly withdrawing his former and regretting it. Were you here I would, of course, show it you. My tour every where has been very encouraging, a great desire to hear and study the word and the brethren free and on the whole

encouraged. I refer to them but there has been in various places a good attendance from outside. Guildford Hall did not go with Jull. Kind remembrance to Ellen. I shall be, D.V., in London Wednesday, have put shoes on now two days running to go to the meeting of which I have had pretty much two per diem.

Affectionately in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

God makes *every thing* together for good. All this draws in to union at Brighton too. Thank God things look up through mercy.

CBA 535d

Sept. 16th, 1881

Dear Gipps,

It is time I should write a line to you. It was not for want of often thinking of you that I have not but what little strength I have, has been spent on the French Old Test. And the English New, both laborious work. But I felt you were a great deal isolated and was longing to write a line. I was very thankful to hear you were all straight at Hereford. At Exeter which was a difficult place, they are too and generally in that county. All around God is carrying on His clearing work. What I am anxious for is that brethren should see that it is His hand which has indeed wonderfully interfered. But that calls for lowliness and thankfulness. The sense of His goodness always humbles. Exulting is never right but what ground for it when we have allowed to come in and grow up amongst us what God in His mercy has to put out. Still we have great cause for thankfulness and one thing I have noticed: God has never stopped His work by and amongst brethren. It is nothing very great but it has constantly gone on and is now too showing itself. Four clergymen have lately come out: two in communion (brothers) and one certainly (he is here) gifted and in earnest. One is not clear and

another hindered by knowing Mr. ---. Still God is working. What I never had specially on my mind to pray for as to this is that they should maintain His testimony, the testimony He raised up among brethren. Nothing is better than visiting work without assuredly depreciating the gospel. What I feel is to be done and as far as able always have done, is to seek to present Christ according to the state of the soul one has to say to. I never bother myself with brethren, if God gathers them it will be well, but my business is one. What does that soul want {i.e., need}? It may be a deeper conviction of sin, it may be that Christ has made peace, but whatever it is that is what I have to bring and look to Him to seal the word and make it good. And then feed on Him for myself for He is there in grace for us in unsearchable riches in Him. I am better in His goodness; God has preserved my mind untouched and indeed my body save that my cheek is still numb and I have to take care not to trouble from losing my balance. For study and work, I am as fresh as ever and happy and thankful in His love which is infinite. It is not the age to expect very great restoration but there is one above it.

Love to all the brethren: may they with purpose of heart cleave to the Lord.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 32a

46 Forgate St.

Worcester

21 Sept., 1881

Beloved Brother,

Several of the saints here being greatly exercised as to the truth of the statements put forth by brethren in Ramsgate, in reference to the notice to quit, etc., as if the remarks in your letter were correct they could not expect to be recognized. I enclose a

copy of their reply to the several questions put to them as in yours. So told me the notice "was done at their wish and request. They were offered a week or a month or three months or 6 months and they chose a week." Next, as to the refusal to put a footnote to explain, hence your "Therefore said it was intentional, a vile and intentional deceit," we were anxious to put some 9 or ten testing questions. You can see their answers to each for it. and surely they would not, could not, write deliberate untruths to us, and thus coming direct there can be no error or mistake as to the statements actually made, beloved brother, I was so thankful with yourself, thankful to find the efforts of the enemy to divide about three years ago and was so thankful to see your letter from Pau to Mr. McAdam, and felt one could breathe a little more freely, seeing the deliverance that was wrought for us, little thinking that even the enemy had another attack prepared and now as far as one can see unless the Lord comes in, in special deliverance, the long dreaded division will spread: division is upon us and that by those professing to be the spiritual amongst us, beloved brother, we are still counting on God for His deliverance, but if in His wisdom He permits it, it will be all in love to the poor lowly humble ones, who don't profess or aim at high pretensions but quietly and truly go on with the Lord by His Spirit looking to Him, walking in humility and lowliness. I was in some hope, that your letter to Mr. Jull would be used of the Lord to crush those high pretensions, but it has become much more arrogant at Worcester than formerly, now it is openly proclaimed without any desire to screen it, indeed so plainly that one professes himself the only spiritual man in our gathering, simply because we keep to scripture, while he wants a theory without scripture to satisfy us, but thank God, while we are simple and keep to His word, we can judge of the Doctrine.

Beloved brother, may the Lord in mercy remove from us all that is not of Himself and keep us little in our own eyes, learning of Him. I thought I must send you the answer to our questions from Brethren at A.H.

Affectionately in the Lord,

S. Howard Coombs

{to} Mr. Darby

CBA 258

October, 1881

Dear Mr. {George} Rymer,

You mistake the whole matter. It is in no way a difference between me and Mr. Kelly. While I was in France and nothing to say to Mr. K., he wholly lost the confidence of brethren who had, letters of his being produced which falsified his statements to them. After my return his public statement at Park St. as to Ryde was untrue as he admitted to me when I sought him, as was his printed statement in the B. T. He promised to contradict it, but never did. Mr. G. V. Wigram said that since he had come and was connected with Dr. C., it was all over with Brethren. There are many more details but I do not enter into them. As to Dr. C. I will give you an extract from a letter of his, which as he had it printed and circulated when he found it was in manuscript, no one can complain of my referring to it. I cannot lay my hand upon it and have not time to search but he not only owned it to be his but printed it himself as such: "Most of us feel and regret that the time is come to apply Heb. 12:27 and give up brethren to take some among them and some out of other denominations and they will be the materials for God to set up a new testimony." You can have it in print so that I am not concerned about quoting it from memory. I had had no doubt of what was going on for a long time and was here avowed. I decline going into any charges for I feel for the old man with all my heart.

My statement as to meetings for humiliation referred to the existing trouble in which those who were guilty of evil sought to get others to involve themselves in the acknowledgment of being

on the same ground. I did not propose Dr.C.'s restoration but that I should be delighted to do it myself if he ceased doing evil and acknowledged his fault that he might not think I had any unkindly feeling towards him, as I believed he loved the Lord.

There is no insuperable hindrance to confidence being restored as to Mr. K., if he confesses what he has done; his nearest friends have been to him and written to him and only finally been driven away. It is only an attempt to delude, talking of me and Mr. K. Many do think his conduct at Ryde was the root. I was not in England, not at the time of the conflict as to Dr. C. I came in at the very end of the latter and would not go to the meeting at Park St. as to it. I have refused all intercourse with the whole party since they established themselves as such. But this I may say to you, that it is a settled thing with me not to walk with the iniquity I have known to be going on and which you did your best to defend and justify. I saw God was working, and believe He is, and {I} was content to leave it to Him, as I am still. Those who supported Dr. C. have supported the wickedness of Abbott's Hill. The whole thing has been a system of iniquity or an effort to hide or excuse it.

Yours truly in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

CBA 11

1 Yew Tree Road

Edgleaston

Birmingham

28/10/81

Beloved Brother,

I received your letter yesterday and I am thankful for your ready and kind reply. What I was anxious about was to know from yourself whether in your judgment this question of the decision

of Park St. Assembly is one for provincial gatherings to question the right or the wrong of. Hence I wrote you and I did so as one whose full confidence has never wavered in your judgment.

Now I write to tell you what has actually taken place here during one month.

I came home from Penzance at the end of September having missed the week night meetings on account of my absence. It was announced from the Table that an Assembly Meeting was called for Monday night (and Prayer M. night) *to consider the Ramsgate question*. Those who are usually at Brothers Meetings were away and 5 brothers only decided to call the meeting. We came together, and Mansell for over one hour laid the case before the meeting, saying we were each responsible to judge it and clear ourselves of evil. I at once told the Saints I was sorry it had come up without any fellowship among brethren about it, that I did not myself look upon it as a matter for our judgment as we could not possibly judge it righteously without all the facts. I considered it was for our acceptance – as in every case of discipline by another Assembly – and not for our Judgment, the very thought of which was *inferentially* to question it. I reminded them too that we had been breaking bread with a person from Park St. in and . . . and to my knowledge there was not an element of dissent in the meeting

In proof that I was not opposing, I stated that I had broken bread the past two Lord's days in a meeting (Penzance) where they had simply announced their acceptance of the Park St. decision in Aug. last.

I wish to say particularly that up to that time I had not sought or received a single line in writing or print from any living person for or against the Action of Park St. and I told you I said clearly that our duty was not to investigate, but to accept it and so on, adding that wherever they had taken it up for Judgment, there had been trouble.

A note was made to announce it on Lord's day morning as

accepted but before the week was over some brethren came from the other meetings and wished to go into it together, and a meeting was held, inviting the 3 Assemblies and a week later another Assembly Meeting at Ruston St. in which meeting I am, and to this meeting Mansell brought a paper on which our acceptance of the Park St. Judgment was written, but he had also added to this a statement in which we were made to speak of it as though we had ourselves understood them through the whole matter before the Lord, and I at once stated most emphatically that I accepted the Action and Judgment of Park St. most fully but that my conscience would not allow me to adopt that language about a matter which I had . . . At this meeting there were under 50 out of 150 saints who compose the meeting and many had the same difficulty I had. I think Mr. Barnett went farther than I did but I can say he was very much drawn out by interrogation. It was ultimately proposed that the paper should be accepted as read, and 26 of the Saints said yes to it. It was also proposed that we should wait a little to consider the paper, and 18 said they wished to do so, I among them. It was then asked if any *one* had any opposition as to the *Judgment itself* and there was not a single person.

Mansell said he should claim that (26) as an assembly judgment and the meeting separated. On the following Saturday evening, I felt deeply our position and in order to make plain any difficulty I wrote the enclosed paper and put it on the Table and also read the enclosed letter from Mr. Rickard telling Brethren that my whole spirit went with that letter and that it had been a comfort to me that *no one* opposed the judgment itself on Thursday but simply asked to wait to consider Mansell's paper.

But Mansell at once said that those who waited, *did it under a cloak*. God is my witness, dear Mr. Darby, that it was absolutely false, and that among those who did wait were some of the most conscientious in the meeting. I was very much cut up and broken by it. I could see you were angry with us and ready to deride indeed they said so. I then, after reading the enclosed letter

and paper said that although my conscience would not have led me to write the language of Mansell's paper I would not oppose it but bowed to it in deference to my brethren. Barnett said the same in effect. Mr. Tompson, the oldest Brother in this district then said "that removed the difficulty between us."

Mr. Pollack was present and *told the* Brethren that he should be satisfied with that. These were his words.

It was agreed thus that the Paper (Mansell's) should be read on the following a.m. before breaking of bread and it was done, after which I felt that {it} was due to those who had heard my *statements about that paper* that they should know in what spirit I was breaking bread and I rose {and} stated what you will find written on the enclosed paper. I do declare before my Lord that I did so without any trace of hostility or opposition in my spirit and that my object was that I might conscientiously break bread with saints and they with me. No one else said anything, and Mansell then said he thought "we might now resume the object for which we had come together." A Brother soon after gave out hymn and at that moment Mr. Lessey left the Room. Rayner followed him to the door and came back to his seat. Mr. Pollack then continued the meeting in prayer and Mansell broke the bread after which Mr. Pollack ministered from John 9, and Mansell gave out {a meeting?} for Mr. Pollack on the Tuesday.

Mr. Lessey came back and preached . . . announced an Assembly Meeting for Thursday night to the surprise of everyone, not one of us could tell what was the object and they would not disclose it. Last night we went. I greatly feared the Enemy was at work and I asked Brethren from the neighboring gatherings to come and sit down in our midst to witness what took place, surely and . . . among them.

Mansell at once set aside the Lord's day morning, and Saturday night meetings, went back to Thursday night and Mr. Staces said that 18 of us rejected the Park St. Judgment (This is positively and wickedly untrue in God's sight. We only waited to

consider his paper and not a single person opposed London) on that night, and that division then came in and that he should claim as an Assembly Judgment the voice of the 26 (out of 150 saints). He said Barnett and I in particular had opposed the whole thing from the first. I earnestly assured everyone present, Mr. Lessey in particular, that what I stated at the Lord's Table was honest and true and was intended to conciliate rather than to offend anyone, but they seemed determined to leave us and after Mansell had denounced, he called upon those who agreed with him to follow him in separating from us. About 30 left the room, I should think not so many, 24 remained and thus we are divided in Birmingham.

I believe Mr. Lessey in God's sight is responsible for it and guilty of much that he does not now see to be evil. Ever since he has been here he has followed up every meeting and even individuals too forcing this matter upon every conscience as the Judgment of God. The result is that there is an Assembly where we are all out in the main and those of us who are left see clearly that our position in fellowship to the truth of God about us commands us to reject what Park St. rejected and accept what you then accepted, *and refuse all* who do not carry this out.

Here I say we are divided and scattered and Know not what to do.

Dear Mr. Darby, Where can we go? We are connected with God's testimony in the Earth and wish to be. I believe Lessey has a notion that W. K. is influencing us. It is absolutely false. I am sure, quite sure that neither Barnett nor I have sent to or received from him a single line. I have not *seen* him either for years.

If there was time before post, I could get the correctness of this statement witnessed by scores of the saints here, and on my single testimony scripture does not warrant me in asking you receive it. But for the moment I declare it to be a true account of doings by brethren here and placed as we are with Lord's day

upon us, we do not want to break bread in secession, neither do we want to cease and lay ourselves open to have forfeited our existence in fellowship. What is your advice to us in this sorrowful moment? I should be thankful to have a line from you posted middle day tomorrow to reach me Lord's day a.m.

I am yours affectionately in Christ,

Edwin Bond

CBA 281

{Date: circa 29 Oct 1881}

{to Voorhove}

My dear Brother,

As I wrote to your brother when he first proposed humiliation, I could and did sympathize with him in the general wish and do now desire it may be the spirit in which those who seek to go right may walk. Since I got your letter, I had one from Mr. Macintosh who says, "the more I read and hear and see the more I am convinced that there are great foundation principles underlying all etc. . ." "a question of good and evil". I quote this not to give any person's opinion as to who is right or who is wrong, but that it is not a mere question that can be settled by kindly feelings but that there is a vital question at the root. It is what I have felt all through. Now some of the meetings for common humiliation sought first to throw those who sought to maintain the right and those who sought to undermine it on the same footing of confession of circumstances, regrettable no doubt but mere circumstances (I believe chastisement, however, for . . .) and thus swamp the question of good and evil as if it was all no matter. This I could not accept. Most of the time, let me add, I was away in France and took (after I had made to be known that it was for me a question of good and evil, this was in Dr. C.'s case) no part save at the closing meeting at Cheapside on my return including an effort at closing discussion in the local

assembly I belong to with a view to peace. Your brother published a tract at the time, I think, of his proposal for humiliation which greatly destroyed any confidence there was of brethren in him; he had been in constant active opposition to the body of those who really sought what was right. At the time, he was proposing, the last he was going to print, an attack on or summons to me to answer for myself but his father-in-law hindered him.

As to a circular from Park Street, Park Street took the question up because a letter of commendation came to it from Guildford Hall. But though a local question it involved so much that crowds of brethren from inside and outside London came and Abbot's Hill leaders and friends held the fullest liberty of speaking and use of it, save some short words had it mostly to themselves the two first nights, when Abbott's Hill was in question. The third, there was more from Park Street because Guildford Hall was directly in question from whence the letter came. There was no circular to send out, but as it, though local, concerned all, the decision they came to was sent down to Cheapside so as to reach all in London. I refer you to the beginning of my letter for the real question: unity between good and evil I do not understand, nor is it to be sought. I have referred to Dr. Neatby because you have so largely referred to him. My path has been to leave all to God who, I believed and believe, will, alone could, bring out the first issue but I am not conscious of any feeling towards any but desire for the fullest blessing. But I cannot walk with what I know to be evil. Save answering letters I have written nothing on the Kent matters, nor read the multitude put out, but I saw those of Abbott's Hill myself besides their public statements at Park St. and sought to keep my own conscience clear. You are not aware of what is passing now. I resisted separation when the harassing of evil seemed likely to drive many out, but the danger does not arise there now but in the effort to force the acceptance of what is evil, or leave. I thank you for your letter and trust you will understand

mine. My comfort has been to leave all to God.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

{not sent}

CBA 282

{Date circa 29 Oct 1881}

My dear brother,

If activity in falsehood were to govern, we should be in a bad way, but I trust the Lord and do not even reply. I will send you an extract of a letter from C. H. M. (Macintosh) I received last week. "It will, I feel assured, interest your loving heart to know that the Lord has given me perfect clearness and rest as to all that has been going on amongst us. The more I read and hear and see the more I am convinced that there are great foundation principles underlying the strife and confusion, and the enemy is seeking to cast dust in people's eyes by occupying them with men and their sayings and doings in mere local details in order to prevent their seeing what is really involved. I am convinced it is not Abbott's Hill or G. H. but a question of good and evil." He speaks then of all he has passed through in spirit, for two years, "and now, blessed be His name, my heart is at rest about it all, come what may I believe the Park Street declaration was, under the circumstances, the only right thing and if it had been universally accepted we should have been spared much, etc." Now M. was disposed the other way and I have had no communication with him for years. If I had not made a decided stand and trusted the Lord alone, I should have left brethren. Mr. Wigram had given them up as hopeless. I did not because I said the hireling fleeth and it was not faith but his conviction was that since Mr. K. and Dr. C. had got together there was no hope. It was as Macintosh says a question of good and evil. No one from the outset has been so persevering and insatiable in mischief as Dr. N. who wishes it

(... it) ... ; he ... of facts Abbott's Hill; I do not know {that} he has gone further. His own father-in-law stopped him in printing one violent attack. I have declined all communication with him. I do not know one whose opinion I should value whose respect he has not lost. He has a violent party who are now escalating the confusion. Dr. C.'s object, avowed in a letter all possess, was to break up brethren and with some from them and other Christians begin a new work. Scarcely one statement in your letter or in the wretched pamphlet you sent me is true. Strange to say, I received it last night and read it, for I read none of them, being convinced of their wickedness; their details and attacks are immaterial. I prefer trusting God. But as they are very active now, I thought I would look at it. It is only a resumé of all the falsehoods they propagate. But to turn to yours first, you say G. H. has left the assembly. We all think it did wrong but left no assembly. Abbott's Hill did not exist at all. The assembly broke up on a false principle that unanimity must exist for discipline: four out of some 80 objected to the discipline as to Dr. C., or they would say Kennington. One ... first who had pretended to have fits and was detected and is now off I know not where, though plainly committed then a ... after. At Ramsgate, another did not press his objection. They all own they were wrong in their breaking up. They broke bread next Lord's day in a private house and there *was no other meeting at Ramsgate*. The Abbott's Hill leaders and friends came up and were heard at Park St. and their staunchest friends declared from *their own statement* "they had not a leg to stand on." One laboring brother, ... with them who had labored to support them, went down to undo the mischief he had done. The Abbott's Hill meeting began the Sunday after. There had been none, pretended they were the usual meeting, and their first act was to ... out the others without seeing them about it. I deny that Park St. was moving to exclude Kennington. I had nothing to say to it, but you may not know that Kennington on whose action they had patiently waited for months had formally declared they would not go any further. I would not have gone there and some half had left through their tergiversations so that there was

difficulty as to whether they could be owned as Kennington when they turned round that same week. They were, though my saying that if owned when going wrong, surely they must own them when going right. Had I better known the party, perhaps I might not have done it. What you say is confessed is wholly untrue. You are all wrong as to Park St. It was not even the first who acted but a letter of commendation came up from Ramsgate and Park Street had to decide could they receive it and being a grave question thought it had better come before all those and notice was given and the brethren at Park Street met, but the gravity of the question brought together brethren from all London and outside and everyone was heard, Abbott's Hill itself. But the decision was come to after three nights' discussion. As to the reception of the letter of commendation: you say it was sent by Park Street before all the gatherings in England. This is simply and wholly untrue: it was, as all London was really concerned in it, though in form a mere question of commendation always acted on by each local assembly itself for the . . . at the time . . . who sent to Cheapside where brethren from all the London gatherings meet for weekly business and nowhere else. The three brethren who signed the notice rejecting Dr. C., as many other local assemblies in London had already done, did send that round, not the assembly, though the assembly was apprized they would when hearing it. That was wrong and Park Street recognizes it was wrong. But it is simply false that any letter was written at all as to Abbott's Hill. It was really, too, a question of good and evil as M. says, and is. Abbott's H. is simply a wicked place and no gathering at all, though only recently through Mr. K. and Dr. N.'s efforts, it is sought to be reaccruited. And I told those who once supported that party that nothing would induce me to walk with evil and through grace I will not. I saw from the beginning what C. H. M. now sees and acted accordingly. One after another has had his eyes opened. I refused all intercourse with a few and would not go to two or three gatherings for a long while, but left it there, but since they have openly formed a party of wickedness of which Mr. K. pulls the wires and Dr. N. supports openly, I

have refused to have anything to say to the whole set. You speak of coming together to discuss these things in the Lord's presence; it was done for three nights at Park Street and though brethren who did not belong to England said they never saw a meeting of the kind carried on with such gravity and where the Lord's presence was so evident. But I tell you plainly that I would, and 21 out of 25 meetings came on independent enquiry to the same conclusion, some more strongly than Park St., not kneel down to pray with Mr. K. or Dr. N. I and many others have done all in grace we could. Mr. K.'s nearest friends have gone and gone again, and left as hopeless. So indeed with Dr. C. There are others but as you do not know them there is no need to refer to them. It was the only advocate for Abbott's Hill in Park Street who brought that party up, without asking the brethren, and their own testimony satisfied, as I said, their staunchest friends that they had no ground to pretend to be an assembly of God. Your tract declares no partisanship and *will* read the papers, but the judgment must be a righteous one, but goes on with pleading for one side. "Is it not to impose" etc., he has settled the case before "weighing solemnly." This pretension to impartiality satisfied me he was a partisan, which the next page declared. There was no assembly excommunicated but the judgment formed that it had never been an assembly of God at all and thus clear from the statement of one of their leaders, indeed two. Of course, if Abbott's Hill maintained they were *the* assembly, refusing, up to the Park Street meeting, all other ground, how could they meet for humiliation honestly in order to meet together? They declared subsequently that there could be no restoration but by the others coming to them confessing their sin. I say, "God forbid!" Jull, etc., at ours and Lowe's instance gave up breaking bread afterwards in view to union. A. H. peremptorily refused. Remark another thing: there is not an allusion to any testimony but the one side. "I fail to see for what purpose Park St. was called together": could he not have asked? I have told you the adjacent gatherings which he . . . speaks of, though the friends of Abbott's Hill . . . known not . . . supported A. Hill. They did, four of them

declared that the seacoast gatherings did so but four more issued a paper to say that it was false, for they would not go there. If they had not, the judgment of the first four would not have weighed a feather with me: what gave them a right to judge for others? This was pressed at Park St. where really every thing was gone into, and no one accepted it and the falsehood of their statement was exposed. A judgment seat, he tells us, must be impartial etc. etc. If you had been there, you would have seen whether all were heard. The first two days Park St. said very little because the others were practically on their defense by which they condemned themselves. The statement in 8,9 of leaving the acknowledged assembly is a falsehood. Abbott's Hill told us so. The leader had written at the time the assembly is "smashed," the other that he looked anxiously around to see if there was anyone with whom he could break bread and there was no one but his wife. The third, for they tried that too, saying that the others had the key, was walking about Ramsgate with the key in his pocket. The statement at the bottom of 9 is an utter falsehood save that the door was not opened, the other person who had a key having refused to go, not one of {the} dissentients was among those who came not knowing what had happened. The statement having notice to quit Guilford Hall is a dirty fraud, the statement of which opened many eyes. The statement in 10 *is all falsehood* (save possibly as to Manchester which is not to the purpose). The statement as to me (11) is a falsehood. Abbott's Hill did not then exist. I never said nor formed any judgment about the declaration. I had just come home to England from Pau and would not get into the questions. I did object to the three sending it out and do still. I do not say the statement is false here for he confused a true man who said it and it is far from fact that *in my notice* there is a distinct denial and disclaimer of it, independency to which they added what many thought . . . because some had said it. The statement at the bottom of 11 is simply and wholly false: right or wrong they had withdrawn from nothing. The comparison with Dr. C. is nonsense: he went down to begin or rather join a separate meeting where a meeting never disowned by any was in

full operation as such. The only three at Abbott's Hill when it began who had not been out with G. H. had at the meeting which broke up . . . what they owned to get on safer ground at their first Lord's day meeting on Sunday week. The statement as to withdrawing the judgment on confession (13) was arrant wickedness and the statement here false. I do not know what he means when he says "their judgment is mainly founded" (13). Where did he get this? I never saw or heard it and as I, along with . . . about it. All about intervention and reversal of brethren is simply that finding their exclusion of the 6 universally rejected, their own leaders advised them to withdraw it.

It is not true that they did confess to the fellowship of their brethren when they broke bread the third time. Mr. Lowe and myself, I through the wish of several, got Guildford H. to cease. Abbott's Hill, you . . . also written, refused. Lowe afterwards wrote to Broadstairs to encourage *their* breaking bread again. Guilford H. then began again (though taking other ground) but they came up to London that it might be in fellowship, as they had given up at their wish. I told them that they could not refrain from breaking bread for ever, but that I had no light from God as to the special time. Ask them to go to Abbott's Hill, I assuredly would not, when I would not go myself. It is characterized by falsehood and violence and is no assembly of God at all. Mr. Lowe told me, who was anything but a partisan of Mr. Jull's, that it was shocking at Abbott's Hill: he could not find a trace of conscience. As to the neighboring gatherings, it was asking the consent of partisans of the wickedness which they had been victims of. The three Kent gatherings who told a . . . {history}, putting seaside gatherings and saying all were (and as far as I know are) thoroughly identified with Abbott's Hill. (18) There was no schism in the first table. Keep in mind that Abbott's H. did not exist. I think they were wrong by an error widely spread then, but they separated from evil, not from an assembly. I do not go again into the question of Dr. C. I would only recommend his friends to . . . are false. I only need say what he cannot deny that

Abbott's H. claimed to be *the* assembly. If their terms were accepted, it would be owning this and this is exactly what godly persons who know the facts will not own. The statement at the end was a mere dodge to save their corporate existence and that was refused by Mr. Jull. It may be well to say that those who formed Abbott's Hill when it met, save the three alluded to came from the other meeting (23). Of these, when they gave up breaking bread, Dr. C. being excluded, about half went back again. I beg you to understand that I wholly agree with Mr. Macintosh and never was on any other grounds and that it is because I know it is a question of uprightness and godliness. Nothing, with God's help, will allow me to swerve from it.

I forgot to notice a statement of the . . . of the notice having it in two weeks, a fortnight. If it had been true, what then? The meetings lasted over the fortnight, but it is not true. My mind was made up and stated to Abbott's Hill at the time they refused to give up breaking bread, when Jull did at our request with a view to union that in the course of the meetings drawn up another notice in which nothing was said of things, . . . many we would not {accept?} ourselves, put in the notice was the effect of what transpired at that meeting. They also charge it with being itself a part of Jull's expression . . . at the meeting which was none, both cannot be true, but . . . are. I have read the tract you put out. I have read none of the mass of statements about. I went down and saw the Abbott's Hill people. I objected to all the writing . . . But brethren who are right (I do not speak of G. H.) have written nothing that I know of. They got hold by fraud of two of my recent letters and published them, but that was some of the friends of Abbott's H. I give you full leave to all the statements in this letter, but I do not allow you to copy, print, or circulate it, English or Dutch. Two have been pirated, and I decline entering into any controversy as to statements. If you trust me, you may use them, attributing them to me. I do not do it among . . . which is common with them as your tract is. But I write them for you (of course, liable to mistakes) and not to be bandied about the

country. You may say, how is it possible there can be so much false? My answer is we have had nothing else for the last three or four years, and I have broken with it all. These who have been decided are united and blessed though in sorrow, and as they were not for years before. We had the American laborers over with us and never did the brethren experience such blessing as at that conference. I may be alone with Christ and content and happy, but with those whose accounts you have received I, through grace, will not but on open repentance.

Your tract quotes Clapham: they tried fraud proposing a general meeting of brethren in London, where the majority of gatherings had decided, which of course, would be assembled if the proposal had been accepted, and the person had to produce from his pocket their rejection of Park St. decision. The meeting of those who did this is not owned. I may add by the bye, the statement as to Lewisham is a disgraceful falsehood, but I leave it there: it is all of a piece. It is a question for us of good and evil.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 283

Southsea
Laugharne House
Victoria Rd. North
October 29, 1881

Mr. Darby

Dear Brother in Christ,

The matter of Ramsgate is still before Brethren here. The many papers are producing a crop of troublesome questions, and hindering a godly decision. Yet it is felt that patience should be exercised to prevent if possible division. I give you a list of

questions from which you will see what is troubling some minds. I would not have placed them before you, but I could not think of any likely to answer them so satisfactorily. Pray pardon my troubling you.

1. What is understood to be the “new lump” in the neighborhood of Ramsgate?
2. Has Mr. Jull ever been in fellowship with it? and did your letter to him refer to it?
3. If it is an evil thing and Jull was in fellowship with it, has he to your knowledge judged it etc.?
4. Is the position of A. H. altered in any way to your knowledge or do you know anything of their having decided not to receive or commend, and if so, what is their reason?
5. When they, A. H., at their first meeting dealt with Kennington, was not their act rather to present themselves favorably to Brethren in London and elsewhere?
6. Did Jull and those with him at first break bread in fellowship with what is known as the new lump? Was it not rather in heart and purpose with the gatherings represented at Cheapside. I enclose you a list of works: some of them have been sent to me, and you are roughly spoken of and to. Can you give me any clew to them? They are wretched things --- one of the pamphlets has its title “Darbyism” in which you are written to in 1869 or `70.

We have a meeting on Tuesday: if you could reply before, it would oblige

yours truly

Geo. Weeks

CBA 285

{Date: after 29 Oct 1881}

My dear Brother,

Before I take up your questions, I will quote a passage or two from Mr. McIntosh’s letter to me, received within this few days. “The Lord has given me perfect clearness and rest as to all that has been going on amongst us. The more I read and hear and see the more I am convinced that there are great foundation principles underlying all the strife and confusion, and the enemy is seeking to cast dust in people’s eyes by occupying with men and their sayings and doings, mere local details in order to prevent their seeing what is really involved. I am convinced it is not A. H. or G. H., but a question of good and evil” He speaks of what he passed through in his mind, which I omit and then, “And now, blessed be His name, my heart is at rest about it all, come what may. I believe the Park St. declaration was under the circumstances the only right thing and if it had been universally accepted we should have been spared much of the strife and confusion. But God is above all,” etc. The next thing before I come to questions is to point out how the enemy is deluding people by bringing in Jull so as to hide the standing of Guildford Hall. Supposing Jull’s state of soul was everything that could be desired. That would not make G. H.’s standing right, and if it was ever so perverse would it make it wrong. The question as to the standing of Guildford Hall if Jull were dead and gone would remain where it is. If . . . Saints at G. H, some 50 to be deprived of the Lord’s supper for ever. Abbott’s Hill was given up when the facts were known by its staunchest friends, Guildford Hall having done every thing to repair the breach, what brethren begged them and A. Hill refused. Misses Miller, Mr. Cole of Brentford *all* got clear as to it and have declared so.

And now for your questions:

The new Lump is taken from 1 Cor. 5:7. I believe they think a great deal more about it at London than at Ramsgate. There is no proof that it ever had any influence at Ramsgate. Some at Broadstairs had individually got under the abuse of the term: that is, that there must be a quite fresh judging according to the warning to Laodicea. I think some had got under the influence of

this, Ramsgate certainly not directly, second hand some individuals may. At Broadstairs there were. But the thing is Scriptural. At Ramsgate there is nothing of it there that I know of at all. It was not this I referred to. But brethren had got such a leavened lump that many were pressed in conscience as to staying with them. I was; and only absolute confidence in Christ kept me amongst them. Mr. Wigram had given them up, as gone and hopeless. The other (new lump notion) had the tendency to strengthen this feeling. That I resisted, but there was a system of utter demoralization going on which I feel as strongly about as ever.

3. The thing is not evil: it is in 1 Cor. 5, but the abuse of it to separate brethren was, I believe, want of faith, as to the reality of it I wish there was a great deal more of it. It means holiness . . . is no assembly of God at all. That is the point.

5. I believe so but that is a matter of spiritual judgment.

6. Certainly with the gatherings at large and when afterwards Mr. Jull gave up brethren in a moment of excitement not one of the assembly went with him, not even his own wife. And it was withdrawn that or the next day for it was done at 4 o'clock in the morning and only in a letter to myself. My answer was got only by some rascally fraud which has never been traced though the printed *circulation* of it I do know by the person's own confession.

In the deep sense of the utter leavening of brethren that was going on, nothing but faith rising up to Christ above circumstances could then have maintained an upright person who was acquainted with the state of things in connection with brethren. But I do not think giving them up was faith and therefore I resisted this and God has interfered and worked the conscience of brethren and is arousing it. And one after another too has been getting clear like Mr. McIntosh. What got the name of new lump was a collated thing of which a Mr. Cluff, an Irishman, was the source and which took hold chiefly of women

and godly men too. It is now nearly extinct though . . . through it in Scotland where it had penetrated far more than in England. But the leavened state of brethren gave a handle to Satan to attack the godliest in this way.

As to the pamphlets I *suppose* they come through one in Edinboro who was a chief Cluffite but had to be refused, not for immorality, and now indulges in a kind of quakerism. Possibly, he is mad.

I would add that the original break up of the assembly at G. H. came, though I doubt not what I have spoken of led the way morally, from another false principle widely afloat there: the need of unanimity in discipline, an antisciptural absurdity, and was more the act of a brother named Cove than of Mr. Jull. 4 out of some 80 objected; 2 however left the meeting. Two protested, so it was held that no discipline could be carried out and thus they broke up as a meeting, though all met at Almorah, not, of course, the three, for one had gone off to London. There was no meeting that day at Ramsgate. It was pretended the others had the key, but this was all falsehood.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 12

Birmingham

13 Bennetts Hill

Beloved Brother,

Nov 15, 1881

I read your kind letter this morning for which I am thankful. I do not wonder that you do not understand my position in all this. No one not present could do so. I thank God. He sees and knows. I must first explain to you what I can see already has been misrepresented, i.e., my calling on Mr. C. Sheddon to speak.

He came to the Assembly meeting on Thursday week *to hear*

and at the end of meeting a brother, in no sense a leader nor partizan, said he should much like a little time to consider Mansell's paper and Chas. Sheddon rose quite voluntarily and said if the Brethren would do so he felt sure all would be one mind and those pressing would not regret it, adding that it was always a safe course not to be in haste. This was disregarded and it was asked that those who were for immediate action would rise (26) and those who wished to *wait* (18). Then if any one opposed the action of Park St. entirely, not one rose. Now, when on Thursday *last* Mansell said 18 *refused* the judgment of Park St. and in the most *sudden* ruthless way rose to leave the meeting, I at once called C. Sheddon to witness that we did not refuse it and that they were positively separating on the basis of either wilful or accidental misstatement but they would not hear a word and rushed away from us as evil doers. This is exactly what took place.

As to Mr. K., I am sure he has not influenced me, as I have seen and said for some time past that whether he was conscious of it or not, there was a tendency to break up what little united testimony was left and I could truly add that my instinct and sympathies has been with the action of Park St. throughout, but Brethren have no patience.

The very spirit of division seems to be in the air. I believe Mr. Lessey is responsible for all the mischief and sorrow we are now in.

I believe the snare the {Enemy} laid for us was to break bread in haste. I wrote Lessey on Saturday telling him I should stand alone, and hoped all would break bread at room as usual, but was grieved to find, on Lord's day, that one clear day {they} had was quite sufficient for them to take another room. If they had met as usual, I intended to go and sit behind till matters were subsided, but when I learned they had left the Room, for the sake of others I sat still in the house. Many I am told not knowing that any thing had taken place went only to find there was no meeting.

Mr. Lessey is evidently set to break up, divide, and scatter, rather than to strengthen what remains. He called on me last night and in the most sharp and lofty spirit said, He had heard I was in business with an unconverted man, charged me with living in sin before God for the sake of worldly gain, saying that on this ground alone, he could "have no sort of fellowship" with me. Now, Dear Mr. Darby, but for the spirit in which he came, I would have explained to him fully that these are *relative ties* and *relative* circumstances in my position in the world which any honest mind would accept in justification of it and I may add freely to you that years ago when I *took up mainly* the responsibility of the business I am in, I did so in the fullest council of some of the oldest brethren I know and I have had no reason whatever to think that I took a step in disobedience to the word of God.

I have since asked Mr. Lessey if this is the path of service he has before him to speak to Mr. Rayner with whom he has been staying here in the same way he has to me. He will find Mr. Rayner has two partnerships of the very same nature mine is. I state all this to you as Mr. Lessey has not only led his Brethren here to make me a prisoner, but by his word last night that he wanted to have "no sort of Fellowship" with me, he has effectually locked the door. I was pained and grieved, and could not help telling him that I have labored in the world to obtain an honest living for my Family, and to help those who do not get bread for themselves, but in their path of service to the Lord had become the harsh judges of those who so labor.

Mr. Talbot and Mr. Lessey may report what they see now, but God well knows that the elements which have led up to it have been working here for years, during which every matter effecting the Assembly has been brought before us by Mr. Mansell in so independent and high handed a manner as to render it next to impossible for Brethren to deal calmly and unitedly with it. The whole cause of our present trouble is mainly in this.

During the past two years, he has without consulting any of

us, dropped every name out of the list of Meetings except his own so that he was the only Brother in a position to receive a line of information in this Ramsgate question, and then forced it upon the Meetings in such away as to stultify rather than to leave time to exercise conscience. I told him privately when these meetings began, If he would lead the brethren and not try to rule, then all would go well.

As to the former part of your letter, I do stand to it all and have done so here that I accept the Judgment of Park St. in its entirety honestly before God and man, but I would remind you that neither Mr. Talbot nor Mr. Pollack were at the previous meeting where 18 *asked time to think of Mansell's paper*. Had they been, I have confidence that either of them would have stopped the fatal course of their Brethren last Thursday by reminding them they were dividing on a false issue – utterly false – They said we rejected it and this was all Mr. Talbot heard. There was no time for a word. They rushed out and all was over. Oh, what a moment in the history of this meeting! Some of those who had sat in silence through all the meetings were so paralyzed they remained in the room to speak about it, but their names were quickly taken and on Lord's day some of them were refused admission in the *new* room. I verily believe that Mr. Lessey is under the influence of new lumpism, nothing else can account for his hasty actions here. I am satisfied he is responsible for the break up and scattering of this meeting.

Still I reflect and look up to God and am conscious that He is speaking to me in all this and although I have detailed to you the reckless merciless acts of those who have precipitated things here, I nevertheless believe that God is raising the question as to who really loves His truth and desires to keep it; I have never been more conscious of it than at this moment. In a letter I had from Mr. McAdam last week he says, "It is a second edition of Bethesda principles and discipline in the House of God as necessary as then."

Those whose ecclesiastical position is with what is left of

God's testimony in the earth have cast me out unjustly. This I feel deeply, but I am thankful I am free from all these so that I can in my individuality look to God to preserve me from any path which is not His.

May I ask you, dear Mr. Darby, (for I do not know) what W.K.'s position is now and *why* his influence seems to lead to the break up rather than to the maintenance of a testimony to the truth? You must please understand I know nothing of what he said to those who saw him at Burton. I have never asked them. I am thinking of the way he has been regarded by Brethren for some time and why it is you spoke of Kennington being demoralized by him (He has been in bed for weeks or I would have told him. I have not seen him.) I ask you merely for information and guidance. I have felt for some time it is important his position should be known.

I must now close, grieved to write you from an outside position, which in reality is not mine, grieved too that at your time of live not the cares only but the sorrows of the Church should be as they are upon you.

If you return to London, I should like to see you. Meantime, I ask you to remember me even where I am now. In all confidence and love in the Lord, I am truly yours,

Edwin Bond

CBA 313

{Date: 1882?}

{January} . . .

My dear Brother,

I am still a poor invalid but able to do a little more than I did under the gracious hand of God. I not only can freely express myself as to your position but have done so several times to

different brethren that were I at Canterbury a Lord's day, I should go and break bread with you. The mistake you made was giving up the room etc. to Smith and company, but it does not alter your position. As far as I am concerned I own you as the assembly of God at Canterbury. You were mixed up with Ramsgate in the minds of brethren and hence they have had difficulty in many places, I dare say, but the case is really different. Only one person objected to Mrs. Cooper at Clarendon and McAdam was not there, and they did not like to raise a discussion at the moment. But the person who objected got a meeting held about it, but even so it was Broadstairs, but they were very decided against him. But there are those who would wait to have London act together, for that: were I at Canterbury I should not wait. My advice to you is to go on as the assembly at Canterbury. As far as I am concerned I should own you in every way. Ramsgate was more complicated though I do not own Abbot's Hill as an assembly at all. I hoped to have been down and seen you all. That the Lord's hand has hindered and I am sure He is wise but it is the first visit I hope to pay. You stopped breaking bread when Jull did, that helped much to identify you with the whole Kent "new lump" movement. With that I do not sympathize as being faith, but with their sense of the evil around them I do at Ramsgate as elsewhere and hope to see them all. I think things are coming to a crisis but all feel our part is to wait on God for Him to act, but I have no difficulty or question as to you. In some places some who really feel with you have difficulty from all in London not acting as yet together in it. Kind love to the saints.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

10th Jan., 1882

Dear Mr. Darby,

Would you kindly tell me if it is scriptural to say that we have fellowship with *all* believers, though we are not able to show it outwardly to all?

Is not fellowship with believers spoken of in *two* senses in the word of God; firstly, in a universal sense, with all believers, and secondly, in a narrower sense?

Does not 1 John 1:7 – "we have fellowship one with another," means that we have fellowship with *all* believers?

My reason for asking is that several brethren who were speaking about it, all agreed that though they had *love* to all brethren, it was not right to say that we had *fellowship* with all.

I suggested that though we had fellowship with *all* believers, we could not give *practical expression* to it in many cases; but they all agreed that they had fellowship only with those with whom they were practically in communion; i.e., those with whom they were breaking bread.

I should esteem it a favor if you would say if you think their exclusive view of the meaning of the word "fellowship" in Scripture is correct; and, if they are right, would you be kind enough to explain 1 John 1:7?

Apologizing for troubling you,

I am

Yours respectfully in the Lord,

C. A. Colman

N.B. Please address C. A. Colman

Dear Mr. Darby,

My esteemed brother in Christ,

I have seen your letter to Mr. Patching as to the reply from Herne Bay to the two notices sent to us from Faversham, and would be thankful to you if you would allow me to explain why we accepted the notice from Kennington on the 24th August, and why we said that Faversham withdrew their excommunication “because another assembly (London so called)” etc.

We received the Park St. declaration on the same day as the notice from Kennington reached us.

Park St. said in their notice three times “this assembly”, then followed three separate declarations of judgment, the third refusing the Saturday evening meeting as the medium of communication between the local assemblies in London.

Now, we knew from Mr. Vander Linde that the meeting that sent out this notice throughout the country was not of Park St. only, but also of many brethren from other meetings who were prepared and resolved to go with Park St. in this assumption, i.e., “this assembly” – ignoring the rest of London, and the only medium acknowledged of communication between them.

Along the Kent Coast division was expected and indeed counted on. Even as early as Easter last it was said to me at Ramsgate (names can be given if needed, “when the division comes, I hope you will be on the right side.” Those who called the meetings during that eventful week (August 19th etc.) of the assemblies in these parts insisted that “London was a ruin”, “was gone”, and the Park St. declaration was evidently to be the new testimony for them and every one was pressed to decide for against it.

On August 23rd, D. Cheetham wrote to me, in reply to my inquiry as to the meaning and content of their declaration, in these words: “All intercommunion is intercepted until we are all again, if it may be, on the ground of the unity of the assembly and

body of Christ, an unleavened lump as to anything that affects the unity” and in the Broadstairs notice of the next day, the brethren that went with Park St. say, “We met again to break bread Sunday Aug. 26th as a new lump”. Faversham “fully accepted” the Park St. declaration, but quoted only the second part, putting every one out in London and elsewhere that did not go with Park St.

It was clearly our duty, as gathered to the name of the Lord, and owning the Holy Spirit as the only source of wisdom and power (if in real dependence on His guidance) to disown what was not of God and to own what was. The time was one of exceeding difficulty, and the deepest exercise. Our united cry was to be led aright, and we accepted the Kennington notice and refused the declaration from Park St. Some in London did the same, Aug. 26th. On Aug. 22nd I wrote to Mr. Hewer; “I have confidence that in time London will be brought to oneness of action in this matter but the bond of peace will be wanting till the spirit of Zech. 12:10, 16 is realized.”

I knew nothing then of how the oneness would be brought about or how soon your going to London and to Park St. did it and all here blessed God in unfeigned praises for it.

It was the submission of Park St. (and the many with Park St.) that to Faversham was “London” for the rest of London was ignored (or, at least had been) “was a ruin”, “was gone.” Hence we said, “another assembly (London so called)” referring to that submission.

We still feel that it was very wrong of Faversham when they knew that the Lord had graciously begun the work of healing the division made by Park St. (i.e., by Kennington acting in discipline) not to wait, but to give another wound, so late as Aug. 28th, as deep and as large as Park St. on Aug. 19th, when, one hopes, that the latter knew nothing of what God was, in mercy, doing at Kennington.

Even D. Cheetham writing to me in reply to my question whether, having accepted the Kennington notice Aug. 26th, they

(Park St.) would give up fellowship with us, said Aug. 26th, “there is movement externally at least, at Kennington which may issue in clearing the question and ground. We are waiting, without giving up the principle, to know how all stand.”

I left this note with Mr. Patching on Aug. 27th. Yet on the 28th, they cut us off. They would not wait. Was this right?

Instead of adopting “independency,” as you say, all our conflict is against it, yea our sorrow of heart, and many a cry to God is about it; but this we must leave to that day when the fire will try every man’s work of what sort it is. Solemn truth!

I have ventured to write to you freely beseeching of you to bear with me in all charity and grace and to continue your supplications on our behalf.

Dear and esteemed Brother,

I am yours affectionately in Christ,

W. Burbidge

We have never had the thoughts of refusing fellowship at the Lord’s Table with Faversham. Interchange of service etc. is hindered at present.

CBA 23

{

Dear Mr. Burbidge,

I did not answer your first letter because I have given up for some time all communication with the party that has been formed, I think in disregard of righteousness. I do not think Abbott’s Hill is more than an annex to it. But there is a principle at work which puts external unity before righteousness, uses unity to hinder righteousness. Now to me, righteousness goes first. I find that in Rom. 2. Let grace be what it may in sovereign goodness, it never sets aside righteousness. I did not think sending out the Park Street notice right, nor do I, nor did any I

think, judge Mr. Jull right in the step he first took, he very soon did not think so himself but the course of Abbott’s Hill, I was convinced, was wicked, was so commenced from the beginning and it was not a mere mistaken act but a course pursued and I could not own them. I never meddled . . . with the ecclesiastical question till after Jull started to break bread the second time, but there was unrighteousness and in result I could not own Abbott’s Hill as an assembly. I had no light as to the particular time for Jull to break bread, but I could not ask them to go where I would not go myself, nor could they be deprived of it forever. As to Broadstairs, Mr Horton went, I own and {heard?} to Mr. Jull’s, not to break bread, but, which I regretted, to visit them, and Broadstairs then showed they were morally one with Abbott’s Hill which I disown altogether. The question goes far deeper than local claims whether Christian profession and so called unity, to which in its place I hold thoroughly as ever as plain Scriptural truth, is to go before righteousness, God’s claim to fidelity to Him. I have found in all that has gone on that the path of faith was to do God’s will and let others judge of it as they pleased and leave the result to Him. But I do not think that any church theory, however true and ... when walking in the Spirit can go before practical righteousness. You are probably aware, as it was published abroad, though not by me, that I was deeply exercised as to leaving brethren altogether so great was the demoralization I saw systematically going on. Mr. Wigram had given it up as hopeless and if I felt it was not faith to leave them, it was not to go on with that demoralization. If you wish to know what has been really the leading action in Kent affairs since they were developed, you should see Mr. Lowe’s letters, a most sober God fearing Christian. It is not above a fortnight ago that I first saw them. I knew he had been down there and occupied with them.

Yours sincerely in the Lord,

J.N. Darby

CBA 214

Dear Mr. Owen,

I write a line to say that I feel it wrong to acquiesce in your trenching at pleasure on the feelings, judgment and spiritual peace of the mass of those gathered at Park Street, and slighting, rather defying, the Spirit of God, and the authority of Christ, who however feeble they may be, is amongst them. Without any antecedents calculated to give you a title to be their special teacher and admonisher in opposition to the feelings and judgment of the great body of them, after opposing them in every way in their desire to maintain righteousness and supported evil assiduously wherever . . . knows pain it is to them. Having absented yourself for months just when it suits your fancy to force yourself upon them. I have been, as all know, laid by ill, unable to attend meetings. Sunday I got down to find you and Keridge taking each his part. An intelligent and spiritual American brother come to this country for other objects was there. He was judging himself and wondering if it was his fault that he could not follow or receive as of the Spirit what you said, did not know you but wondered what was the matter, that there was something wrong. Poor Keridge followed you taking up what you said and making sense with your speaking. I do not understand coming together to find the Spirit of God not waited on and active, but despised, and the violation of every feeling of the great body of saints there. I shall seek therefore that no ministry on your part be allowed but distinctly disallowed and forbidden till another Spirit be shown by deference to the spiritual judgment of the saints. I am still merely convalescent so that at present I may take no active part in the matter as I might have done when stronger, but am quite settled not to recognize such a pretended ministry myself. I can conceive, alas, knowing the spirit shown by those whose party you are of, that you may slight, not merely my letter, but the action of the saints supposing they should act in any such way, but I would remind you that,

though the facts be applied in Scripture to another subject, it is always true in itself as to believers he that despiseth despiseth not man but God who also hath given to us His Holy Spirit, and you haply may be found fighting against God. I beg you to think that there is no personal ill will, and that it is simply a question of the order and authority of the Holy Ghost whose presence is known amongst the Lord's people.

Yours truly in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

CBA 211

{1882}

Dear {George} Owen,

I was very thankful to get your letter. I pass over all the name of myself. It does not, of course, surprise me nor do I complain of its tone, it is connected with the whole course of the last year or two's history in connection with Ryde and Dr. Cronin, a subject too wide and going on, I believe, to the question of the existence of brethren, for me to enter on here. Nor is it required for my present note which I have utmost pleasure in sending to you. {In fact,} I do not expect you to believe in or apprehend what was in my mind in my note to you, possibly you may hereafter. But I have seen a dead set of the enemy at all order and authority of Christ acting by the Spirit in the assembly, and this only made me take the point up. I know of particular instances in Reading and at Exeter, but {these?} things were only particular instances, but it is now taken up as a principle to act, and that in the assembly, as they think right with an utter disregard of anything but their own will. We have a notable though extreme case at Croydon and, if they are to be believed, indirectly supported by Blackheath and in communication with them and telling the brethren the question would go on to London and not end at Croydon. I do not in the

slightest degree connect you with this. I refer to it merely as what is going on and assembly bonds were tending to be dissolved by human will. Your letter says if the saints or the bulk of them had conveyed an intimation to you, you should have respected it and should now, if what I spoke of was acted on. Now, this was what my mind was upon though you came into question personally as to it and accepting sincerely what I doubt not is sincere, what was in my mind and led to my note is met and I am thankful for your sake, for my own, and to God for the whole church's sake, and meeting thus far an evil threatening every meeting and when He has begun, He will, I am persuaded, carry it on and give peace.

Your note does so as to this place and, I believe, more as coming from God and I thank you for it, for believing it to be of God, it has greatly relieved my mind. The great main question remains, I may say, where it was, but you have no more to say to that than others. The Croydon affair was directly in its root disunited with what put the whole question of brethren in question. I quite recognize you have nothing to say to that, but it had to say to the general state of things {setting forth} the ground that it was all up with brethren so called. I believe, God is working and I am at rest as regards my note to you and thank you for it. As things go now rest is a mercy from God, His rest.

Sincerely yours in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

Letters without dates.

CBA 22 {A letter not to JND and not by JND}

January 14, Birchwood

Dear Brother in our Lord,

I thank you for your kindness in the letter you sent. The

enclosed note I gave to Mr. Jones.

I mentioned the case of Worcester on last Sunday week in the morning after the prayer meeting at which there were Jones, George, Leines, Mr. Bird, G---, and two or three others. I said there were a few there yet on right ground, to which Mr. Bird answered "a half peck of poor wheat was better than a peck and a half with smut amongst it." The brethren here are of one mind with respect to Bethesda, and all links of the same chain. After the meeting at eleven o'clock (when others were gone out), I laid the matter before the gathering that the whole might have their consciences exercised about these things not that I fear there will be any difference on this question except in one or two cases. I quite think Mrs. Turner is very weak minded in spiritual things and but very little spiritual apprehension, and I doubt, were she left alone (that is, without someone to advise her) and {exposed?}, she would be ensnared. The quarter, from which I think there is a probability of a little trouble to arise, is Betty George. Maria is in service at Worcester and meets there when she has opportunity. I suppose she is ignorant in a great measure of what is going on in Worcester, if not altogether. I mentioned this to her father and advised that he should take the earliest opportunity of seeing her and laying the matter before her and if he could not soon see her, I would. Because on her decision in the matter depended whether or not she could be allowed to break bread with us, should she come over as she has done occasionally, when she has come over to see her friends, because, after the case is laid before her, if she continues to meet with those at St. Nicholas Street, she could not be allowed communion with us. Mr. George does not in any one see the principle of separation. I do think there is not one meeting at Birchwood so dark on that subject as she is and you cannot get her to see it, or she will not see it, and since the Lord has given Thomas to see it, she has been a great trial to him, and would be a great hindrance to him, did he give way to her, she is of a most obstinate disposition. She is a little trial to many because she is not bearing

testimony to the truth of separation, nor any example to others; she likes to be on good terms with all, she can go to Church or to Chapel, that is Methodism when she pleases, not any thing that may be said on the subject appears to make the least impression on her mind. She is often angry with Thomas because he will not go with her to Church XC and that he adheres so closely to Birchwood. He has been for sometime very decided.

As . . . Worcester they know my judgment with respect to the condition of things there and my decision in reference to Bethesda and all her abettors, about a month ago I was at two meetings there on two different evenings and from what I then heard I judge they are, if possible, in a much worse condition than Bethesda, a person at the meeting on Thursday evening in answer to what I had been stating with respect to not receiving from Bethesda, said, he should like to see a much love amongst them, that, would not only, open their arms and doors to receive from Bethesda and Hereford and other places in like position, but to receive to the Lord's table Mr. Newton, Craike and Muller and all the Lord's people without reference to doctrine or practice, and the substance of a letter from a young man, a son of Mr. Maws', was of the same import. I said, undoubtedly that would be an easy way of settling the question. If we had no respect or regard for the truth of God, the personal presence of the Holy Ghost, and the honor of the Lord Jesus Christ. I testified against the evil and told them at both of the meetings I could have no fellowship with such a state of things as that, nor with any that had fellowship with it, either directly or indirectly.

I was at Worcester on the Saturday before the division took place and saw S. Birt and Guerton, and several others. They told that Mr. Maws' son was fully determined to break bread at the room on Sunday and I believe sent a note to that effect, though he had previously been remonstrated on the subject. This young man had been from Worcester a short time. During that time, he had been in communion with some that were in like position with Bethesda. And he stated that he {had} done so on purpose to see

whether on that ground they would refuse him communion at Worcester. They asked me what I would do under similar circumstances, did the young man, as he intended, come to the room with an intention to put in practice his determination. I said if he came, after he was seated, I should quietly go to him and ask him if he intended to break bread. If he answered in the affirmative, I should then in the assembly state the grounds on which I objected to break bread with him, and testify against the evil, and others, in order, of the same judgment, having ability, should to the same. The young man came to the room, a brother went to him and asked if he intended breaking bread which he answered in the affirmative, after which S. Birt got up and stated the reason why he objected breaking bread with him, after which they all continued in the room a short time, some one in the interval read a portion of the word. After which one of the favorers of Bethesda arose and walked out of the room, and all the others like minded rose and followed, leaving S. Birt and 8 or 9 others in quietness, who afterwards broke bread together, and had a very happy time. So you see the Lord prevented the young man from putting in practice his determination. I have just briefly stated a few things that occurred in that {occasion?}. We can have no fellowship with those meeting at St. Nicholas St. nor they with us. Since that time those on right ground have given up the room to the others, as it had been suggested by Mr. Sharp, that probably Mr. Yapp would like his friends to occupy the room, as he was held responsible for the rent and another consideration was they few would not have been able to have met the expenses of that large room.

We continue our reading meetings as usual, Sunday afternoon and Tuesday evenings, as it was the express wish of some to know something more definite as to the first resurrection, the rapture of the Church and the coming of our Lord with the saints, in judgment on the ungodly. We have been reading the Epistles to the Thessalonians. On X-mas day, being a leisure day, we had two services. They were in the character of conversation

meetings. In the morning the subject was the rapture of the Church or first resurrection to meet the Lord in the air as being different from, and at least a thousand years previous to the general resurrection. In the evening the subject was the second coming of the Lord with the saints to execute judgment on the full grown and . . . evil and the ungodly, as being distant from, and subsequent to the judgment spoken of in the Revelation. There was much interest in the meetings and many spoke of them as being very much blessed to them. We frequently have meetings of that description on different subjects, one subject at a time, and they are generally found very profitable, many get a better acquaintance with the subject, and the Scriptures than they would under any other form. I think it promotes diligence in searching the Word of God.

Mr. Birt is much interested in the readings and advances beyond any in intelligence. His ideas are generally very clear and his remarks very much to the point. I was very much pleased with a little matter he used in illustrating his thoughts on the subject, that that should principally occupy our minds as giving power for walk and service. He said it was not thinking what we were, nor what we are in our walk here, though each have their place and use, but what we are in Christ and what we shall be with Him, by and by. This is what he used: he said suppose a nobleman, going along the road saw a poor dusty ragged girl, and he was to take her up just as she was in her filth and rags, and wash her, and clothe her, and educate her, and tell her, that he would take her to his home and make her his Bride, he should thin the best thing would be that which would be most in her mind {would be} where she was to be, though she would not forget all the rest. I believe he does with others understand what is the unity of the Church by the Spirit to the head, one body into which all its members are baptized, unity yet diversity by the same Spirit. We have had no visitor except Mr. Preen from Malvern; he was with us one Sunday.

You will be happy to hear a very pleasing circumstance that

was related to me and which gave me much pleasure, respecting the last illness of Mrs. Gilson. It was told me by a person who occasionally was with her: a lady living at Glenarch with her two daughters frequently visited and took much interest in supplying the need in every respect of Mrs. Gilson in her illness and it pleased the Lord in His grace, to make the object of their visit a blessing to one of the young ladies, in bringing her to know and rejoice in the grace of our Lord Jesus that bringeth salvation. She was made happy in the saving knowledge of the love of God after which she was most kind and diligent in her attendance on Mrs. G., never missing a day without seeing her and attending to her wants. She said that the happiest moments of her life were those spent by the death bed side of Mrs. Gilson. The young lady was not long with Mrs. Gilson: she was taken ill and soon fell asleep in Jesus. All the Brethren join in their love to you and dear Mr. Darby,

CBA 29

3 Orchard St., Portman Square

Dear brother in our Lord,

As the servant of Christ you have allowed me to address a few lines to you and I ask a moment of your precious time to glance at what is often on my mind (of course, no reply is needed). It has struck me that: "Priesthood. All the Lord's people are Priests" is a subject little understood, very practical and very needful for these days.

Again, "Christ as a son over His own house, whose house are we." As I understand it, I speak under correction, Christ exercises His authority in the Church by His word and Spirit. Brethren seem to me to have often spoken and written as though it was the Holy Spirit that governed and so losing sight of the foundation and chief cornerstone, practically, the Door got left open to a lying spirit to come in.

Again, “My brethren, be not many teachers.” I here felt this needed much to be pressed on the consciences of brethren. I have felt that the ministry of the word in the Church has often been too lightly entered upon and without a true divine call and giving oneself wholly to the work. So also the work of the Pastor of the flock laboring from house to house. I believe brethren only want their consciences awakened and everything will fall into its right place. A true divine call and a true giving oneself to the work of the ministry what ever be the sphere of labor and the solemn responsibility incurred by teaching in the Church, I believe, {are} points very needful to be pressed on brethren.

And now, dear brother in the Lord, I am not surprised nor disheartened by present circumstances. I have confidence in God that He will yet appear. I am encouraged and helped in waiting upon Him. It is on my heart in a measure and the good desire is now Himself. Preserved from personal discussion there is a way for me to help forward the cause of Christ and praised be His name there are many who are striving in their prayers, and the adversary will at length be beat out of the field.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

Chas. Caldwell

Of course, no human arrangements or fleshly order can meet difficulties.

P.S. Dearly honored brother in the Lord, . . . in it.” My whole power with God lies in my walking as He directs. If I get pushed into any other position than the one I am in, my power is gone; brethren don’t understand this and I have often to suffer but I am fighting against the enemy and strengthening the beloved servants of Christ. It is hard work, but God has set me to it, and I love it. I am conscious of unworthiness and much failure and mistake but I see God has put me in a place where, if that grace I can keep, I shall help to drive the enemy out of the Camp and I can not say the confidence I feel that God will yet appear, maybe the hour is at hand. Why not? `Tis His own cause, the cause of

the Church, and dear to Jesus for which He gave His heart’s blood. Let us never say “Die,” a phrase I used to hear in the army. We will beat the devil out of the field yet for Christ is with us, if He was not, would any thing be left? He is in our midst, if but we believed it, too, but a lying spirit is got in and our eyes on . . .

CBA 98

Dear Mr. Humphreys,

I return dear Evans’s letters as you desire. I mentioned it to several brethren at a reading meeting the only opportunity I had since, and I do not doubt some will be glad to help though jogging their memories might be useful sometimes.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

I leave, D.V., Monday on my way to Liverpool. I shall gladly take my share in helping {Piper?} when any thing is done if {sure} that will not alter it.

CBA 99

Dear Mr. Jackman,

A letter was shown me today professing to give my view of the state of Ryde. The conversation which gave in to it was between Dr. Cronin, Mr. Kelly and myself and was to the effect that the case would have to be looked into. Where Mr. Kelly resides a man is in the same case only married abroad which does not really change it. My mind was clearer on one point because I had seen the Act of Parliament passed in 1835. That is all. I have no more intention than ever of meddling in the matter or coming to any conclusion. In my first letter to Tunley in reply to his, I did not reveal my difficulty as to Cook. That difficulty remains and

that is all, strengthened by the terms of the act, but I do not go to Ryde so am not called on to decide. If anyone came up from the meeting to London, I should not make a movement to hinder their being received. If it were Cook himself and where I was, it might force me to weigh it. I know four cases of the kind in communion, one sitting back and I decide as to none of them, am not called on to do it at this moment. It was of all those cases Mr. Kelly, Dr. Cronin and myself were speaking. Where Mr. Kelly resides the man has not been put out, he sits back by request till they know what to do – and the case was very much worse than Cook's. As to his statement that you would soon be received as walking in . . . you will remember I told you that you would be, right or wrong, I believed, rejected in nine meetings out of ten where brethren were cognizant of the case, and I said to Tunley that the letter that declared the separation offended the conscience of all that knew the facts. Those statements I repeat. I told Mr. Peters what I thought about it when I saw him. My letter to Tunley referred to a mention of a proposed breaking of bread by those who separated, which you can see. I only write to let you know this because my name has been used. I have difficulty as to Cook. I have never concealed it. But my judgment as to the letter of separation is that it was as bad as could well be.

Yours truly in the Lord,

J. N. D.

CBA 145

{copy of letter to P. Loiseaux}

My dear Brother,

Mr. Taylor assures me, for I had written to him, that he is quite sure that he joins heartily in praise and worship to the Lord Jesus Christ. He has only wanted the full sense of sonship to be known and of nearness to God in Christ. Now this is right and

many fail in it and have the feeling they can approach Christ and trust His love but not God. The Spirit of adoption is greatly wanting in many. When there was a man at Auburn in Maine (I forget his name: Hopkins or some such) with whom I also had to do when {Haskall?} was there and who opposed prayer and praise to the Lord Jesus, Mr. Taylor had also a correspondence with him to show him he was wrong, but then both our efforts were useless. It is possible some may have objected to it really. If they will not worship a man, the angels will and moreover every knee bow to Him, of men and infernal beings. While W. puts us into the glory with Christ, like Christ, it carefully guards the personal glory and title of Christ. Moses and Elias were seen in the same glory as Christ, but the moment Peter would put them on a level, they disappeared and the Father's voice is heard declaring He was His beloved Son. The heavens were as open to Stephen (through Christ's death) as to Christ when He came up from Jordan, but Stephen looks at Him as an object as Son of Man and is changed morally into His likeness; heaven looks down on Christ and instead of conforming Him to anything, the Spirit seals Him as He is and the Father owns Him as He is. It is down here He says the *Son of Man* who is in heaven. It is He who came in in subjection by the door, the shepherd who gave His life for the sheep, who says I and my Father are one. If there is the divine and human nature in Him, there is only one person. And he who says I will not adore a man is to say the least in danger of denying the unity of the person. He who has seen Him has seen the Father. The man who spoke to Philip and washed his feet could say and did at the same time, Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? Stephen full of the Holy Ghost addressed himself to the Son of man, saying, Lord Jesus receive my spirit. Authority is given to Him to judge because He is the *Son of man*, but it is that all men may honor the Son even as they honor the Father. Is that refusing to worship Him? See v. 18 (the Jews were more consistent: to separate the Son of man and Son of God is to dissolve Christ). See John 3:14, etc. See again 1 John 5:20. We know that the Son of God is come and hath given us an

understanding that we should know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, that is in His Son *Jesus Christ*. This (He, οὗτος) is the true God and eternal life; but Jesus is the name of Him who was born of the virgin Mary, and Christ is the anointed man. And the Apostle emphatically adds in contrast, Little children, keep yourselves from idols. There is a most striking passage in 1 John 2,3 -- 2:28, 3:1,2. The inseparableness of personality and the distinction of nature is very striking. "Him at His coming", "is born of Him" in v. 29 so that we are sons of God, 3:1, and yet the world knew Him not, *sons of God*, v. 2, but we *like Him* when *He* shall appear. All this blessed truth is lost if we dissolve, as I have called it, Christ. And yet I must know Him as a man, that is the distinctness of the nature, for He prayed to God and died, and yet *He* was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death. When in the form of God made Himself of no reputation (ἐκενώσε εαυτὸν) yet being thus could say destroy this temple and in three days *I* will raise it up. No man knows the Son but the Father. But he who loses these things loses the Son. Speaking of worshipping a man is losing the person of Christ. And if the angels are to worship Him, worship is a just service as to what is: for it is not our being exempt which is in question, but His being entitled to it. And there it is Christ though His Godhead is brought out, yet as incarnate for it is said when He had by Himself purged our sins, and He is the first-begotten, not the only begotten, and the second Psalm is quoted where He is distinctly celebrated as Messiah-Christ, or as in English, "the anointed". But I fear there has been too much discussion, refusing to worship the Lord is a very serious error but discussion about His person seldom leads to much fruit. I have spoken as plainly as possible that there may be no mistake about my judgment of refusing to do it. But you or others may have wrongly estimated what Mr. Taylor wished to put forward. It is not only in replying to me but in his controversy with the man at Auburn that he rejected the thought of not worshipping the Lord, to whom every knee shall bow (and that puts Him in the place of worship, as "have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal" shows). But his

statement to me is quite clear. It is possible some not inclined to worship Christ as is due may have profited by expressions to support their false state of heart. Hasty conclusions are not always wise. Firmness against false doctrine is always right. But there are a great many who are in the Martha state, "What thou askest of God", who as not really free cannot go directly to the Father nor worship anybody rightly and cannot worship under the conviction the Father Himself loveth them, not questioning God's love in sending His only begotten Son, but who do not enter into the present privilege of direct address to the Father as those who are in His presence, and enjoy His love there, loved as Jesus Himself is loved wonderful as such a word is, this love being in them.

I am very thankful you are getting on in your depot. I trust they have got pretty straight at last in Springfield.

Affectionately yours in the Lord,

J. N. Darby

CBA 208

Bristol

7 July

A difficulty is found in these parts as to the meaning of the expression "Now unto the principalities and powers in Heavenly places γυνωσθῆς by the Church etc."

All seem inclined to think (myself included) that it is *the Church on earth* as seen by them from on *High*.

But I have an old pencil note in my Bible "because of the Church's place *there*" – evidently taken down from you.

And in B. Treasury for July there is a paragraph, which looks as if it is because the Church's place *there*. But it is obscure. I will copy it out.

Yours,

{H. Littleton}

Will you say *distinctly* whether the Church {is} on earth or in *Heavenly* places?

“Now another thing may be remarked as to the epistle, that is, that everything refers to heavenly places; not that we are not upon earth, for we are, but that still to principalities and powers in heavenly places may be known through the church the wisdom of God. We are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places, we are sitting in heavenly places in Christ, we are a testimony to principalities and powers in heavenly places, and we are fighting with wicked spirits in heavenly places. Our blessing, our place, our testimony and our conflict are all in these heavenly places. Now you will find that ministry here is connected with these.”

{An old pencil note in the margin of the Bible of H. Littleton of Bristol, England, evidently taken down from J. N. D.’s oral ministry on Eph. 3:10, reads as follows:}

“because of the Church’s place *there*”

CBA 306

My dear Brother,

As regards my letter to Mr. Gonnet, it was a reply to me from him to help him in the difficulty they were in. . . his . . . action in mounting a party there and English brethren there or in England opposing. In my reply not merely at the close which you refer to but at the beginning, I declare I should say nothing of Mrs. Peters but state principles to help him and the assembly. Just the unity of the body was in question. Mr. Gonnet not only knew that Mrs Peters was outside in England but mentions that they had written

to Mrs Peters to reconcile herself with this assembly she had left and she had declared she never would. Mr. Kelly had refused a letter of commendation and (not in the body of the letter but by the bye in a postscript, saying you will perhaps understand) stated she was outside. In this, therefore, unity was broken. This was my first principle. There is no withdrawing it; it is a fact. The next objected to is that if Mrs. P. were to be restored in England the state of her soul of which I declined saying any thing to Gonnet would have to be ascertained. That principle I still maintain. Do you mean to pretend that a person is to be away ever so long and that there is no obligation when they return to meeting to ascertain what state they are in or what they have been doing or that Mrs. Peters is an exception? Mr. Peters asked me who was to judge. The answer is simple: the gathering she sought admission at, probably in communication with where she had been. This I hold too fully and could never withdraw. The next point was the commendation from Cannes. That, as I told you, I did and do think all wrong. Put it to any godly Christian and see what they will say. These are the principles in my letter which I maintain.

There is another which is no principle at all, but plain common sense and is always true and as a rule must be so. Gonnet spoke of the difficulty he had through the partisans of Mrs. Peters who would have her to be a saint and far more . . . than any of them, and I replied to that that it was merely the pretension to know Mrs. Peters through a few weeks acquaintance better than those who had constantly known her in England, a very simple remark for in fact her intimate counselor and friend could not give her a letter of commendation. Of this last fact, I did not speak in this connection but merely noticed the foolishness of the pretension of those in Cannes. The tenor of the remark none can deny, but this alleged it insinuates bad conduct on the part of Mrs. Peters. Now the force of the statement is evident to those who see what it is an answer to but I never had, nor have, any intention to say any thing as to Mrs. Peters’

previous ways. Nor if I did not approve of her manner of acting ecclesiastically has it anything to do with her conduct in . . . ordinary . . . I never thought of such a thing. I reject and {deny} ever {saying} such or ever having had such a thought in writing it, and if any have seriously so applied it, . . . have no objection to withdraw it as having no principle in it unless common sense be one. The principles of my letter I maintain. As to going to Switzerland, I can answer for no reports. It is very possible I may have said they did not for my full impression was that they returned from Cannes to England. But I perfectly remember this that seeing the kind of tone that enquiries were made in when writing as to it, I took care not to put the word which first came into any mind and used another such that there could not be any pretense or insinuation that any fraud was . . . used about it.

I had written to Ryde before I received your brother's letter at Talbot's request and forwarded the answer to him.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. Darby

CBA 394

{Letter to Cluff}

We have not got Mr. Cross' address. Mr. Cluff was to go there yesterday. The brother for Weston-super-mare is

John Baries or Mr. H. Baries

14 High Street

Our thanks to you,

Mr. Darby

{This note precedes a copy of *Letters* 2:484.}

CBA 402

It is a mistake to think that English tenses are simply grammatical expressions of time, and the common use of auxiliary verbs makes it less so; for the auxiliary verb may be one time, the participle another, and give together a metaphysical force which connects both. "We saw his star;" "we have seen his star," are not different in time, but vary in the form of the expression. As to the last form, in general, it would be taken for the perfect of the Greek – a past thing continuing. But to take it as answering to it is a mistake. "He took the city, but took it the next day." "Took" is an aorist. It is a fact, past, no doubt, where I say so but the fact. If I said, "He has taken the city," it supposes he is in possession of it because "has" is present, but to apply this rule as constant would mislead. I say "He lives in London;" I say, "No, he has lived there." "Lived" is continuing, but "has" here denies the present continuance; the continuance is in the past participle; "has" only affirms as a present conviction of my mind that once he did so continue to live there. "Has" affirms something present, but the thing affirmed is past. It is a past thing present to my mind. "He did live there" *affirms* that the fact is past. "He has lived" is no affirmative of time but of a fact in question. If I say "He has lived there a long time" it supposes he lives there still.

If I spoke of time past I should say "He lived there a long time." This is an aorist. The other is an affirmation as to the fact whether he ever did – he has. It is a present truth to my mind. "He lived there," "did live there," "has lived there," by itself are all the same time, but the mental effect is quite different. I say "by itself" because if I say "He has lived there nine years" it goes up to the present time; on the contrary, "He lived there nine years" supposes it was in past time, because "lived" is past, "has" is present. Thus, the preterite, or call it what you please, is a past historical fact, that is all.

"I ate at his table." That is an historical fact. "I have eaten at his table" is a characteristic, or perhaps questioned, fact, an

affirmation of intimacy. The difference is not one of time but of mental or metaphysical force.

Let us take the passive. "I am crucified." The participle is a thing done and I affirm I am, as a present thing, in that accomplished state. "I was crucified" is a past historic fact. "I have been crucified" is no doubt a past fact, but the "have" gives a present moral power to it which is no question of time. I am not a living man. I have been crucified. "I have" has always a present application, though the thing spoken of be past. Hence "He has taken the city" supposes he has it, because "taken" means taking into possession, and "has" affirms that as a present.

"I have," "He has" is present: it may be only the moral force which is present but this depends on the force of the participle it is connected with. "He wrote but I never got the letter," "He has written, but I shall pay no attention to it." "Has" involves its present moral value to my mind.

CBA 406

My dear Douglas,

It was matter of regret to me that I did not meet you here in hope that it might have prevented all the confusion that has occurred, but it was not so ordered. But I cannot let it pass without writing a line in faithfulness to you. I believe the whole of it from before the time you received these people to have been simply the power of Satan on your mind. You may have been unfit for a pastor but it did not follow that you should throw the people up into evangelist's hands who had believed in Christ to leave them rather as sheep without a shepherd. If they were Christians, they needed this in fact. This folly which confounds regenerate and unregenerate should have sent something besides evangelists to Christian people. To use their system is such an excess of folly that I never know when to begin and of

wickedness that I scarce know how to tolerate with patience the mention of their pretensions. While you are writing that the Spirit does not hold that Christ took a sinful nature nor had the carnal mind, they are effectually teaching it here so that it is openly around by many now and by some of their disciples and the most active that Christ had not the fulness of the Godhead in Him bodily until He was baptized and received the Holy Ghost but was only the God-man after a manner and a man approved of God: they denied expressly that they hold Christ had a sinful nature and did so to the people until they had gained influence over several and then they taught them it, so that such now avow it as one of them because God did not suffer him to conceal himself or it to me, thank God, this fraud and falsehood has delivered several from their hands and would you stand and persuade me that the Holy Ghost is a liar and a deceiver and expect me to believe it? I cannot. I have known it myself in multiplied instances so that I could not accredit them in any place as honest men in any sort. I believe them to be led by a spirit of lying. *You* told me that they had worked at the substitution of Christ. I find them falsifying Christ by their doctrine, making Him a sinner as the simpler people who have received it now honestly and simply say and as having said I see them making prophecies confessedly falsified in fact and with every fraud and blasphemy too against the word of God covering and trying to conceal it and am I to believe this to be the Holy Ghost? Mr. Bell told me the Holy Ghost in the Scripture never made a prophecy that was not dependent on the faith of man for fulfilment which is almost too great and egregious folly to treat as wickedness. I suppose the death of Christ was by the faith of man or the destruction of Nineveh or of Sodom or of Babylon or of Egypt! Do you not know that their prophecies have been falsified? I know that those who are honest among them confess that they have failed. And am I to blaspheme {the} Holy Ghost by believing that this is of Him? I dare not and could not and woe be to the man who does, be it you or any one else! I sorrow over you because I believe you to have been misled by their guile and

subtleties and crafty lying in wait to deceive. What you, according to your own showing, have sinned against the Holy Ghost, a fact if it be true, but indeed, you have much upon your head (save it be blotted away) as to the poor people of S---. You cannot escape from this. If self-confidence, of this you must judge, led you beyond your strength, you must still have the evil to answer for, but I confess to you your doctrine, it is plain to me, had entirely put *your mind* off the foundation of Christ. I grieve utterly over you to see you withered from godly usefulness by the subtlety of these deceitful men; and a little less self-confidence, I am persuaded, would have saved you this. I still hope to have seen you, but surely if ever you are delivered from it, but you are now in bitter sorrow and humiliation. You will have to go through it but it is a withering, blighting system. I pray God to deliver you and the people. Where are your . . . what Church is to be built up in glory if the dead in Christ and living saints are to be caught up to meet Him in the air and then come with Him? Not only do I believe this not to be the truth but I cannot find anything in Scripture which it does not contradict, as far as it goes. I prefer the written {word} of God to their contradicting devices. I know they frighten and threaten you about speaking against the Holy Ghost, but I think it is blasphemy to say that the Holy Ghost has prophesied what has not happened and taught doctrines destructive of the person of Christ.

CBA 407

Dear Castle,

We feel distinctly and strongly that your conduct relative to all that passed as to your engagements was not such as became a Christian walking in the fear of God. We can very well believe that many circumstances connected with it may have arisen from want of decision for which we can make allowance. Still we think there was much that was wholly unjustifiable in a Christian,

specially remembering the profession you made.

It is our impression that you were not as explicit as you ought as a Christian to have been in your statement as to the £ 600, but we do not at all wish to say that it was with any evil intention and we also think that the arrangements entered into on your marriage, we are bound to take for granted on all due investigation by those concerned, exonerate you in their result from any charge of wrong done to Mrs. Walsh's family, and, of course, as to this if they are satisfied, we have no complaint to make.

We feel, and this we would pass over as lightly as possible save for your own sake as that evil which your nature made a snare to you, that there was a want of accuracy and moderation in many of your statements which, while it has injured no one but yourself, calls for your own watchfulness and self-judgment in future for your own good and your consistency with the Lord's glory as acknowledged as a Christian. There have been many things painful and which have occurred since your separation but which as arising out of the state in which things {are}, we desire to pass by. We also do not deny that the state of circumstances may have given occasion to feelings in some others in communion which being of the flesh we do not, of course, in any way justify, but while we in no way extenuate the sin in itself, we think it would become you to feel how deeply what passed was calculated to wound them. There is reason for all of us to be humbled as to the evil that has occurred and we think it will help you to feel rightly as to the whole matter in your own soul before the Lord if you consider the circumstances under which you came to this place and how much occasion it gave to those opposed to truth or alienated from us to blaspheme and triumph over any effort to glorify the Lord, a triumph which we trust may be done away by the practical grace which may be hereafter shown in you and by you now. We have no difficulty in expressing our earnest wish for your restoration to comfort and to us but we believe that godliness and the maintenance of a standard above all blame, as

far as we are able, to be the only way of real comfort and the only meaning or sense of such an association as we find ourselves in. If you feel able to submit to the judgment we have formed and expressed above and desire to be received again as a recognized brother amongst us, you have only to sign what we add below and return therewith this paper to us and we will then at once state our satisfaction to the brethren and look for their concurrence in your cordial reception back.

J. N. Darby

I submit to the judgment of the brethren herein and desire to return and be received into communion again at the Southmall.

CBA 409

{Copy of a letter to Mr. Humphrey}

Dear Brother,

The idea that ceasing to break bread a Sunday or even two dissolves the assembly seems to me without any ground whatever. An assembly may not break bread out of the fear of God by reason of trouble and confusion at the time through a perverse individual, and I have known such a case, without a thought of dissolving itself, just because it was a faithful assembly and feared God. Why a persecuting police or violent man might come in and hinder them breaking bread. If it must be by the will of the assembly it must be a will to dissolve itself. I trust the Lord will put an end to the confusion at Bath and believe He will. What is needed in such cases generally is restoring souls not the outward state of things. There is an interference often of brethren from a distance which is not of God and dulls the conscience of the assembly. I do not deny they may be useful if coming to serve and awake the conscience of the assembly itself.

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. N. D.

Its own folly may dissolve an assembly as a fact.

{CBA 410 is a second copy of this letter.}

CBA 411

{Copy}

Dear Mr. Rumson,

I was down at Dr. Cronin's which has delayed my reply to your letter enquiring as to Col. 3, and I do not think the object of the apostle is to detail what the heavenly things are. Were it so, he would have done that, but to contrast them characteristically with earthly things, things above not things on earth. If we seek these things, we find them generously in Heb. 7, and more specifically in detail in the promises to the seven churches and in the heavenly Jerusalem. I have, however, I must add, given them only in the character of rewards from God in government, and there is another and, I suppose, I may say, more blessed character which the heavenly things have for us, of which the beginning of the 14 of John presents to us. But the degree in which these with more details for the heart is that in which these relationships are lived in and realized, the degree of spirituality. Such terms as husband, wife, father, child, my Father's house, have more power than any glory or honor if these relationships are realized, but all depends on that, on the value one attaches to them. We find, moreover, the two latter presented to us in the beginning of Eph. 6, as is Christ's love to the church in Eph. 5:1. 1 John 3:2 (compare Rom. 8:29) helps us also, largely in showing what the heavenly portion is, connecting it with the beginning of Eph. 1. For how great is the blessing of being with and like Christ in the unclouded pleasure of the Father! I have here some general indications of the things above, at least in their full result. At the present time they come in more or less in spirit, but we have

especially to think of Christ at the right hand of God as man. See Acts 7. But all depends on the spirituality of the assertions, only that as man is, these things spiritualize them.

Truly yours in Christ,
J. N. D.

CBA 413

Mr. Duncan Bells
Toronto, {Saturday}

Dear Mrs. Dickenson,

I felt that my simplest and best way yesterday was to do just what you asked me and, of course, through you for your beloved ones. I do not doubt at all that it is good for them and most to their honor to exert themselves confiding in the Lord and that He will help and bless them. But I quite wish *you* to understand that whenever you feel there is an occasion, it is a delight to me to minister to them through your hands now or at any time. I desire for them as I should for anyone I cared for that they should trust the Lord and not man. Still whatever the tenderest kindness of a father could do to aid them through your hands, I shall rejoice to do, not as a boon to them but as a true privilege to myself. Do not hesitate to write to me if it is called for. As I should fear to obtrude myself but I shall only take it as a kindness if you trust my affection for them thus far. Should the Lord see fit to remove you then they may, if in the same circumstances and I am yet here below, communicate with me themselves. May the Lord surround them with His own blessing. I shall be very glad to help dear Lucy too should the case arise. Should I be in England, a letter addressed to the care of Mr. Morrish, 24 Warwick Lane, Paternoster Row, London, England, will be forwarded to me.

Yours truly in the Lord,
J. N. D.

CBA 529

I Know Whom I Have Believed

{Notes to 2 Timothy 1:12 in Mr. Darby's Greek Testament, ed. Griesbach, vol. II, pt. 2, p. 412}

Not supposing that much time remains to me, I refer to this {verse} as the guide of those who remain behind me as it now suggests itself to my mind. I add, I have found the Scriptures perfect, nor since a certain time (which I will mention) did I ever find an enquiry of another or of my own mind to which a full divine answer did not at once suggest itself from the Scripture. I leave this testimony (God is my present witness of its truth) for my brethren's sake. I have found statements made not found in the Scriptures but alleged to be drawn from them; these I found it my part to leave. They had all found no place in my own mind, while the light of the knowledge of the glory of the Lord in the person of Jesus Christ --- in a word the mystery of Godliness: God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, believed on in the world, received up into glory --- has shone forth to my soul with clearer light.

It is declared that in the last days perilous times shall come. Such these are and nothing could have been more perilous than those times, when all should receive the mark of the beast whose names were not written in the book of life. Man here {2 Tim. 3:2} signifies, I conceive, professing Christians. However, St. Paul here gives what the security of the soul will be in perilous times. First, "Knowing of whom thou has learned them" {2 Tim. 3:14}; compare here Hebrews 2:2, and note (I note in love for the work's sake this is the first religion, the faith once delivered) the warning: Take heed lest we let them slip {Heb. 2:2} and remark here the matter St. Paul is upon: the Divine Sonship of Christ and

His real human nature, and these two truths rightly used will give the whole faith as against all deceivers, we understanding by faith the offices in which they are exercised for sinners. The agency of the Holy Spirit is a promise, observe, to be received by faith perhaps more than a fact to be believed by it. Note also St. Jude: Contend for the faith once delivered. {Jude} Observe too, the Scriptures exactly answer the passage in Hebrews; thus the salvation is to be found accordingly again. Take the salvation noticed by St. Paul in Ephesians: by grace are ye *saved* through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast; for ye are God's workmanship, created {again} in Christ Jesus unto good works which God hath before appointed that we should walk in them. What does St. Paul present as the matter of religion, if I may so call it? By grace ye are saved through faith, and good works which God hath before appointed that we should walk in them.

The instruction we want then is the way of salvation and direction in the good works which are appointed. What do the Scriptures afford? They are able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, and they are profitable, etc., that the man of God (the soul brought into the power of salvation) may be perfect; thoroughly furnished unto all good works. What could more conclusively answer the one to the other than these two passages? Note further in these perilous times the state of the children of God are upon one hand and presumptuous deceivers on the other. All that are godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution, and evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.

I will now mention one thing about myself as an object of grace. I had once had my soul brought, I know not where, so deep as no tongue I suppose could tell (others may have felt it, I know not), hardly before I began to preach repentance (I had previously a good while given myself to God, having myself been brought to deep repentance and self sacrifice). After that I went on having the way of salvation on my mind, opening upon its reality with

occasional trials of unbelief, some of them painful but none such as the one I mentioned. I think Scott's essays gave a strong determination to my thought at one time, while my mind was working upon it. I had always recognized the truths, but I am speaking of their power, for my mind had passed after its own repentance under the dark cloud of the popish system, i.e. to look for the powers of Christ's agency in the visible authority of the Church. Though God was with me through it all, and I used to hold up Christ to my brother as availing against the claim of men on these points, yet it prevailed so far as to prevent my mind from finding comfort in the truths I honestly urged on him which I had found in what poor reading of the Scriptures I had, and yet God was with me all the while. And I was in my secret affection framed on the doctrines of grace and abhorred the world and sought not conformity to it, but I had not Christ, though I loved Him, I have no doubt, sincerely and growingly since June or July 1820 or 1821, I forgot which. I had not certain peace, though I trusted Him for salvation, and since the deep trial I mentioned, had (first indeed in preaching I began with holiness but soon felt it was not the way) avowed salvation only by Christ and stated the truth of Scripture as I have no doubt was in it, and I believe not without profit to souls.

It was only latterly at Calary, I began generally to proclaim love. Then I was totally stopped in the work and suffered long confinement. After I had been confined something more than three months, I was tried with indeed very different support from what I had before, [though, or through] the grace I had received and which will explain how I was led into this long statement. It issued in assurance in love, as I trust to be perfected ere long so as either by my life or death to glorify God. It took its occasion from a great trial of judgment on a matter in which while my weakness was very apparent, God's hand seemed very remarkably in. It brought my soul by much and various exercise by night and day to this point: could I rest the faith of my soul as a living man on the word of God? Grace determined me to do so;

the trial passed away in various exercises of conscience, searching whether there was anything offensive in it towards God or towards man, with some intervals of thankfulness for evidences of love in circumstances brought before me, till it all began to give way before the apprehension of His love in Christ in a way I could not describe, settling into steadier and calmer assurance of love by a progress which I cannot state but of which I felt the work from day to day. But the Scriptures have coincidentally approved themselves to be the perfect manifestation of God in Christ, and though I used them in everything before, it is only since then that they have supplied themselves to me on every side as altogether Divine and all sufficient.

I would remark that humiliation was the method in which God wrought with my soul from the beginning to reveal His love, and I could not doubt, by the issue of peace, whose hand had been there and in my minute circumstances as man would judge providence showed itself indeed: the whole trial arose from a paper of directions being left out of a parcel by mistake; while the paper it referred to was sent to the printer and laid there, he not knowing what to do with it or whose it was, till I found it out afterwards. By the carelessness of a messenger to the post and a third time by his delay two letters were arrested on the subject and each of them had their part in the passages of the trial. I have been led to mention these things merely as showing God's hand. Another passage of the trial as I recollect was: would I endure all things for the elect's sake? In this, grace also determined me. I had a further trial in which some persons related to me, who I had believed were under grace, but a cloud was over the exercise of it in them. Doubtless under God's gracious wisdom, {it} was proposed to me: suppose these were reprobates, would you give them up? --- and they were presented to my mind as such; in this I submitted to God. Since this, I preached the gospel I believe in its simple power for a short time at Calary, but that was not as I believe the work the Lord appointed me. I wait now only for His permission, trusting He is preparing me for it; that is, I preached

not merely that there was no other salvation than Christ, but also that Christ was the power of Divine love unto salvation, and the difference was felt indeed. This made all instruction different. Before, it dealt more exclusively with principles, now more fully with souls, and though it had not been without, to me, most blessed testimony before, yet together with a great deal of practical weekly dealing with their souls, I thought the word was ploughing much deeper than heretofore. The day will declare it indeed; though the result of weakness in me, I am not sure that in Divine wisdom it was not suitable. I am quite sure that in all I am debtor to Divine grace and have perfect need of the Divine mercy. The previous account, though strictly accurate is very imperfect. I did not feel led to speak of more; it is possible I may elsewhere. I may rather speak nothing but of the Lord, as I trust in measure I have {done} for some time; for He is the rock --- His work is perfect.

J. N. Darby

CBA 534

{Marginal Note on a Remark by Bishop Pearson, found in J.N.D.'s copy of *Ancient Truths Respecting the Deity and True Humanity of the Lord Jesus* by B. W. Newton, London, Houlston and Wright, 1857, p. 13.}

{B.W.N.'s text: Bishop Pearson observes . . . (Art. 4, p. 211). . . " . . . He had no natural preservative: nor was it in the power of His soul to continue its vital conjunction unto His body bereft of a vital disposition."}

{J.N.D.'s note:} This Nestorian here may safeguard the truth. It is practically . . . Christ died --- in itself nonsense.

{B.W.N.'s quotation from Pearson: "But when by an act of His will He had submitted to that death --- when He had accepted and embraced those torments to the last, it was not in the power of His soul to continue any longer vitality to the body, whose vigor was totally exhausted". . . (Pearson on the Creed, Art. 4, p. 212, folio.)}

{J.N.D.'s note:} This is entirely contrary to and refutes the doctrine it is alleged to explain. The result is nonsensically expressed. It never was in the power of any human being's soul to continue vitality to the body whose vigor was totally exhausted. It is really all deplorable nonsense while doubtless quite true.

CBA 535b

{Date: ??}

Dear Miss H.,

Though my conviction is Satan raised the question the other day, to perplex souls which are enquiring, I am not sorry for it because it touches what I believe to be the danger of those engaged in the present movement. There is a French proverb: "Satan does a work which deceives himself," which I believe to be true. The point I take to be fatally dangerous is *confounding private judgment* and *conscience*. We see the full-blown fruit of it in the present state of Protestantism, where private judgment is used to authorize the rejection of everything that the individual does not agree with.

Confusion as to this is found in L. S.'s letter. The difference is plain in the case put. A father's authority is admitted. Now if it be a matter of conscience, and Christ's authority or the confession of His Name, of course this cannot stand in the way. I am bound to love Christ more than father or mother. But suppose I reject my Father's authority in the house for everything my

private judgment differs in as to what is right, there is an end of all authority. There may be cases of anxious enquiry as to what my duty is, where spiritual discernment alone can come to a right judgment. This is the case in the whole christian life. We must have our senses exercised to discern good and evil --- not be unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is, and such exercises are useful. But the confounding a judgment I form simply as to right with conscience is, in result, confounding *will* with *obedience to God*. True conscience is always obedience to God, but, if I take what I see as sufficient, confusion of a deadly character comes in, and this confusion, doubtless unconsciously, is in L. S.'s note. Does L. S. mean to say that she does not submit to a Father's authority unless he can bring, even in an unimportant matter, a text of scripture for everything he desires? Is there no setting up of self and self-will in such a principle? But I go farther; and it is the case in question. Suppose in an assembly a person has been put out for evil. On their humbling themselves truly, all admit they should be gladly restored. The assembly thinks he is humbled truly; I am satisfied he is not. They receive him. Am I to break bread with the assembly or refuse subjection to their act, because I think them mistaken? Supposing (which is a more trying case to the heart) I believe he is humbled and they believe he is not, I may bow to a judgment I think erroneous and look to the Lord to set it right. There is such a thing as lowliness as to self, which does not set up its own opinion against others, though one may have no doubt of being right.

Now this was the case Mr. L. S. sought to identify, in the rejecting an assembly, on principle, because they deliberately received blasphemers against the Lord Jesus Christ. It is perfectly monstrous. Now there is another question connected with it --- one assembly's act binding another. On this point there is, in general, entire ignorance in those who discuss these points here. I do not admit, because *Scripture* does not admit *independent assemblies*. There is the body of Christ, and all Christians are members of it; and the church of God in one place represents the

whole and acts in its name. Hence, in 1 Cor., where the subject is treated of, *all Christians* are taken in with the assembly of Corinth as such; yet this last is treated as the body as such, and made locally responsible for maintaining the purity of the assembly; and the Lord Jesus Christ is looked at as there; and what was done was done in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is wholly ignored in the ground taken; it is wholly set aside in L. S.'s note. Mr. L. S. spoke of 6 or 7 clever, intelligent Christians and a number of ignorant ones. *The Lord* in the midst of an assembly never came into his mind; he did say, but the flesh often acts in an assembly. Why assume it does, and forget it may be in an individual? L. S. ignores it. She speaks of obeying the Lord first, then the church. But supposing the Lord is in the church? It is merely setting up private judgment against the judgment of an assembly meeting in Christ's name with His promise (if they are not, I have nothing to say to them); {it is} simply saying, I count myself wiser than those who are. I reject entirely L. S.'s ground as unscriptural, in saying, "first Christ, then the Church." If Christ be not in the church, I do not own it at all. It is assuming that the church has not Christ, making them two distinct parties. I may reason with an assembly, because I am a member of Christ, and hence of *it* --- if it is one, help it. But I cannot if I own it an assembly of God, *assume*, as L. S. does, Christ is not there. {It is} simply denying it is an assembly of God. The thought of what an assembly of God is, is wanting. This is not surprising; but it necessarily falsifies judgment on the point. L. S. must remember her ground is not "if the word" --- but "if I *see* not His word for it." It is simply trusting her own judgment as against others and the assembly of God.

I could not for a moment put a question of blasphemies against Christ on such a ground. It is really wickedness. The attempts to cover them by church questions, or pleas of individual conscience, I abhor with a perfect abhorrence.

Allow me to put a question on minor points in another shape. Suppose I am of an assembly, say Sligo, they judge something, I

think in a mistaken way, am I to *impose* my individual way of thinking on *them*? If not, what am I to do? Leave the assembly of God if it be such (if it be not, I do not go there)? You cannot help yourself, L. S. calls it an enclosure. Be it so, but if she does not continue in an assembly, because it does not agree with her in everything, she can be of no assembly of God in the world. All this is simply a denial of the help and presence of God's Spirit and the faithfulness of Christ to His own people. I cannot see godly lowliness in it. But if an assembly have judged as such in a case of discipline, admitting all brotherly communication and remonstrance, I distinctly say another assembly should, on the face of it, receive their act. If the wicked man is put out at Corinth, is Ephesus to receive him? Where then is unity? where the Lord in the midst of the Church? What led me out of the Establishment was the unity of the Body: where it is not owned and acted upon, I should not go. And Independent churches I think quite as bad or worse of than of the Establishment, and if each assembly acts independently of another and receives independently of it, then it has rejected that unity --- they are independent churches. There is no practical unity of the body.

But I shall never be brought to such wickedness as to treat acceptance of blasphemies as an ecclesiastical question. If people like to walk with them or help and support the bearing with them at the Lord's table, they will not have me. I distinctly judge the principles defended, their want of lowliness as to self, and the setting aside of the very idea of the church of God. But I am not going to mix the two questions. I do not accept the setting aside my spiritual liberty: we are a flock, not an enclosure. But in questions of discipline, where no principle is denied, no truth of God set aside, I do not set up my judgment against that of the assembly of God in that which God has committed to its care. It is simply setting myself up as wiser, and neglecting God's word which has assigned certain duties to an assembly and HE will honor it in its place.

Yours truly in the Lord,

J. N. D.

Blest Father, infinite in grace,
 Source of Eternal joy,
 Thou leads't our hearts to that blest place
 Where rest's without alloy.

Thy love will find its perfect rest
 Where all around is joy,
 Where all in Thee supremely blest,
 Thou'lt all their powers employ.

Adoring love its fulness finds
 In Thee who that love art:
 And perfect there, our heavenly minds
 Live in what fills the heart.

Thy counsels too in all Thine own
 Fulfilled in power divine,
 Spread wide the glory of Thy Throne
 Where all in glory shine.

There Christ, the center of the throng,
 Himself shall in it shine,
 But not an eye those hosts among,
 But sees that Glory shine.

Yet more than all, the Father's love,

Runs as one thrill through all
 And is, where all is bliss above,
 The Chiefest joy of all.

J. N. D.

Letters connected with New Zealand:

CBA 052

{Date: 10 Nov. 1875}

Beloved Brother,

I was sorry that you could not be with us yesterday, but He who cares for His people and the house of His Son in them, is above all and knows how to guide and order the steps of those He has chosen to minister to them in His hand. And I trust this has been the case {in} your remaining at Nelson. "Satan hindered" is, I suppose, as true now, but the Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise that they are vain and maketh the counsel of the brethren of none effect.

It is wearisome work yours, dearest brother, in these last days. How I can feel for you in my poor measure in the trials you have and are undergoing for the elect's sake, but He is worthy for whom you endure them and will know how to sustain and comfort you in them.

Dear Mr. Stuart will tell you of us here. His heart has been much cast down by his S. Francisco letter. His ministry has been relished much and been a help to many in these parts. He will tell you of us here. I am too feeble to run out with him as I would have wished to see you.

Will you speak to Charles Capper about the Xmas meeting and think on the subjects that could be profitable for consideration

Yours very affectionately,

J. G. Deck

Wednesday Evening

10, November, 1875

All ours here specially I and mine are looking to see you here again and do not cease to remember you in our prayers

CBA 27

{to Auckland, New Zealand}

. . . accorded blessing and rejoicing in God's way. Poor Hardland with F— and others seem more determined than ever on Independency and have set up a table of their own. We have an addition of 2 godly couples from London.

I heard of dear G.V.W. spending a day at Kennington. The Brown's feel happy about them. 2 souls, Eugenie and Augustine, both seem to have got decided blessing under Moody and Sankey, both confess Christ and speak for Him.

Alfred has been in town for a week but it was principally on business – however I got one or two conversations with him – not satisfactory about the state of his soul, poor fellow, but I must still look to the Lord whose grace delivered me and can deliver him.

Dear Howard's letters are a great comfort to me. The Lord is giving him to long more and more after Himself. The W. Dartnall's, he tells me, have settled down in the Presbyterian Church. I heard from Honoré last week (the first time since he was in town last year). He speaks of a great work going on in Wangasesies through Mr. Elmslie and Mr. Baader and spreading to the country districts. He also feels there is a real work in the hearts of several of the Maories of the Njaliassa tribes.

Charles' very extra busy time is over, but he is feeling the effects of the extra strain as also of his attack. I think a little fine weather would do us all good. All mine (as would I know all ours if they knew I was writing would) desire {to send} much love.

Please also to give mine to all your dear ones and believe me I am yours affectionately

M. A. Capper

CBA 49

Beloved brother,

The enclosed by today's post, which has brought your most welcome letter I do thank you for what you tell me of Christchurch. How graciously has the Lord turned and ordered your steps.

The brethren in Wellington delight at the thought of a conference. We have just heard that Lewis will be a month or so in works away with Sir D. Martin. I hope dear Samuel has found his way up to you and that he Lord will graciously work deliverance.

I send this on to George to add a line and just telling you of his movements, greatly do I long for his having the privilege of being with you during his holidays. I hope to be with you when you come to Wellington, but must work as much as I can while he is away.

Dear Mr. Darby,

My father wished me to add a few lines. He has decided to remain here quietly till you return to Wellington, and as that appears to be still future, the way seems clear for me to go on to Christchurch. I hope to leave here the end of next week. Mr. McIntyre with Meta is to accompany me as far as Wellington. We are so thankful for the encouraging accounts you are able to send from Christchurch. Hoping, through the Lord's goodness, soon to meet, Believe me,

Yours most truly,

George Deck

Please give my warm Christian love to dear Mr. Grant.

CBA 50

Friday morning

A little refreshed by sleep I add a few lines for Henry to take in to . . . the post. I do not know if you have heard of the sad affliction which happened to poor John Cole. George, his brother, wrote to my George's wife that he arrived in England quite out of his mind, too bad for his poor mother to see, and that he had to be placed in an asylum. The ship he went to England in from Christchurch was an awfully wicked ship, and poor John broke down under the contradiction of sinners and power of the adversary, imagining himself to be Antichrist. . . . in the family. Poor Kenny on his return home found his brother in an asylum. "Lord, how long?" His poor Mother . . . Lady, may she . . . in His presence who can sustain in such sorrow the lessons she had would teach her in their afflictions.

The Wallis' have been turned by the covetousness of their landlord out of their asylum and have to build in some land they own in the mountain places. They are very poor and it is a hard struggle to do this. If some dear Brother who has the means could lend them 200 £ or 300 £ at a low rate say 4 percent of interest for a few years, it would be a great help to an industrious whose a . . . nearly . . . all being rescued from the street and trained up in most loving care. All his children are turned to the Lord, 9 of them, dear Richard Wallis gives me great joy.

I am thankful, you have seen dear G. V. W. and that he is better what a joy it must have been to him to meet {you} of whom he was so accustomed and glad to speak as a beloved brother and dear servant of our Lord Jesus Christ. He would have to . . . too from Christchurch far better than I could with my feeble {body?} and failing memory.

My dear child has lost all her pupils. I am glad of the test for her for this quarter and she needed it and will accompany me to Picton and Blenheim. It has been a little trial of faith but the Lord has provided and will provide. Indeed we have heard since all left

of some purposing to come next quarter.

What I feel so failing in is the {consecration?} in my walk in these last days of grace with truth so wondrously shining forth in Him who was full of both. So often do I through my unbelief and not abiding in Him expose rather the fancy of the Kirk in its {invitation and impatience?}. I thank the Lord in helping me in this . . .

Give my love to dear G. V. W. and Mr. Adams.

So thankful for your letter and the opening of Scriptures you gave me so kindly of the Red Sea and Jordan.

The Lord spare you still to us, dearest Brother. Ask the Lord among other things that I and you brethren should not make our love and His grace and {faith in Him} a snare for we are poor though all would unite in love.

Yours in much affection,

J.G.D.

CBA 51

Sandridge, 7 Nov. 1878

thank you much beloved Brother for your kind remembrance of me in your last two letters – the one from Germany, and the other after your arrival in England regarding Christchurch and Samuel's letter circular. The perplexity was that you went in desiring at Christchurch and did not ignore it publicly till you had left it. The Lord is above all but had you come to N. Zealand I think it might have cleared up much that perplexed and hindered many. When all the past is reviewed in the Lord's own presence, we shall better understand, marking our stupidity and mistakes.

Your remarks about dear Samuel and the state of mind which still hinders his discernment of the question are but too just. I do not think while there is much that I can thank God for in him, that he has yet become a fool in his own eyes, but the Lord can and

will, I trust, deliver him from his self-confidence. What fools we are when in the things of God, we lean upon our own understanding.

There has been trouble at Nelson among the brethren owing to dear Raikes baptizing the unconverted children of our brother Hargreaves; it awakened a strong spirit of opposition in the minds of many and a sectarian feeling but this I trust is subdued and that the brethren will walk in forbearance and longsuffering together. I had greatly desired to see *with* you if you had the truth of God in this point, but basically as I have desired and prayed to be taught of God in this matter, I do not think you have the authority of "thus it is written" in this matter. Indebted to the grace of God in you for so much and loving you as I do for the grace in you I had to watch lest I should through my partiality allow my judgment and integrity of conscience towards God to be crossed, but I much confess without being what you call a baptist, I think you wrong, and that without thinking baptists right. Lev. 12 gives me something better than water for my children. A living priest, a Man and sacrifice. Jesus says, "Suffer the little ones to come unto me and I put them into His arms, assured that He receives and blesses them, rather than to an ordinance which is the figure of His {death} and their burial when crucified and dead out of God's sight. This difference of judgment is very humiliating to us all and perplexing to the weak and ignorant. But it also is accounted for wise and salutary purposes if it teach us not to call any man Master and leads us to walk in mutual forbearance and humility. It would not be wise or right in God's sight lightly to abandon that which at the cost of any thing I believe I learnt from God, when with singleness of heart I desired to know that I might do His will – and this has been the case with so many others likewise.

At Wellington there has been and still is a good deal of trouble connected with evangelizing and the use of the Room where the Saints meet. My own judgment is that when there is not oneness of mind in the occupation of the room, it would be

better to have open meetings for worship and edification, where no one especially commends himself to the brethren as being qualified by the Lord as an evangelist. There is a bit of the same trouble at Nelson, where dear Raikes has taken the preaching of the Gospel on him.

I was up at {Ngatiosti?} on Sunday and at the Nestor's in the evening. God is working in both places.

My heart has had Picton and Blenheim laid upon it, and, D.V., I start for those places with Mary as my companion on Friday, preaching in the German village that night and Nelson on Tuesday. Sunday to Picton and Blenheim. I also shall hope to visit {Hokatitiou?} and the West Coast this summer. Pouling is returned to Melbourne from Sydney where there is blessing, and purposes visiting Tasmania and then N. Zealand. My health broke down so that I cannot reach Auckland or Sydney.

I have had some help in the way of Maori tracts from Mr. G-- here. He has translated 6 for me into Maori and 2 are in the press. Should any dear Brethren feel led to help in the printing of them I should be very thankful. They are translations of some of dear C. Stanley's tracts to whom I enclose a note.

I am so wearied after a very happy meeting this afternoon with brethren for prayer and a tea meeting at Sandridge commending my journey to the Lord that I have asked . . . George who desired to write to C. McAdam to write in my stead, as I wished to acknowledge your kind letters. I am 71 on the 1st of this month. I am so thankful to hear how the Lord has strengthened you for continuance in your labors for Him. When He is satisfied, we will be satisfied. Till then your heart must rest in Him and in work for Him – Blessed Service! I thank God for giving it to you and for all that He has made you to be to His saints and to your unworthy grateful brother,

J. G. Deck

CBA 417

{copy. To Mr. Alexander}

Beloved Brother,

I was glad to get a few lines from you and to hear something of the Brethren too. I have never had a cloud on my mind as to my path since I fixed to come, the Lord helping me, to N. Z. As to my strength, I found after 96 hours constantly in the train in that dreary wilderness nothing the worse. The voyage rather a rest, being as a whole very nice weather, and the ship unusually easy. Were I health hunting I might stay in this beautiful country with pleasure. The climate is admirable here, and the locality charming, of course I have seen this mercy working as elsewhere. Having been put off before, and dear Mr. Grasse having been here, I had doubts about coming, but as they still looked for me, I thought I would come and all has been ordered, I don't know where I have had such earnest and attentive congregations coming out well, and a good many of the loose gatherings.

I was at Auckland where it was also the case. I have been at the gatherings round Deck's where there are three: Motueka, Bunkee and Ngatimoti, a scattered country population of settlers in bush and mountains with a river often difficult, or not, to be crossed (John Code amongst them), but fresh and happy. I was at other outposts as Lowel and Notire, Monteu, everywhere good attendance and attentive, at times most earnest and I felt the Lord with me. In those tracts all are clear unless perhaps one, who is still not against, but really getting his soul exercised, feeling others have gone on without him. The Word is enjoyed so that I trust there may be blessing for all outside as well as inside. At Wisterlea the Somers came out as they never have done, having been a good deal asleep, and prejudiced, but they came in a remarkable manner and the Lord has been graciously with me, of course the exercises of soul in others and in myself are found practically the same as elsewhere, still it remains joyfully and thankfully true, that God has wrought us for the self-same thing,

and has given us the earnest of the Spirit.

On the whole all hitherto has been encouraging. I trust will be so yet. I feel sometimes a little envious of those called to be evangelists, still happy that they have it and good for me and keeps me low and I know and feel that I should be willing to serve where He sets me, and rejoice to do it because it is His will, only *pray* I may serve thoroughly --- happy to be allowed to do it.

As to the translations, though very thankful to give the Word of God to others, I feel I am only a hewer of wood and drawer of water, always have, it is joy to me to have been permitted to do it; but it is the Word in the soul which is the power of life. I only hope that in the midst of all that is going on the Brethren may be devoted and continue to evangelize and increase in it, but earnestly, soberly and devoutly. I am not (though I am sure the Lord does all things well) entirely at ease as to the way Moody sets all to work. I have seen the increased lowering of Christianity it occasions in America and the mischief it does to souls and partly in England. It is earnest working when called of God and confessing it is a great privilege but work is made the means of getting peace – openly so and systematically in the States, besides that many in whom there is no deep work, *yea because it is not*, set out to work. I do not deny that where it is deep and simple, one in the freshness of grace and forgiveness can deal better with sinners than one more advanced. I do not speak of positive gifts but setting to work in a superficial state of soul I dread for the person. I do not doubt Moody's setting forth the love of God more freely has done good, he has got on in truth unquestionably and where he contested with me against grace in conversion, now says I was right, but I do not believe there was ever any deep conviction of sin in his case, of his real earnestness I have no doubt. As to sects and the church the question remains just where it was. My thoughts turn towards England, though I have to finish here if the Lord will, still day by day we have to follow His will and Christ is the same and all everywhere.

Letters from Edward L. Bevir

Novi Ligure

Jan. 3, 1873

My dear Mr. Darby,

I take this opportunity of enclosing a few lines in M. Biava's letter: I have just come to Novi for a few days and find that he is writing to you. I thank you for the message which you sent me by him, although I never was a Captain. I never rose higher than the rank of a very junior subaltern.

I have been a month at Turin and I have been much encouraged there: Caseglia's sister and another are getting on very nicely. Also a young brother named Obertoni, who seems to me to have more energy than most of the Italians, and has laid hold of a great deal of truth and walks according to his light. the rest at Turin are steady: I think Ballada's wife is converted. Castelli has gone to Milan. Another has been lately brought into fellowship at Turin. We used to have meetings every evening there and a good many strangers came at times to the gospel. I trust that the Lord is dealing with them.

At Novi I stayed six weeks (before going to Turin) and felt very happy in the little work and much encouraged at the way in which the Lord has led on the saints here: a few more have been brought out, and they seem all to have got hold of the heavenly calling and hope of the Church, and are beginning to understand the Psalms and Prophets a little. Paolo Giulio especially is very bright and intelligent. The priests here have been playing a few little tricks, and managed to get Paolo G. turned out of his house: . . . the brethren have been at a loss for a locale. Now an entire house has been found: the brethren (Paolo G. and family and one or two others purpose to keep most of the rooms leaving a large

sala for the meetings). Whilst home before I visited Milan twice and attempted a little evangelistic work in outlying villages. Now they are very happy and firm at Milan. I was rather anxious about Castelli when I was there: now he seems all right: bright and steady.

At Torre-Pellice nothing new has occurred since I wrote: Beneck was truly grateful for your present: a few have been added since you were there but they are very weak.

I have had several letters from Malta: chiefly from a bombardier in my ancient battery who is in fellowship: the Lord seems to preserve a little testimony there in the midst of much opposition and evil: I also got a naughty letter from the Presbyterian minister at Malta, who took the trouble to send me about eight pages of abuse: he opposed us in every way that he could when we were there.

I got a long letter the other day from Major McCarthy – there has been much blessing in the Isle of Wight: I was very glad to hear of it for I was there for six weeks before coming to Italy, and felt that the Lord was about to bless: there seemed an unusual desire for the gospel in the villages. Also very good news from Northumberland . . . you have heard of this.

The work here is one of patience and often one meets with much disappointment: it is surprising to me how rapidly infidelity is spreading. Nevertheless I am very much encouraged, chiefly in the way in which the Lord is bringing on and establishing his saints: I have seen a little of the corrupt state of C. Guicciardini and Co.'s meetings: one has little idea of the state they are in unless actually seen. At Genoa, for instance, the greater part of the Bethesda meeting are Freemasons and I believe every form of false doctrine is tolerated and countenanced. I have felt led to write a few articles from time to time in the *Dispensatore* about some of these things. Next Monday, I hope to go to Genoa a little with Biava: some are now separated from Bethesda there and perhaps may be led to take a true position: the Lord will guide us.

I have had nice letters from Hooke, W. Lowe and Phibbs lately. This last is very seriously ill: he has been staying a little in the Isle of Wight where Mrs. Peters has been very kind to him and keeping him quiet. I saw him in Switzerland and that even then he was much overworked.

This note is very badly written and disconnected: I am half asleep: I could not sleep all last night thinking much of Malta: I got a letter last night from the brethren there and could not help following them in all their little difficulties, indeed they have had rather a hot time of it: every one against them, writing about them in the papers, etc.

I saw your note to Biava. Also I heard from time to time of your work and constantly pray for all connected with your testimony. I feel in some little measure the responsibility of a servant of God – especially in these last days when evil develops itself so rapidly – and ask your prayers that I may be kept faithful and calmly obeying the Master's will. The saints here send you "taute saluti". Please give my love to any I know and to all the saints and believe me with much Christian love and respect,

Ever yours,

Edward L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.

Milan

Jan. 9, 1874

My dear Mr. Darby,

I just write a few lines to give you a little of our news. I have been eight days at Novi and Tortona whilst Giacomo Biava has been at Como: the little meeting at Novi seems getting on

decidedly, I think, and there are some fresh souls who attend the meetings. I trust they may get blessing. At Tortona it will be an affair of time, humanly speaking: Davide Mottini the brickmaker of whom I spoke in my note of the 12 December has been a great help, I think, to the brethren there: and Biava has been going there once a week lately. I was there last Sunday night and had an interesting meeting, although Reggio, one of Guicciardini's men, was there: he seemed more quiet and subject to the Word than many of the others. Moïse, one of Guicciardini's preachers, attacked Biava very naughtily some few days ago when he met him at Tortona. Spigno is very angry with us about Como: he is a nice man and much further on than many of the others: he has a bad conscience, I fear: last night I hastily glanced at an article he has written in the last Vedetta against discipline and denying the unity of the Body and Spirit: I hope to look at it again, and perhaps I might get an opportunity of writing or speaking to him about it: I met him a year ago and he took something which I said to him about a wrong idea he had very graciously.

I hope to go to Como again tomorrow for a little: things seem going on well there. the little conference at Novi begins on the Lord's day the 15th March for 15th, 16th, 17th: so that it would be necessary to be at Novi Saturday the 14th. I say this because in your letter you spoke of the 16th.

Giacomo Biava has gone to Novara and Piverone today until the Lord's day. Some Christians at Piverone have been asking some questions and he has gone to look after them. Please excuse this scrawl; I write in the midst of great noise: with much love in the Lord

Believe me

Ever yours affectionately in Him,

Edward L. Bevir

Giovanni Biava and Mrs. Giovanni send their Christian love.

J. N. Darby, Esqre.

{Note in another handwriting:}

Old Dr. Gray has gone home to the Lord. So Mrs W- tells us.

Yours, C. Mc. A.

Como

May 29, 1874

My dear Mr. Darby,

I write a few lines to give you the news of this part: I have been at Como since I last wrote to you going weekly to Argegno and Milan.

At Como they seem getting on a little, I think, and less restlessness in the meetings, one new man employed in the custom house assists at the meetings and appears to be really converted. Cechino Nosedà has left Como and is just now at Cremona employed in a shop. I think he would be better if he stayed at Como. At Argegno there are three or four whom I believe to have got life, although they are still very ignorant. I have been there every week, and always had nice little meetings: now they have begun to meet every Lord's day to read the Word and I hope they will get on.

Yesterday I was at Varese where once there were a few brethren: there is only one left now, an old tailor named Caravate: he seemed a steady old brother.

Biava is at la Spezia for the moment and seems to have found a door open there, though I have not much confidence in that Ermenegildo Rocca who is there. I think tomorrow of going to Tortona and Novi for a few weeks, when I hope to see Biava: I am not sure whether he is going away now, or not.

At Milan, the tall man whom you saw has had rather a bad accident: he got his hand entangled in some machinery or

something and is very ill in hospital: I have seen him once: I quite think he is converted, but his wife is a great drawback to him.

I have had some nice letters lately from the Drôme: they seem to be going on happily at Valdrôme and la Motte &c.

I do not know where you are, so I address this note to England. I hope you have been encouraged in all your service latterly. I am sure all the brethren here would salute you, if they knew I was writing.

Bagshaw, who is just starting for England, sends his love.

Believe me

Yours very affectionately in Christ,

Ed. L. Bevir

Bassignana

Feb. 20, 1875

My dear Mr. Darby,

I write a few lines from Bassignana to give you some Italian news. Since I wrote last I have been chiefly here, where there seems to be an open door. A good many have separated from the Chiesa Libera, as I said in my former letter and some amongst them seem to be really desirous of learning although there will be a good many things to be judged before any can break bread.

The meetings have increased rather as to numbers: sometimes there are as many as 100 who come to the meetings in the evening. They have five regular meetings a week, and many other occasional ones in stables &c. I have visited Como & Argegno since I last wrote, and Davide Mottini has been here between whiles: he is the brother of whom I spoke, who came here first and who has been a very great help to them, I would think.

Biava has come up from La Spezia: he seems to be encouraged

on the whole as to the few there; also at Tortona they seem to be going on better now. He was to have come here next Tuesday but the snow is so thick, it will delay him a little, I think. It is difficult to find furniture in Bassignana and he will have to bring some of his own from Novi. He thinks of staying here two months during which time I hope to go for a cruise on the mountains, whilst one can still have meetings before the people have begun their work in the fields.

We had a little conference at Novi. M. Favez came and we read the Epistle to the Philippians – not many were able to come because the notice was so short, but it was very nice, I think: one felt and enjoyed the Lord's presence in it.

Lafaurie has joined me for a few days and sends his kindest love to you in the Lord. I think of soon revisiting Como and Argegno for a little and then of going with him to the Drôme and Ardèche whilst Biava is at Bassignana.

Please excuse this rough piece of paper: it is not very good here. I only just write these few lines to let you know how things are going on here.

Believe me

Yours very affectionately in Christ,

Edward L. Bevir

CBA 8

Como

March 25, 1876

My dear Mr. Darby,

I am sorry to trouble you in the midst of your work, but I feel I must write a few lines to you in strictest confidence about the

dreadful troubles at Ryde, in which I take a painful interest; you will probably have heard something about it already. I determined to write to you knowing the interest you take in some of them there.

I have not the slightest wish to meddle and it would be unseemly for a young man to write about these things, if there were not urgent need. I write to you quite freely, I am sure you will not misunderstand.

You will very likely have heard that Mrs. Lowder has been put away from the Table as a wicked person, after having been once forgiven after confession of a very ungirded walk. The assembly received this confession, and welcomed her to the Table . . . charges against her which could not be proved, and then with the help of others and strong moral pressure upon the gathering forced it to put her out. I send a copy of a note which Mr. Kelly wrote to me about this: the action could in nowise be called a proper one, it is clear enough. (I believe that had there been enough faithfulness in the gathering she would have been dealt with long before for worldliness . . . – but not in this manner.)

What I am so anxious about is that Mrs. Peters should not be wrongly judged in this sad affair. I write to you about her, asking your prayers, knowing the interest you take in her. I happen to know that Major McCarthy has a very strong feeling of spite against her, and in my own mind I am persuaded that his attack upon Mrs. L. was caused by an undercurrent of strong feeling against Mrs. P. I fear he has not hesitated to asperse her in a very wrong way, indeed enough to break her heart, humanly speaking although the Lord will not allow this. He brought the very worst charges against Mrs. L., which could not be proved, gave the greatest publicity to them, and endeavored there in the most iniquitous way to asperse Mrs. P. It would be quite needless for any one who really knew Mrs. P. to be told that she has the greatest horror of anything of the kind, {to} say nothing of . . . really truehearted to Christ: but Major McCarthy has so represented things that I feel one must speak plainly. No one has been really

more separate from the worldliness of the L's than she (she cannot help being related to them), and the whole course of the Major's conduct towards her has been most unjust to my knowledge.

I have taken the liberty of thus writing so freely because I know the interest you take in my beloved friend Mrs. Peters. I know her better than I know any one else; and though she has a great deal to learn, I know her to be a truehearted and godly soul, though in a difficult position. It is my personal love for her in Christ that causes me to write, asking your prayers for her. She has been very ill for many months, the thing was such a blow to her: I thought perhaps if the Lord should lead you to write to her, it might be blessed to her without speaking *directly* of her sorrow.

Dear Mr. Darby, I write to you with the utmost freedom, and I know you will not misunderstand: I know the Lord is over all, and will bring great blessing out of this ultimately, but I cannot but feel anxious that my beloved friend should not be misunderstood. She was so anxious for the Lord's glory in this sad affair, though they misrepresented her at once. I have not heard from her since she fell ill.

I will only add one instance of Major McCarthy's unfairness, which came under my own eyes, before I left England last August. He wrote to Mrs. P. a letter in which he could not receive the money she was sending him for his son, on account of her connection with the Lowder's (although . . . of her connection with them). He could not take money from such a person, – and then at the end of the letter he actually asked her to send . . . to his son! This I saw with my own eyes. I could only feel grieved for him; and I only quote it as an example of his unfairness.

I am convinced that if the whole course of his action were quietly examined before god, it would show great unfairness. The thing is now a tangled cord - the trouble at Ryde – and the Lord alone can disentangle. This I feel persuaded He will do.

I can only grieve that Major McCarthy has acted as he has: in the case of Mrs. L. . . . was painful enough because he has gone far

beyond any real indignation against sin: nothing is so easy as to excite vehement indignation against a crime against a *person* not really guilty of it: this I know he has done: what grieves me is the wrong way in which he has tried to asperse people far more righteous than himself. I say this with no ill-feeling or disrespect, but it is a relief to me to speak to you so freely about it, asking you to forgive me, if I have taken too great a liberty.

I have been several months on the mountains of France. Good continues at Valdrona. The assembly increases greatly. I have got back to Italy after having been a month in the Isere.

Here at Como, they are getting on quietly, at Argegns too, we got a check and repulse at Bassijuana after all, but I hope to go there and see what there is in the debris: there are two or three souls, I doubt not who are clear. Biava says there are two or three at Florence who are going to begin to break bread. He is there (Firenze) just leaving for France.

Addio, caro Siguor Darby noi tutti qui la salutiamo caramente nel Signore Crotta. Bonorni, i Nosede, e tutti addio! Che il Signore la benedica e la fortifidii nell'opera sud.

Sus affectionately in X,

Edward Bevir

4 Via Cavanna

Novi Ligure

May 4, 1876

My dear Mr. Darby,

I write a line to say that I hope you will not mind the letter I wrote to you in March: it is only the Lord who can put those things straight of which I wrote and I believe He will in His time, and I feel it is not my business to meddle with it. If you thought to write to . . .

At Novi they seem pretty bright on the whole: I have been here about two weeks, and I think of staying on a little. I was at Bassignana the whole of yesterday, but there is not much there in the ruins; there is one family, though, very bright. there are four or five at Tortona who seem all right. Davide has gone to Switzerland, and Biava is in France and Switzerland till about September. They seem bright enough at Como and Argegno: I think of staying about six weeks more, so as to visit all the places, and then of going for a cruise in Dauphiny &c. by the Valleys.

Today I got very bad news from France: the assembly at les Ollieres has divided over that Valence affair and Gabert &c. Do you not think that brethren ought not to come from outside of a gathering to put it straight? It seems to be disallowing the sovereignty of the Spirit. I think they did this at Valence.

All here send their kindest love in the Lord. I do not know when you will get this scrap. I am yours affectionately in Christ,

Ed. L. Bevir

P.S. I have just got the last two letters and MS on the Acts to Biava and I will send them to him today.

At Bassignana I do not think there will be anything just yet: it is an affair of patience, for any who may be true hearted amidst the mass: but they are a very bad lot and deceived very badly. I sent two silk caps to your address, a present from Poumaret of le Vigan/

Ferraris and others have just come to read and send you their love, and says he hopes you will come again to Italy; he is at Novi now.

J. N. Darby Esqre.

3 Lonsdale Square

Barnsbury

London N.

le Buisson

par les Ollières

Ardèche

Sept. 29, 1876

My dear Mr. Darby,

Since I last wrote I have been chiefly in the high part of the Isère and in the high Drôme to which I crossed by the Col de la Croix Haute: and now I have got back to the Ardèche. Things are in a dreadful mess here, and a division is inevitable at les Ollières. Lately thirteen brethren of les Ollières met in secret to uphold Gabert and Astor etc., refusing to receive a letter written from the gathering at Liviori: this letter was written to the gatherings round about, complaining of an aggressive nectary act on the part of Chabanne Gabert. The rest of the gathering at les Ollières has written a final remonstrance to the thirteen, but I greatly fear they will not listen to it. I fear that le Crouzet and la Pizette, two gatherings in the environs will also be upset by this affair. For the rest, the gatherings in these parts are firm and united: Valence, St. Agreve, Lamastre, Désaignes, le Pape, Livrou, etc, as doubtless you have heard: it is a very serious affair and I think it gets worse as it goes on: I trust the brethren of les Ollières will have the firmness and grace in acting towards these thirteen, for the more space they give them, the more arrogant they become.

The gatherings in Dauphiny are quite clear and united (except of course Valence). I met W. Lowe at Livrou in descending the Valley of the Drôme: he has gone to Bordeaux. I have pretty good news from Biava from Como etc., and hope shortly to get back to Italy, but I think of staying here a little longer, as things are in such a mess: not to endeavor to help those who are in the trouble here. M. Favez is at Annonay; I do not know what state exactly they are in there: I hope to hear from him today: I fear a division is inevitable there also, from all I have heard.

You will have heard before this that poor Mrs. Peters has quite lost her reason: I did not meddle in any way in the trouble at Ryde but I have still the same views about it. I will send off this scrap hoping to write again in a day or two, to give further news of the state of things in these parts, les Ollières, Annonay, la Pizette, etc. I must close this for I have got a good deal of work just come in,

I am yours ever affectionately in Christ,

Ed. L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.

c/o C. McAdam Esqre

13 Cambridge Garden

(pressée)

Notting Hill

London W

le Buisson

par les Ollières

Ardèche, Oct. 3, 1876

My dear Mr. Darby,

I add a line to my former note to forward a letter which Lafaurie wishes to send to you, by which you will see that the division long impending at les Ollières has taken place. Every one felt it to be inevitable after the refusal of the thirteen brethren of les Ollières to receive the letter from Livrou. this letter declared that the gathering at Livrou no longer recognized Chabanne Gabert and Astor, (after their action on the cotea of Livrou Aug. 15) and all the other gatherings round about, except for les Ollières and Annonay have approved it.

Lafaurie is writing about les Ollières: I fear they must be in a sad state for the moment at Annonay. May the Lord give patience

and dependence upon Himself to all who desire really to glorify Him: it is rather a serious state of things. I think les Ollières would have been much clearer, had not Gabert for a long time undermined the gathering.

In the Drôme (except of course Valence) the gatherings are quite clear as to their course of action, i.e., they have refused to acknowledge la Place de las Pierre, Valence, as an assembly until they judge their sectarian conduct and their wrong and violent expressions.

I have no doubt you know all the detail of these troubles: may the Lord make even the troubles themselves the means of awakening and blessing His saints in these parts. It is a happy thing to look up to Him for His people, in the midst of all the attacks of the enemy. This is only a short note to forward Lafaurie's letter: I am yours very affectionately in Christ,

Ed. L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.

c/o C. McAdam Esqre.

13 Cambridge Gardens

pressée

Notting Hill

to be forwarded

London W

4 Via Cavanna

Novi Ligure

Dec. 12, 1876

My dear Mr. Darby,

I write a few more lines to give you some news of these parts, – but I daresay you are already au courant through Biava. I stayed a few days at Como since I last wrote where they seem to be going

on pretty well, though rather sleepy; at Milar poor Ambrosini is dying of consumption; but seems happy in the Lord. Last year, a Milanese doctor bled him for his complaint! (consumption): he made me quite angry. At Novi they seem going on well and Ferraris and the two with him are certainly progressing; also there are a few more than when you were here, so that often the meetings run up to about 30 or more. there is hardly anything left at Tortona only Buttini and old Ottavio, but they are neither of them worth much: Ottavio is given to drinking: I have got some nice letters from Valdrôme: they seem to be going on very well, and not to have been influenced by the troubles in the Ardèche and at Valence. Lafaurie has written to me a good deal lately, and it seems that things are going pretty well in his neighborhood. I have not heard of Annonay: they wished me very much to go there at the time of the trouble at les Ollières, but I felt I ought not to go, to avoid even the appearance of meddling in the disturbed state of the meeting. I felt that the Lord was with those who accepted the decision of the gathering at Livrou in the various gatherings. I think incalculable harm was done by many of M. Vialet's letters, etc. for he wrote without being on the spot, and only misled in general, I think. the Lord will bless His saints and bring good out of all this sore trouble. It is in any case a happy thing to look up to the Lord for His beloved saints and to pray Him to use these very troubles to awaken them and to prevent their falling asleep in the worldliness and indifference which seems pressing in upon all sides.

I have heard that Mrs. Peters is much better at ryde. I was afraid that she had permanently lost her mind. The Lord knows what lessons He has to teach in all these things. I would not have spoken about the trouble at Ryde had I not felt so much interest in Mrs. P., and so anxious that she should not be wrongly judged in the matter. For to me, it was, and still is, a gross piece of injustice to have aspersed her as Major McCarthy did, and all the more sickening because done in the name of great zeal for the Lord, and great profession of love. I am sure that the Lord will manifest all in

His time, and bring good out of it: I trust too that I say this with no feelings of illwill or disrespect towards the Major, but I have a deep feeling of the injustice of many things he said about Mrs. Peters.

We constantly look to the Lord to bless you and guide you in your work, Mr. Darby; all here send their love: . Grosso, Antonio, Ferraris etc. The Lord abundantly bless your labor, one feels that His coming is nigh.

With love and respect in Him,

Ever yours,

Ed. L. Bevir

Gavezzi has written a most wicked book against the Brethren: I never saw anything more scurrilous: he quotes from a certain Dr. Carson (who must be nearly as coarse as himself) and from an article in the Quarterly, without any fair reference to Brethren's writings: it is really the worst thing that has been published.

Valdrôme

Feb. 2, 1877

My dear Mr. Darby,

I write a few lines to acknowledge your last kind letter with its enclosure which I have just received.

I have just crossed over to Valdrôme where we are having some interesting meetings: it is just the time, for there is not much outdoor work. I left them pretty bright at Novi. Poor Ambrosini died about a month ago. I was at Milan at his funeral, and we had two interesting meetings, one in the cortole {courtyard} of his house, and the other in the cemetery: there were a great many present, and I felt there was power and attention.

Indeed I thank you very much for what you say about Ryde: indeed I have to judge myself for saying what I did, and I ought not to have said what I did to the Major. It is easy to form a wrong conclusion when one is interested in any matter, but this is no excuse. I trust the Lord will keep me from this hastiness of judgment, and want of patience and humility.

I have just got a nice letter from dear Turner who seems happy in his work. We have been having large meetings here, in the neighborhood, these days, and a sense of the Lord's presence in the meetings. there are two conversions at Vauqelas in Valdrôme. I wrote some letters to answer Gavazzi, but when I found the book was so very coarse, I asked Biava not to publish them: I think it would be only lowering the truth to do so. I have been working a little at clockmaking lately.

I must close for my time is short. I would ask your prayers for the patience and humility which I constantly lack. I have been lately very much struck by the untiring mercy of the Lord in one's service. I send my kindest Christian love with that of the saints here.

Yours with much Christian respect and love,

E. L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.

le Buisson

par les Ollières

(Ardèche)

Feb. 22, 1877

My dear Mr. Darby,

I wrote a few lines to you from Valdrôme to give you my news. I have just got down from the High Drôme: I had a very happy, and I may say, profitable time at Valdrôme, and a nice

conversion while I was there: I felt very much encouraged and happy with the simple-hearted saints up there, and visited nearly all the corners, and had a good many meetings.

I forget whether I told you that poor Ambrosini died before I left Italy: we had two nice évangélisations at his funeral, one in the courtyard of the house where he lived, and the other at the cemetery. I have heard from Biava from Novi just lately: he did not seem to have been much encouraged in the South. Spigno professes to be anxious about his present position, as not being according to God: I saw him before I left Italy, but I cannot say I think the work is deep in him: another of Guicciardini's men, Professor de'Giustina seemed very desirous of fellowship with Brethren, but I could not quite make him out either.

I had asked Biava not to publish the letters I wrote in reply to Gavazzi, and I am rather sorry he has published them, for Gavazzi's book was so coarse that it would have been better to leave it, in silence. I was at les Ollières last Lord's day and Tuesday, and found them pretty bright: we had a very large meeting on Tuesday, and I felt there was some power in it.

I am thinking of fixing my headquarters on this side of the Alps, so as to be able to cruise in the higher parts of Dauphiny and Italy, and also to be able to visit these parts.

I trust the Lord gives you encouragement in your present work. I had a nice letter from Turner the other day, and heard a little the news of the Sourthern states etc. Lafaurie joins with me in very much love. I may perhaps be coming to England in the course of two or three months when, D. V., I may see you.

With much love and respect in the Lord,

Ever yours,

E. L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.

(to be forwarded)

le Buisson
par les Ollières
Ardèche
Mar. 14, 1877

My dear Mr. Darby,

I have been for some little time in the Ardèche. I staid at Valdrôme about two weeks after I wrote, and had a good many interesting meetings, and another nice conversion whilst I was there. then I crossed into the Ardèche: I have got a room in Lafaurie's house as my headquarters, and fitting up an étable, to work at clocks and watches when I have not anything else to do, but I find there is immense need in these parts. I have been lately at le Cheylard, Lamastre, and that part of the Ardèche and had a great many meetings: the gathering at le Cheylard (NW of Lamastre 20 kilometers) is increasing and I found several really interesting souls in the neighborhood, especially one or two who have lately asked to break bread.

I think these sad troubles in the Ardèche have not done much harm but e contrà they have awakened the saints to pray a little, and I am sure there is a far higher tone at les Ollières than formerly. I met Astor the other day, but found him to be in a very naughty spirit. I hope to come to England this year, D.V., and I trust to see you, if the Lord will. I do not write much for I am not sure if you are not on your way and I hope to write again shortly. Biava sends pretty good news from Italy, but I fear Genoa is not much. With much love and respect in the Lord, and much love from Lafaurie.

Yours very affectionately in Him,

Ed. L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.
3 Lonsdale Square
Barnsbury
London N
to be forwarded

Autrans

Isère

Aug. 21, 1878

My dear Mr. Darby,

I wrote a few lines about three weeks go to acknowledge your last kind letter: I hope you will have received it by this time. I am at Autrans for a few days, a village lying SW of Grenoble, high up on the mountains: I hope to be able to visit the high part of the Isère and Valdrôme before going back to Italy. Biava is going back this week: I have just heard from him, he is thinking of going to Florence this winter after visiting Novi and Como. Three or four Italians (brethren) from Novi, Tortona, and Bassignana are establishing themselves at Vigon in Switzerland; they are better paid there than in Italy: I hope all will not emigrate in this way. Biava said you were looking over the Italian hymns: it is necessary to publish a new edition for the first has run out, and it becomes a need to have new hymn books. If you thought of it, it might be well to send the corrections to Biava quanto prima. I have made a good many corrections, and got the thing nearly ready: Biava says we can go over it (he and I with any others who like to aid) when we meet – i.e., Biava and myself – and have got your corrections.

These little gatherings in the Isère are very feeble: they seem very bright and hearty at Valdrôme, and the gathering has much increased: I was there some little time lately. I have been very little in the Ardèche, but from what little I saw and heard, it seemed to

me that the troubles at Valence and the neighbouring gatherings are gradually becoming less. at Valence itself the state of things is always the same, but all the gatherings round about (with the exception of a few individuals) are very determined, I think rightly, in declaring against Astor, Gabert, and those with them. Gabert is now at Valence as doubtless you know: I have been a little tired lately from long marches in the heat, but otherwise well. I am having a rest here in the midst of this little gathering. I saw a letter from J. W. Smith lately in which there was an account of some of your work; may the blessed Lord keep and preserve you in all your travels, and continue to bless the ministry of the word through you. Samuel Repellis sends much love: Believe me with much love and respect in the Lord

Ever yours in Him

Ed. L. Bevir

J. N. Darby Esqre.

Past Midnight

Once more, O Lord, the prayer repeated oft,

Awake Thy saints to wait Thy quick returning!

Midnight is past, and mounting high aloft,

The morning star in clear soft radiant burning

Darkness to shadowy light will soon be turning,

As on the day when Mary sought the tomb

For her lost loved Master sadly mourning.

Hushed lies the guilty world in silent gloom

And stumbling little sees her fate, nor knows her doom.

Arouse the Bride to sense of heavn'ly sight,

To be the partner of Thy majesty,

To be with Thee in spotless robe of white,

To fill Thine heart and fully please Thine eye,

Deck'd in the glory of simplicity.

Arrayed in brilliant byssus, pure and fair,

No fuller's art can with its luster vie,

No virgin snow of Alpine peak compare

With dress unsullied which the favour'd spouse shall wear.

Voice of the Spirit and the Bride go forth,

"Lord Jesus, come, from highest heav'n descending."

And he who hears the Name of matchless worth

Repeat the cry in reverent rapture bending,

Then turn to the dark world, all effort lending,

The thirsty of the fount of life to tell.

One wakening shout as mortals' day is ending

Ere justice sternly rise and sound their knell:

"Whoever wills may drink the sacred well!"

E. L. Bevir

March 3, 1880

(Found in the *Sibthorpe Collection* of letters addressed to J.N.D.)

**Notes Written by
William Joseph Lowe
(1840-1927)
about early days of the
Brethren movement in
Switzerland and France**

From Mr. Bob Lowe,
Wellington, New Zealand
(Great Grandson of J. G. Deck & of W. J. Lowe)

Yverdon -- 1843

Essertines. (1½ hr. dist.).
Spring of 1844 or 5.
commenced w 3 frères.
(Calame of Yverdon went
Two or three Sundays. After
2 more joined less than a
month after that 4 others --
(nearly all the christians in
the villages) Then began
conversions & the number
rose to 60 -- Agricultural -
Aug. Perret-Jordan at
beginning of the meeting at
Essertines -- born Sept. -/19.
conv^d. at 12 years old. made
his first & only long tour

April-July 1845 -- Thurien,
Noirague, Ponts &. -
Tramelan & country about
Montbelliard & married in
Nov. of that year.

Revoil in villages about
Essertines began in 1824 or
thereabouts. Laudon preached
in 1826 & following years &
died in -/34.

In village of Gressy there was
a christian pastor M. Mellot,
greatly blessed about -/24 --
He had two brothers also
pastors in the neighbourhood

& also devoted men

Vallée du lac de faux --

Commencement of Anci
Dissid. -- at le Brassus -
1816 or 17 -- father of
Eugene Piguet (of
Colombier), who left the
valley for Nyon about 1853
& then joined the frères. His
son Eugene left two or three
years before & finally settled
at Colombier - (in
Neuchatel).

Sainte Croix (1840)

1839. Frère Barbey visited Sam^l Bornaud who had already separated from the nationals for some years & formed the “ancienne dissidence.”

In autumn of 1840 two or three began to break bread & were soon after visited by J. N. D.

Barbey went to Paris where he died. Sam^l Bornaud born 1804, conv^d. at age of 12 -- 1843.

Oldest brother at Auberson -- David Jaques died 13 Sept. 1869 -- aged 70.

Geneva

Madame Sechè (the Lydia of Geneva) buried 2nd Nov. 1869.

Tramelan

Severe persecution in autumn -/48 & spring -/49. No. in communion then about 15. Several were added at the time so that the number soon rose to 70, which was afterwards reduced by death, secession & other causes. About 30 in commⁿ. up to -/67 -- 14 added in -/68 30 more in -/69 & eight others in -/70. Louis Etienne died 1870.

Berne.

1845-6. chiefly through a Mr. Conod and another, both of whom afterwards went back. Wm. Heintziker came out at that time In /70 about 30 in fellowship.

Rheinhard (Arginè)

commenced in '59 or thereabouts by a brother from Sophinque. More than 100 meeting there in 1869.

S^tImier 1834 (?)

M^{me} Perret & M^{me} Tschauz (mother of Tschauz of Sonvillier) exercised about truth in Dombresson & used to meet afterwards in St. Imier with a few others, & broke bread occasionally,

Lac Le 1845 --

commenced by Pfister who removed to that place from La chaux defonds at that time.

gradually feeling their way out of system. Rammel, Fracol & others worked here. In 1842 Fracol commenced a meeting for evangelization chez M^{me} Vuillème which was blessed to the conversion of many as well as her own

family --- Meeting very fluctuating as to numbers.

Les Ponts de Martel. 1846 -7.

Adolphe Hesquemin came from La Chaux de fond & established himself aux Ponts autumn 1846. Meeting began soon after. Felix Ducommun converted at that time took his place afterward at the table. August Aellen conv^d. year after, also M. Stauffer, Ducommun (afterwrd of Gorgias) & the Perrins.

La Chaux defonds.

Anci^{en} Dissid^{en} in -/38 & -/39 commenced 1836 Frère Ronget visited them about that time. A. Fred. Pfister with them, also. he came to live at La Chaux defonds (from France) in 1839.

They first began to break bread regularly every Sunday in the house of Jules Jacot (1796) in 1844 or thereabouts when Ronget came to live at la Chaux defonds.

The reunion was held for some time in Ronget's house & then in the present local chez Guyot.

In 1836, they often went to "Les Brises" about ¾ hr. from the town where an "ancien" of the national church received them -- by night when the persecution prevented their going by day.

Considerable persecution in 1838, 39.

Jules Jacot's son Jules (1826) suffered as a boy.

Besançon. 1849.

Ulysse Junod came to Besançon March 1849 & broke bread with his wife for 3 months. (He came from Courtelary, Val de S^t. Imier.)

Then he was joined by a brother Arthaud, also from Suisse, a deserter from the army because he would not fight against the Fribourgeois. this brother died in Besançon.

The Sunday after Junod's arrival, when he was very low in spirits feeling his desolation, & in prayer, David Rodl knocked at his door, an entire stranger to him, but who had heard something of him through an affair wh. had happed at the Douana [customs station] (where Junod rated his goods higher than was usual for conscience sake). -- & soon made himself known as a child of God, only very zealous for the established church from which he did not get delivered till 2 or 3 yrs after. He afterwards married an English sister, & went to

Nelson, New Zealand.

Marcelin Junod came to Besançon 2 months after Junod & through David Rodl June -/51 they became acquainted with the family Magnus, who gradually got freed from system & came out about 1854.

M. Junod remained there 6½ years till Nov/Dec. 1857, when he went with his family to Noirague in the Val de Travers.

Montbéliard 23 July '70

This meeting is more or less connected with the history of Louis Gabriel Vierende.

Born in 1799, converted at Geneva in 1818, connected with M. Guers in the "reveil" which took place there about 1824, employed as Colporteur (expenses paid by Robt. Haldane). went to Montbéliard in 1827. Several were converted through his & others means at Montbéliard, Desandaus &c. About 1831, ___ Vivian, a disciple of Cæsar Malan came from Geneva & wanted to "organise" the church of Montbéliard & establish himself as their pastor but he was quickly resisted by Vierende, & he went to Paris not long after (among other things he wanted to impose Malan's hymn book) At this time the christians met simply, though not knowing much ecclesiastical truth & not breaking bread every Lord's day. In 1837, Vierende left for Belgium (near Waterloo), & did not return to Montbéliard till 1843.

Thomas Carey (1807-1869) came about 1840-2 (while Vierende was away in Belgium) stayed in Colombier-Chatelot for a time & afterwards for several months in Desandaus, & greatly helped the brethren there to understand the scriptures. From there he went to Montbéliard.

(Note. Th. Carey carried on the french work in Guernsey till his death 3 May -/69 soon after which his widow went to stay w her niece M^{rs} Compaise at Puligny. Pierre Compaise & his family left Puligny Feb. 1840 after years solitude in that Roman catholique village, breaking br^d w his wife & mother only, his father being unconverted & worldly. He went to Guernsey to carry on Mr. Carey's work)

Montbéliard (cont^d)
Bêtancourt. 1850

Abraham Oulevay came & established himself at Bethancourt, in the property of the sister he married there, about 1844. And on the occasion of his marriage Franc. Antoine Schittel came for the first times.

The meeting was then held in the house of Pierre Parrot, a labouring brother, who soon after went to Marseilles, where he now is. The meeting was then held in a sister's house, when some difficulty arose, it was transported in 1850 to the house of Pierre Tissot at Bètancourt.

Here it remained till 1870 & still is though Onlevay has built a new room but not used yet on acct. of affair spring '69

In 1866, F.A. Schüttel came to reside at Montbéliard, & as there were several brethren in the town, they decided to begin a meeting again in Montbéliard leaving that at Bètancourt to stand as it was.

The meeting was thenceforward held in the house of F. A. S. until the

war w̄ the Prussians Autumn of 1870. F. A. S. left at the end of -/70 & went to Sonvillier (Suisse) others left also & the meeting broke up, those that rem^d going to Bètancourt.

Colombier-Chatelot. 1840.

Barbet was the first to set on foot the breaking of bread about 1840, though there had been meetings at

Blussengeaux some few years before that, & also in Colombier; but more or less connected with the "ancienne dissidence" or old dissenting movement. Pierre Drot, of Blussengeaux conv^d about - 32 at Montbéliard when in pension there, for his health, where he used to attend the meeting but he remained a dissenter mor or less to the end of his days.

He was used to several, but matters in Blussengeaux went ill: the affairs of this life ruined everything.

In Colombier, matters were better, one of the Lochard's & George Bossardet-Lochard who went to Terreblanche were among the first.

Thos. Carey made 3 visits about 1840-5 & Oulevay, Tracol & Pierre Parrot came often the succeeding years.

(1843) Pierre Lochard (tailor) rec^d the truth from Carey during a severe illness in which Carey & his wife nursed him, & was set free 2 or 3 years after.

Pierre Drot has been always nominally with the brethren -

father of Emilie & Marie. & So has Pierre Gein since the beginning 1840.

Dèsandaus.

George & Pierre Rigoulot received the truth about 1830 from L. G. Vierende at Montbéliard, to whom they applied for tracts &c. being already zealous for the Lord but not freed. They returned home to Dèsandaus & soon by the publication of a full, free gospel to those that applied to them, many souls became exercised. a few years after (about '27?) they began to break bread together, once a month, feeling their way, & being in advance of Vierende who was opposed to it & to the doctrine of the Lord's coming.

There were two dissenting parties at that time - one with Vierende at Montbéliard - the other wth a M. Jacques at Gleign^r Terreblanche.

M. Carey served here some months about 1841 & taught the brethren truth from the SS.

Beutal.

Meeting held chez Fred. Haye-Rigoulet, (sister of M^{me}. Jacques Isamin (Terreblanche).

Beutal.

Jacques Chavet conv^d. ab^t. 1835 by means of his sister who was conv^d at Blussangeaux. The Rigoulots showed him there was no need of a pastor for break^g. of bread. & the meeting began there about same time as at Colombier.

Pierre Marchand-Chavet & some others conv^d. 1860 & meeting held in his house.

Lougres. 1862

A christian pastor, M. Douzè, was blessed to giving many a knowledge of the truth, but it was not till autumn of 1861, that there was much manifestation. At that time several were set free, the brethren in the neighbourhood especially Beutal helping greatly.

The nominal religion is Lutheran. Most of those converted are more or less nearly related, the family name being Jacquin.

Jacquin the ex-maire is the most intelligent. He was much exercised during the 8 years he was mayor.

The Lord's table was spread in 1862, in the spring.

Two years after this, spring of 1864, there was a little burst of persecution. The occasion was the burial of the child of a brother Martz at Longeville, the first in these parts, performed by the brethren. The villagers made considerable opposition prompted by the clergy & L. G. Vierende was very roughly

handled. Fred Lochard (Colombier-Chat.) bears the marks of the stones flung at him to this day. But the father succeeded in burying his child. P. & F. Lochard encouraged by this the villagers of Lougres (2 miles from Longeville) made a "charivari," 2nd or 3rd Sunday after the affair at Longeville. They assembled together the moment they came out of church at the time of the aftn. meeting, but the brethren aware of the conspiracy did not meet as they expected & so not finding them some women assaulted the sister Susanne Bourgesin aged 17 at the time. The mayor, "adjoint," & garde champêtre all managed to be absent. This came to the ears of the authorities who severely reprimanded the mayor who was forced to resign, sent one or two of the worst to prison & sent some gendarmes to guard the meeting room the next Sunday.

Terreblanche 1848 {1870
July}

Meeting for breaking of bread commenced about 1848 after conversion of Pierre Leasurmin & his elder brother Jacques a few months after. in 1847 or thereabouts & was soon reinforced by several from Colombier-Chatelot who came to work in the cutlery fabrique at Terreblanche. The Bosserdets came from Colombier about 10 years after. -four brothers George, Pierre, Etienne (died -/69) & Frèdèric (died young as well as his wife) leaving many children of whom eldest Louis is in fellowship & ___ Aug. Normand of Besançon. the other brothers also have children many of them grown up & converted.

Meeting held chez Jacques Icamin the eldest of four brothers all in fellowship (Pierre, Fred, Charles) the youngest of whom, Charles <wed?> Esther Delacon half-sister of Abel Delacon who got "reformed" from military

service on account of a swelling in the neck which turned out to be temporary.

Jacques I. born 1825 lost his father 1831 when he was six & was left w his two brothers to the care of their mother who still lives. & was conv^d. after he was (Charles J. born afterwards).

He married Clemence Rigoulet (of Désandaus) born 1831 converted -/47 about same time as he & afterwards went to America for a time before her marriage.

S^tJulien. 1848.

Meeting commenced about same time or soon after that of Terreblanche & soon after the conversion of Frédèrich Bainier, at whose house it has always been held.

At the time, there were four or five sisters converted, who, though attending church, used to meet together to read the word & read tracts &c. through their means M^{me}. F. Bainier got peace, before her husband. Frédéric's conversion made some stir in the village, which was made a blessing to the soul of another Bainier who had been exercised many years, but given to drinking & he was converted shortly after & died in 1865. His son was converted on his own death bed some years before, & was then the means of leading his wife & his mother (Bainier's wife) to Christ. The son left his widow with one daughter Maryanne. This widow was afterwards married to Junod of Besançon.

There was considerable opposition from the villaagers at the time the meetings were first held in Fréd. Bainier's house & sometimes they were interrupted & disturbed. Fréd. B. born in 1815, conv^d. 1848.

One of the first of the sisters converted was Catherine Bainier-Colin cousine of M^{me}. Oulevay of Bétancourt, who married an ungodly, wretched man, who gives her but little liberty.

There are two other Bainiers in fellowship brothers, George & Pierre. - cousins of Fred.

Pays d'enhaut. 1846 Aug.Se
pt '70

4 Meetings.

Rossinières chez David
Roch

Chablon - Vincent
Mottier

d'Etivaz - Sophie
Farrod (since -
/70)

Rougemont - Marie
Huber Känel

The ancienne Dissidence began the venerable Sam^l Pulet at Rossinières was one of the first. His son Sam^l (adjutant of gend'armerie also christⁿ but remained a "neutral" at the time of the division in Canton de Vaud (he is now at Laviguy).

Vialet laboured much here about 1846-7. Mr. Darby came up also at the same time & the meetings of brethren began almost simultaneously at all four places.

Melet of Rossinières was much used to help the brethren.

David Roch brought out of Eglise libre.

The Eglise Libre which sprung up soon after the brethren took their stand & which swallowed up the ancienne dissidence, has a strong hold on the people in these valleys.

In Chateau d' Oex, 1870, it fraternizes very much with Eglise nationale.

Malverne 10

Sept. '73

Dear brother,

In inclose your tract. We have had good meetings at Malverne one or two helped<?> Lord's day evening and several at

_____ has
come out and several found
peace and liberty _____
getting on nicely I going DV
to _____ H_____ with
_____ and all the saints.

Affy yrs J.N.D.

English habitation best it is
"____" not "____"
Gen III 15

Subject Index

Autobiographical Remarks by JND	23
baptism	138, 241
Barry, Edward	8
beard of JND in cold weather	26
Bennett, E. Division Among Brethren (1858)	9
Bethesda	202, 247
Bevir, Edward L.	246-260
Blackheath	158
blasphemies	230
Blest Father, infinite in grace (poetry by JND)	234
Bond, Edwin of Birmingham	171, 189
Brinkman, C. Marriage Questions	16
Brinkman, Jabez Protest Letter	17
Brown, F. G. Death of	42
Burbidge, W.	101, 109, 138, 146, 159, 195, 198
Calary	2, 227
Canterbury	128, 143, 144, 146, 152, 193, 194
Christendom (1863)	22
Christianity works by what it brings, not by what it finds	129
church on earth or in heaven	213
cleverness is not conscience	142
Cluff, S. O'M.	62, 65, 66, 216
Col. 3 Heavenly Things	223
Conforming to C. of E.	1
Controversy in 1863	22
Cronin, Edward at Ryde	52, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 66, 68, 67, 70,

.....	71, 72, 81, 84, 88, 89, 98, 111, 115, 117,
.....	119, 120, 125, 147, 152, 170
Deck. J.G. not breaking bread yet (1851).	5
dissolving a local assembly	222
Division at East Street	18
Division Among Brethren (1858). Cause of the Existing	9
doctrines. Questions of	3
Dorman, W. H. Publishing	6
encouragement for JND	207
Eternal Punishment	40
evangelist's hands. To throw the people up into	218
Exclusive Fellowship Principles. Questions on	8
existence of brethren is	140
Faith, Life and Feeling. The order of	32
fellowship	194
Gabert	257, 258, 259, 266
Gethsemane was not drinking the cup	28
Gregg, J. H. Publishing	7
heavenly things in Col. 3	223
hostile criticisms	25
Humanity of the Lord Jesus. B. W. Newton and	229
humiliation	228
humiliation. Meetings for	170, 175, 181
independency of assemblies	232
Jull, H.	109, 124, 126, 138, 142, 144, 147, 151, 156, 163,
.....	165, 168, 181, 183, 185, 187, 188, 194, 198
Kelly, W.	158, 169, 178, 180
Kennington	75, 77, 78, 79, 83, 85, 86, 87, 96, 97, 98, 99,

..... 141, 179, 195
 kindness of JND. An example of 224
 Local assemblies in a city 35, 36
 Loiseaux, P. 210
 Lordship of Christ 25
 Lowe, W. J. Notes about early days 269
 Macintosh, C. H. 175, 177, 180, 183, 186
 Marriage Questions 16
 ministry. Unprofitable 199, 201
 new start 142, 164, 169, 178, 185, 187, 196
 New Zealand 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 243
 Newton, B.W. Humanity of the Lord Jesus 229
 Newton, Mrs. Letter of sympathy to 4
 numbers but souls in earnest. Not 20
 Open Brethren 202, 247
 overseer. Myself in the place of 148
 Owen, George 18, 21, 128, 150, 199, 201
 paedobaptists in Kent 138
 pantheism 150
 Park Street 106, 107, 111, 112, 123, 141, 155, 176, 177, 179
 Pennyfather (1827). Autobiographical remarks by JND 23
 Plato 40
 Post Midnight (poetry by E. L. Bevir) 266
 post-trib rapture 220
 postscript by JND on Kennington's action 98, 99
 Propitiation and Reconciliation. C. E. Stuart and 133
 publishing 27
 Ramsgate (A.H., G.H., Broadstairs, etc.) .. 94, 101, 108, 109, 118,

.... 124, 126, 127, 129, 131, 136, 138, 142, 145, 146, 149, 150,
 151, 155, 159, 161, 163, 165, 168, 171, 178, 179, 185
 reception 144
 Reconciliation. C. E. Stuart on Propitiation and 133
 restoration to the assembly 220
 Ryde 34, 37, 38, 50, 51, 91, 114, 132, 209, 214, 247, 253
 Second Timothy 1:12 225
 separation from evil or from brethren 150, 160, 163, 177
 Sorrows of Israel. Christ and the 29
 Stuart, C. E. Propitiation and Reconciliation 133
 submission to assembly decisions, see also Gabert 230
 Testimony of Brethren 22
 train. 96 hours constantly in the 243
 translations 244
 unanimity 151
 unanimity for discipline 178, 188
 unity between good and evil I do not understand 176
 unworldliness 23
 verb tenses 217
 visiting work. Nothing is better than 167
 Wigram, G. V. 51, 86, 117, 153, 169, 178, 187, 199
 will of JND 41
 wisdom consists in not going before God but following Him .. 153
 Worcester 202
 worship to the Lord Jesus Christ 210