

A BRIEF NOTICE OF A FEW OF  
P.F.H., W.H.D., & MR. GILPIN'S  
QUOTATIONS AND STATEMENTS,  
AND  
J.N.D.'S EXPLANATIONS.

---

It may be well for Christians who have not time to look into this matter at any length, to give an outline merely of the points raised against Mr. Darby, and a few of his explanations, which it seems to me will be amply sufficient to satisfy any unbiassed, unprejudiced enquirer as to the true scriptural character of his doctrine; and the value and importance of the two kinds of unatoning sufferings, as well as the atoning sufferings of the blessed Saviour.

The question raised *really* narrows itself into a single point, namely, Does Mr. Darby state or maintain that our blessed Lord was smitten, or cast down, or suffered penally, except as our substitute on the cross? or does he, on the contrary, distinctly maintain, as all Scripture does, that the Lord Jesus, until His soul was made a sacrifice for sin on the tree, was always in the fullest communion in thought, word, and deed with His Father? Thus, instead of wrath or indignation resting on the Son of God until He was made sin for us, He was, according to Mr. Darby, *always*, in the fullest sense of the word, “*in undeviating communion with His Father.*”

Let us now see what is said against Mr. Darby, and what his own thoughts are on the subject.

P. F. H. says, "The argument, whatever its value, goes simply to prove, if it needed proof, that this teaching really means what it says—*that our Lord was smitten by God's hand and not atoningly.* \* \* \* Tell me then first, Do you think it to be a bad and false doctrine to say, that our Lord was smitten (with others), cast down, cut off, by the hand of Jehovah, and not as an atonement for sin?" (*Grief upon Grief*, p. 11.) "Then tell me, if our Lord is made to suffer *with* others under God's wrath, so as to be smitten while they are wounded—the only difference appearing to be that He had the heaviest blow; while He and they all suffer under the same wrath, and of course for the same cause or reason, how is He fit to be an atonement for others? How could He at the same time suffer *with*, and *instead of*, penally?" (*Ib.* 13.)

These three quotations sufficiently shew Mr. H.'s opinion of Mr. Darby's teaching on the sufferings of Christ. I pass on, therefore, to a few of W. H. D.'s ideas on the subject. Speaking of Mr. Darby's thoughts on Psalm cii., W. H. D. says, "What is stated in this comment is, that *Jehovah* lifted up Christ into the place of Messiah, and then cast Him down from it; and that, in being so cast down, 'He meets indignation and wrath.' That which Peter presents as the nation's guilt, this comment presents as the act of Jehovah, i.e., 'Christ's being cut off as man.'" (*Close*, p. 37.) "If language can express anything definitely, what is expressed here is, that Christ 'meets indignation and wrath' at the hands of Jehovah, but 'not in His expiatory work.'" (*Ib.* p. 38.) Referring to "God's governmental dealings," and to Christ being cut off in this way, W. H. D. says, "To me it appears to be the doctrine that brings our Lord under 'the penalty of His connection with the exiled family.' It is exactly what Mr. Newton designated 'wrath in chastisement.'" (*Ib.* p. 39.)

These three quotations plainly enough shew what

W. H. D. thinks of Mr. Darby's thoughts on the sufferings of our blessed Lord.

Let us now look at Mr. Gilpin's feelings; he says (and in a very marked and peculiar style both of expressing and printing it), "That word on His part lying against the Lord Jesus Christ in life, INDIGNATION AND WRATH." (p. 3.) And not only this, but the very title of his tract is "A Warning with regard to the Doctrine of Christ being Smitten Previous to the Cross." And, further, he states that the "Indignation" belongs to Christ, as taught by Mr. Darby. I quote Mr. Gilpin's words from "A Reply," not having read his tract myself.

Here, then, in point of fact, though we may look at a few minor points afterwards, we have the real charges of any weight against Mr. Darby's statements of Christ's sufferings. I do not pronounce any judgment on this movement, though I have a very clear and decided one myself as to the nature and character of these attacks, but pass on to see what Mr. Darby says on this subject. "I got one paper stating that my language is to the effect that Christ suffered from God apart from atonement. This surprised me somewhat, and I looked at the papers and I found, 'But the moment He (Christ) is suffering from God *because of atonement* for sin, it is exactly the contrary:' and a little further on, 'Christ has only drunk that cup because He suffered from God—entirely apart, totally alone.' Indeed one of the objects of the papers was to shew that Christ's suffering from God was a distinct thing, even if at the same time, from His suffering from man." (*Sufferings*, p. 59.)

"That in Psalm lxi., Christ is in the mind of the Spirit of God, though not exclusively so, is, I suppose, hardly necessary to prove to Christians, seeing it is one of the most vivid descriptions of His outward sufferings on the cross. It is in respect to the remarks in my papers on 'The Sufferings of Christ,' which arose out of the consideration of this psalm, that difficulties arose in some pious minds. These

difficulties I respect, and delight in the jealousy which would not bear anything that they thought touched the divine perfection and relationship with God His Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Whatever expression might throw a cloud on that, or if any did, I condemn it already. I am sure I have no doctrine which does. I hold His cloudless relationship with His Father, save in the act of atonement, to be an essential truth. It was to make this clear that I drew attention to His sufferings from man which brought judgment on man, and His sufferings from God, that is atoning sufferings, which brought forgiveness and peace. This clearly distinguishes a life of communion, and the forsaking and wrath on the cross, and denies, distinctly and unequivocally, in whole and in part, the doctrine of Christ being subject to the displeasure of God as a born Israelite and a born man. He never was but His delight." (Ibid. p. 60.) "His position was the closest relationship of enjoyed favour in life, and forsaking made only more terrible by it in death—these formed the two characteristic conditions of the blessed Lord with God and His Father." (Ibid. p. 64.)

Speaking of the remnant, Mr. Darby says, "They are not yet delivered from the sense of wrath, though hoping in God, Christ was *looking forward* to the wrath He was really going to undergo. To Him government became wrath, *for* He was going to make an atonement, to go through what was needed for the deliverance of the nation, and He was looking forward to this, though *not then* accomplishing it. Hence, when Peter smites one of the crowd come to take Him, He says, 'The cup which my Father has given me to drink, shall I not drink it?' \* \* \* \* He takes up the thought of *wrath wholly with* God. The smiting is entirely God's, and in His case is not separate from that in which atonement is wrought; and *taking death* as He did, and ought to have done, from the hand of God, He could say, 'They persecute him whom thou hast smitten.' Indeed, having given Himself up to *the work of the cross*, before He

was actually crucified, He goes as a sheep before her shearers. He looks at Himself as the smitten One: for His faith the cup is already given Him. \* \* \* \* As long as His hour was not come, He passed through the midst of them and went His way. Now His hour was come, and though not actually drinking the cup, He had taken the position of drinking it, taken it into His hand, so to speak. \* \* \* \* It is not the time for the divine porter to hold the fold open and free in spite of all; but for the good and divine Shepherd to lay down His life for the sheep. Jehovah was *just going* to smite the Shepherd, and He had given Himself up to it." In a note on this place Mr. Darby adds, "The persecuting 'Him whom thou hast smitten' is literally applicable in the 69th Psalm only to what was done to Him on the cross. (See verses 20, 21.) Still surely in spirit all that passed from Gethsemane, or when He had given Himself up *to the suffering of death* and rejection, have the same character. \* \* \* \* All His grief and holy service made Him the song of the drunkard. Then, verse 14, He turns to what He was brought into at the end, which is the great subject of the Psalm, and the circumstances of the cross are spoken of in detail. *There* we know was the true smiting. It was written, 'Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered;' but the moment after, in Gethsemane, He had given Himself up to this, all partook of this character morally, *though the fact of smiting had not actually taken place.*" (Ibid. pp. 66, 67, 68.)

Mr. Darby quotes Psalm cii.: " 'Thou hast lifted me up'—that is, as man into the place of Messiah and glory—'and cast me down.' 'Thou hast weakened my strength in my journey, and hast shortened my days. I said, O my God, *take me not away* in the midst of my days.' \* \* \* \* The setting aside of every present joy and hope, of the present accomplishment of all promises, typified in the giving up of Isaac by Abraham; all ending, not in figurative, but *in real death.* \* \* \* \* Still, then He had to give it all up. It was His piety to

look to the hand of God in all this, and He did so. No doubt, that *when* the Shepherd was smitten, atonement was made for sin, but that smiting was a great and solemn fact, besides the atonement which was accomplished in it. God's Shepherd was smitten instead of feeding His beloved flock." (Ib. p. 71.)

"HIS HOUR WAS COME. As a man with death before Him, and as the Messiah of Israel, with the loss of all that belonged to Him. His being cut off and having nothing." (Ib. p. 72.)

In quoting seriatim from the "Sufferings of Christ," as I went along, I forgot to introduce a passage in p. 57, which throws much light on the subject in hand. Referring to a correspondent of the "Bible Treasury," Mr. Darby says, "Your correspondent has said in a short parenthesis '(unless anticipatively,)' but what is Israel's sorrow in the last day (unless anticipative)? They will not undergo wrath at the close. Christ felt it in Gethsemane anticipatively, because He was about to undergo it. But He did feel it anticipatively; that is, He did feel what Israel will feel, only far more deeply. And He felt it in grace, because He was not under it personally." It appears to me that these quotations from Mr. Darby's explanations prove, as plainly as anything can prove, that he is perfectly sound and scriptural as to the non-atoning sufferings of our blessed Saviour. I have thought for many years, and have expressed the thought to one and another, that a few statements of his might and ought to be made plainer; but I always saw enough that was plain to prove to me that there was no unsoundness in his thoughts of Christ's sufferings. Wisdom would surely suggest that the plain statements ought to be taken to explain the difficult ones. But in the quotations I have given above, there would be, I should think, no difficulty to any fair, simple, unbiassed mind. There are two or three other points, besides those touched on, that I would now look at very briefly, with regard to the way and to the extent to which Christ suffered with His people. Surely these words, "In ALL their afflictions He was afflicted,"

prove beyond any doubt, and without any exception, that *whatever* their afflictions, and from whatever quarter they were afflicted, so was He. Take two very vivid instances of this, and see the fulness they afford of the reality and truth of the above. Who was in the midst of the burning bush when Israel was in affliction in Egypt? Jehovah Jesus. Who was in the fiery, seven-times heated, furnace, when Shadrach and his companions were in the same fire? "One like the Son of God." "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." In Mr. Darby's explanations, we have again and again such words as these: "God was glorified in Him *in life* by His maintaining, in spite of all temptation, and trial, and sorrow, *undeviating communion with His Father.*" "His position was the closest relationship of enjoyed favour in life." "Christ's life was the witness of holy life in divine *delight.*" How could Mr. Darby state these facts so fully and plainly, and at the same time maintain (as Mr Gilpin says he does, and, indeed, the others too) that "Christ was smitten previous to the cross, and that indignation and wrath were lying against Him in life?" Can any one suppose that a man of Mr. Darby's light and intelligence in the truth would contradict himself after this fashion, and declare (I may say on the same page) two things diametrically opposed the one to the other?

But take his own words, just quoted, and there will not be the slightest shade of contradiction. He says, "But He did feel it anticipatively." "The smiting," the "cutting off," the "casting down," the "indignation," and the "wrath" were all felt and endured anticipatively, while He at the same time was in the fullest and closest communion with His Father; and every thought, word, and act of His, His Father's fullest-delight. Nothing can be plainer or more precious. With regard to a "third class of sufferings," W. H. D. says, "My position is simply

this: I deny that Scripture, whether of the New Testament or of the Old, ever presents the Lord Jesus to us as enduring more than two kinds of sufferings, sufferings for righteousness and sufferings for sin." (*Close*, p. 49.) This seems to me a very extraordinary statement. What can be plainer than that our Saviour suffered again and again, neither from God nor from man, but in His own soul, as between Himself and His Father when looking forward to be "made sin," to "the cup," and to the "forsaking and wrath of God?" He was certainly neither suffering from God nor from man when in Gethsemane "He began to be sore amazed and very heavy," and said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death." "And he went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me: nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt." (Mark xiv. 34—36.) In John xii. He asks His Father to save Him from the hour that was before Him. Surely this suffering again, long before the garden agony, was neither from God nor from man, but the pangs of His own heart breathed out to His Father.

In these, therefore (not to quote other passages of the New, and none of the Old Testament), we have the clearest features of a third class of sufferings. And now a word as to the likeness or identity which P. F. H. and W. H. D. have sought to establish between Mr. Newton's deeply heretical doctrine and Mr. Darby's statements. To a simple, unsophisticated mind, it seems to me that the figure of the woman and her son in prison establishes the truest and fullest contrast between Mr. Newton's and Mr. Darby's doctrine. The question was asked, "What is the difference between the doctrine of the paper and Mr. Newton's?" "The answer is very simple. The doctrine of the paper is exactly the opposite of Mr. Newton's. Mr. Newton taught that Christ, as born an Israelite and a man, was at the same dis-

tance from God as Israel and man, because He was one of them, was exposed to the consequences of it, and passed through the experiences of an unconverted elect man; escaped much of what He was exposed to by being in their position, by prayer, obedience, and piety; but still had the fierce displeasure of God resting on Him, as born one of the people. \* \* \* I believe, on the contrary, that though suffering from man, and feeling for all the sufferings of man and Israel, and the sorrow of love resting continually upon His heart, the sunshine of God's favour was on Him, and was His delight and His joy continually; and thus there was no divine displeasure resting on that Holy One, nor was His frame wasted by the anguish of it. I detest it as a false abomination." (*Sufferings*, pp. 56, 57.)

"But sufferings endured by others can be fully entered into and endured by the will and love of an individual, which they are not in the smallest degree subject necessarily to, and could cease to undergo at any moment, if they thought fit. A mother could enter into prison with a child, and suffer the disagreeableness and discomfort of the prison in love to her child, and to win his heart to what is right, to whom *it was no penalty* for a fault, and from which she was free to go out at any moment, if she were disposed. She may enter into all his circumstances, and endure the pain and misery of a prison life, and feel that it is *for him*, a penalty for his faults, without the smallest sense whatever, of its being a penalty on herself—as indeed it is not. She is gone there in love. *It is no penalty.* She is not there, at any time, as in a penal condition herself, nor can she have the sense of its being a penalty on her, as if she were in the same case as her son. Yet, in fact, she is enduring all he is—feels it much more herself, for her natural and moral feelings are much more delicate, and she feels all the shame and misery of it *as a penalty on him*, without its being in the smallest degree such on her." (*Ibid.* pp. 54, 55.)

In the appendix of both P. F. H. and W. H. D.'s

pamphlets there is a paper in the August number of the "Present Testimony" commented on, and as Mr. H.'s attack is the more outspoken of the two, I quote a few statements of his on the paper.

"Meisner—But it is not denied, of course, that the cross is the scriptural symbol of the atoning sufferings of our Lord, and if not, how can it affect the subject of our conversation?"

"Fritz—Oh yes it is: the cross, with its own peculiar shame, agony, and publicity, or lifting up ('And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This He said signifying *what* death He should die.' John xii. 32, 33) is taken away altogether from any direct connection with atonement, and declared to be an infliction under a legal or governmental curse, falling on our Lord and the two thieves alike." (*Grief*, p. 48.)

Now to say that in the paper "the cross, with its own peculiar shame, agony, and publicity, is taken away altogether," is to me the most remarkable assertion, I think, I ever read. Let any one read that paper, and I feel fully assured his emphatic and unhesitating conclusion will be, that instead of the cross with its many awful features being taken away altogether, the peculiar shame, agony, and publicity, of the cross were never more fully set forth in any paper of the same length. The paper was written, I should say, for this very purpose. There are no less than seven features of our Lord's sufferings *on the cross* given. The first feature even is a direct contradiction in terms of that which P.F.H. says. Instead of "taking away altogether *any direct connection with the cross*," the writer says, "He had of His own accord taken the cup of wrath due to others. As a substitute, the just One in place of the many unjust. He was bearing all the billows and waves of God's wrath against sin. \* \* \* He was treated as though He had been *the* person that had alone done any, or all the evil, and He experienced the consequences of being forsaken. 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'" (*Present Testimony*, p. 162.) "This

sort of sorrow is altogether *sui generis*, of its own kind. So completely is it *distinctively* peculiar and not to be confounded with other kinds of sorrows that they might be shared and partaken of by others; but, as to this one, it is true that no one as yet ever tasted it, even in the measure in which a human being can taste it, save the Lord; and He took the full, whole potion as at the hand of God His Father." (Ib. p. 164.)

Here then surely, is a full and plain answer to Mr. H.'s most extraordinary assertion. But the writer not only gives, and gives first, the Saviour's full atoning sufferings, but also six other features of suffering which He endured on the cross. "But *secondly*, there were other sorrows then and there the Lord's. For instance (ver. 3) the sorrow of the contrast between the shelter which the believing line of witnesses had ever had from God (in whom they in measure trusted) and the way that all God's billows and waves necessarily rolled over Himself, as the One who, for God's sake (that He might be free to justify, and that without compromise, the sinner), and who for man's sake too, had thus gone down into the depths, below man's level, that through death He might nullify him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage. \* \* \* \* But, *thirdly*, more than this, and quite separable from the second, and in some respects contrasted with the first sorrow. (Ver. 6, 7, 8.) Wicked men round about Him were against Him, though He was bearing their judgment before God. And His perfect self as a man could take notice of all the little things from man, as much as the great things from God! Reproach of man—contempt of the people—the laugh—the scorn—the pouted lip—the wagging head—the taunting repartee—He saw, He felt it all." (*Present Testimony*, pp. 164, 165.) The fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh sorrows are in the same strain, all describing the multifarious ways in which our blessed Lord suffered when on the cross.

Speaking of the last, or seventh, the writer says, "There was too, to Him, in addition to the pain of the death, the *legal curse* appended, by God's righteous judgment as King of Israel, to the form of death; as it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth upon a tree.'" (*Present Testimony*, p. 167.) It is this statement that so offends P. F. H. and W. H. D. But how it is that they cannot see the justness and scripturalness of the thought, I cannot understand. Our Saviour Himself, in principle, declares what the writer says to be true, and the Holy Ghost in Philippians confirms it. What is the meaning of the Lord again and again speaking of being *lifted* up? and the evangelist adds, "This he said, signifying WHAT death he should die." (John xii. 33.) Add to this the language of the Holy Spirit: "He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, *even the death of the cross.*" Do not these scriptures prove that the cross had an odium attaching to it, both Godward and manward, which no other kind of death possessed? It is not written, cursed is every man who is stoned or beheaded (though stoning to death was God's command); no, but it is written, "Cursed is EVERY one that hangeth on a tree." As *every* one was cursed who was adjudged such a death, would not any Israelite, and the friends of such, feel, because of God's curse, a peculiar and dreadful odium attached to the death of the cross? But in a *mere* man's case this would have nothing to do with the wrath of God and sinbearing, and, therefore, it is a distinct thing from atonement. The moment the Saviour was nailed to the cross this curse was true of Him; but it was not, of course, until He died, that atonement was made. Nothing can be plainer.

21 NO 67

J. D.

*Price One Penny.*