

# *To my Brethren.*

“WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?”

*(Matt. xxii. 42).*

## TO MY BRETHREN.

---

“But ye, who do ye say that I am?”  
(Matt. xvi. 15, N.T.)

---

June, 1914.

**D**ESIRING and hoping to awaken response in some hearts true to the Lord, of whom, it must be that, there are not a few, I present the following to my brethren among whom I have in years past found fellowship and service; whom I love in the truth and for the truth's sake.

Attention was directed many years ago to John's ministry as very specially suited to the last days, by a leader (I.N.D.) whom it is well for us to “remember” (Heb. xiii. 7). The special truth to which John draws attention and to which in these days we should give heed, is the truth about the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ; the great Object of the enemy's attack.

Will beloved brethren be satisfied to be indifferent to this great foundation

truth; shutting eyes and ears while the enemy deprives them of Him upon Whom all God's glory and their own salvation depends?

Looking to the Lord as to it, I ask their patient consideration, praying they may be led to see what is the real issue between the Lord and the enemy at the present time. I shall at least have cleared myself as to my responsibility toward my brethren in having presented it.

I begin with the following statement, made some three months ago in answer to enquiries:—

March, 1914.

“As to the late trouble, I now believe the Lord allowed it because of the dishonour done to His Name, in the doctrines taught among us in reference thereto.

“Driven out, I was forced to review matters in His presence alone, and doubt not I have been led of Himself to this conclusion; as also to humble

myself before Him, for not having earlier resented publicly, expressions about Himself which at all times troubled my conscience. The more so when it was plainly shewn that they led directly to a brother denying the eternity of the Sonship of Christ, for which he was, three years later, put away in Melbourne.

“The doctrine underlying these expressions has come out more fully in a paper recently published, and which appears to me to deny the glory of the Person of our Lord as effectually as B.W.N’s blasphemies. The G.-A. controversy was not the *cause*, but the allowed *occasion* of breaking us to pieces for unfaithfulness in this respect.

“When I saw these things in their true light, my path was clear. The reading of ‘Scripture Truth,’ January, 1912, confirmed me in this. I had, however, still to recognise the Lord’s hand in a local difficulty, which kept

me apart yet other two years. Suddenly, in answer to prayer, the walls fell down and the way was opened; for which His Name be praised!"

A few words of explanation first, to clear the references in the above, and then we will turn to that which from correspondence and printed papers, I am free to say is the doctrine now accepted and taught by many so called leaders.

One "expression about Himself" which troubled me was made as far back as 1897. This is it,—“In becoming flesh He became The Logos.” The Logos, it was said, was merely a title by which He was known among His disciples, as in Lu. i. 2; not what He was from eternity. John however says,—“In the beginning was (or existed) The Logos. . . . And The Logos became flesh” (John i. 1 and 14).

The "brother" mentioned in above statement (C.W.), based upon this, another formula,—“In becoming flesh He became the Son,” thus denying the eternity of His Sonship.

These two statements are equally derogatory of the glory of Christ.

The first was not dealt with, and instead of being withdrawn, was presented in another form in 1902. “Wisdom becomes incarnate; and incarnate Wisdom is the Word, or perhaps the Word is incarnate Wisdom.” (R. & A. in U.S. p. 7).

There were many other unscriptural expressions, but this must suffice here.

The “paper recently published” is entitled “The Person of Christ,” “Mutual Comfort,” May, 1912. This paper in nearly all its details fits in with what is known as Apollinarianism; the leader of which formed a sect in the close of the third Century; against

which Athanasius, the Father of orthodoxy, wrote. It was also condemned by Œcumenical councils and by Imperial decrees. Happily it was short-lived, dying out early in the fourth Century; some returning to the Church, and the rest being lost in the mazes and marshes of Monophysitism; to which it properly belonged. It taught that our Lord had *no true human spirit*.

As this attack is upon the human side of the Person of our Lord, it will be well first to state what Scripture says as to His humanity.

Thank God our heritage is in—

### THE SCRIPTURES.

Our chief privilege is that to us now (the Church) is committed the Oracles of God; but these also form the measure of our responsibility. It is not necessary that we be theologians, but we are responsible to know and

understand the Scriptures, that we may escape the lie of the devil.

All through the Old and New Testaments there is abundant evidence of the three constituent parts of humanity—body, soul and spirit—so that we do not dwell upon it. Paul sums them up together in one verse, praying,—“your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless” (I. Thes. v. 23).

Of these three the spirit is the distinctive constituent of man, “God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.” That which has not a human spirit is not man. To be true Man, our Lord must possess all three; but if one more than another (which cannot be), that one must be the human spirit. Without it He was not Man.

We have then in Scripture,—“Forasmuch as the children were partakers of blood and flesh, He also Himself



likewise took part in the same" (Heb. ii. 14).

"Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren" (Heb. ii. 17).

He "was in all points tempted like as we are, sin apart" (Heb. iv. 15).

These Scriptures shew generally that His humanity was in all things like ours, sin apart.

Then as to details we have:—

"A *body* hast Thou prepared Me" (Heb. x. 5). "His *soul* was not left in Hades, neither His flesh (*body*) did see corruption" (Acts ii. 31). "My *soul* is exceeding sorrowful" (Mat. xxvi. 38). "Now is my *soul* troubled" (John xii. 27). As a child, "He waxed strong in *spirit*" (Lu. ii. 40). "He rejoiced in *spirit*" (Lu. x. 21). "He groaned in *spirit*" (John xi. 33). "He was troubled in *spirit*" (John xiii. 21). He commits His *spirit* to

the Father (Lu. xxiii. 46). "He gave up His *spirit*" (John xix 30).

The word translated *gave up* here, is different to that used in the other three gospels; there as Man in absolute faith in the Father, He commits His spirit to Him and *expires*; here with divine ability and power, He *gives up* His human spirit; dismisses it!

These Scriptures give a very complete proof of His true humanity in all its parts. He was indeed in all things made like unto His brethren, otherwise He could not have been in all points tempted as they. But in all things He was,—“sin apart.”

Apollinaris, the revered Bishop of Laodicea, fell into error, asserting that our Lord, while having a human body and mind, the rational spirit in Him consisted of the eternal Word. The paper in “Mutual Comfort”

affirms the same and as it was published nine years after the writer's death, we can but hold the Editor, P.R.M., responsible for the doctrines therein contained, especially as he defends them strongly.

We now present the other two sets of statements in parallel columns that they may be compared with the Scriptures:—

#### APOLLINARIS

reasoned thus:—

1.\*“Two different substances each complete in all its attributes can never unite into one. A complete God and a complete man can never melt together in one person. The idea . . . . is a *monstrosity*.”

1. Attention was first redirected to this in December, 1903, when it was said with reference to the two natures in the Person of Christ, “Where the idea of unity of a person is got from I know not; it seems to me to be *perfect nonsense*.”

---

Note.—\*The figures and italics are used simply for the sake of reference.

2. "Christ was true God for He was the eternal Logos manifested in the flesh. *He was also true Man*; for human nature consists of three component elements, *body, animal soul and spirit*;" and all these Christ had.

3. He maintained that "the spirit of Christ was His Deity," among other reasons, "in order to *avoid a dual personality*."

4. He solved the difficulty—which was

"MUTUAL COMFORT,"  
(May, 1912.)

2. "The same Person abides though the condition be changed in His coming of a woman. *He is a real man, body, soul and spirit*, but still God's Son (that same Person).

Par. 1.

3. "If you carry the thought of the incarnation beyond the scriptural limit, that is form (that of a servant) and condition (flesh and blood\*) you *cannot avoid*, that I can see reaching distinct personality and so making *two personalities* in Christ, a divine and a human."

Par. 2.

4. "I only add that if 'human condition,'

never intended to be solved, being the divine mystery—by “limiting the humanity of Christ to a body and an animal soul, *inhabited by the divine Logos.*” There was no true human spirit, so that Christ was not complete Man!!

‘bondsman’s form,’ ‘likeness or figure of man,’ ‘flesh and blood,’ do not describe what the Son took in becoming man, it raises the question whence did the rest come? *I should certainly have thought that what was spiritual was of Himself.*” Par. 4.

To meet the difficulty thus created it is added, “In the expression ‘Father into Thy hand I commend my spirit,’ I judge the Lord takes up an expression suited to the position in which He was”!! Par. 6.

In reply to a letter dated 2-1-13, P.R.M. objects to the term “human spirit,” as “a word wrongly used . . . . *His spirit was Himself.*”

Again, in summary of *brothers’ readings* at Kennington, 2-12-13, published in “Mutual Comfort,” February, 1914, page 49. “The blessed Lord could not be spoken of in this way like one of us; it has been truly said of Him that *His spirit was Himself.*”

5. Apollinaries asserted also that "*the humanity of Christ was eternal.*"

5. In P. R. M's booklet, "The Incarnation," page 9, Notes of Addresses at Park Street," 6-1-11, we have, "*All that He was here as Man, He brought out of heaven*"!!

One cannot but be struck with the identity of these two sets of statements, which with their manifest contradiction of the Scriptures is sufficient to brand them as a first and last attempt of the enemy to deprive the Lord, in the eyes of His people, of that which is of vital importance to His true humanity, thus making Him incompetent to be a Saviour for man.

Will "brethren" the successors to men who defended the truth of the integrity of the Person of our Lord in days past, be content to sit quietly by and allow the enemy *now* to have his way in this? If it must come,

Shall it come in among them? Far  
be the thought!

May the Lord arouse them to a holy  
passion, which shall avenge them of  
themselves for these years of in-  
difference!!

G.J.S.

"Elpis," Kingston Street, Haberfeld, Sydney.

Of whom a copy can be had by any of those to  
whom it is addressd.

*By the same.*

---

**THE DIVINE AND ETERNAL SONSHIP OF  
OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.**

**THE MAN CHRIST JESUS.**

**MILLENNIAL DAWN, WHAT IS IT?**

---

**THE SANCTUARY,**

**MELCHISEDEC, THE CROWNED PRIEST.**