

worship at Jerusalem. The application is that separation should not be made today. "Speaking of the prophets," Calvin says, "there was nothing to prevent their departure from them, the idolatrous Israelitic congregation, but the desire of preserving the unity of the Church." Continuing further, Carnell continues to cite Calvin, saying, "It is extremely arrogant in us if we presume immediately to withdraw from the communion of a church where the conduct of all members is not compatible, either with our judgment or either with the Christian profession." This gives a general idea of the use which is made of Calvin in this capacity to refute a Separatist view of the Church.

These citations are taken from the fourth volume of the Institutes, Chapter 1, section 18. A further citation is taken from Section 19. Here, the reference is not to Calvin, himself, but to Calvin's citing Cyprian as a source of his view. The citation reads: "Although tares or impure vessels are found in the Church, yet this is not a reason why we should withdraw from it." ² The plain assumption by Dr. Carnell and by many others in a similar frame of mind is that Calvin negates any attempt to purify the Church by withdrawal; that Calvin's view of Church reform would be passive; that Calvin's view on Church unity is: organizational unity must be maintained at all cost. All of these citations are used to this intent and purpose.

Carnell's use of Calvin and similar treatment by others do not deal with the vital principle of separation from church bodies where the leadership has departed from the teachings of Scripture. No one raises a question about separation because of differences by some within the