

AN ENGLISH BROTHER'S COMMENTS ON J. BOYD'S "INCARNATION."

It only bears out what dear W. J. Lowe wrote me in June, 1913,-that "All Raven's reasoning was flippant, superficial nonsense; yet it has Satanic power over all who followed him, from which even J. Boyd is not yet wholly free. They all seem unable to shake off the chain!" And now J. Boyd appears, in this, to have blossomed forth! On p. 6 he says the Lord "gave up the form of God." The truth is not so expressed. There were phrases and expressions that may have been used by brethren when no new system of doctrine was suspected; but now that new systems of doctrine have been evolved, it behoves us to adhere strictly to the Word of God. What is said there is, "Subsisting in the form of God...He emptied Himself." Mr. James Boyd uses his own phrase (not Scripture) to express that which the Holy Spirit intends by "emptied Himself." It is apparent that what is written does not control Mr. Boyd's thoughts...On p. 9 he says, "All that He took from woman was all that any man ever took, sin excepted; and that was flesh and blood. God is the Father of spirits (Heb. 12:9)." This means that Christ derived His spirit from a divine source. Hence Christ's "spirit" was a different spirit from that forming part of you and me,-and incomplete manhood. And he says nothing here of soul...But the reasoning on pp. 12-16 seems to be very bad. He is here, surely, guilty of the very irreverence he would warn others of; and he has, I judge, himself fallen into the devil's snare. "The human soul seems to have been the result of the ~~in~~breathing by God into man's nostrils of the spirit of life." Does the written word say "seems;" or does it even leave any room for doubt at all? Genesis 2:7 informs us: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathe~~d~~ into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soyl." ...Then Mr. J. Boyd raises the question, "Are there both soul and spirit in the separate state?" What is at the back of his mind that caused him to raise such a question? Does he deny that, in Scripture, the "spirit" is identified with the mind, and the ~~soul~~ "soul" is the seat of the affections, and that "spirit, soul and body are during life but one 'personality,' ...At death the body drops for the time being, out this tri-unity. Spirit and soul, on the other hand, are never separated...these are not independent of each other,-two personalities, but one...The knowledge of the spirit becomes the portion of the soul; the affections of the soul the possession of the spirit." (Grant). Does he deny all this?...His aim seems to be to view (for purposes of his further argument) soul and spirit apart, as he says, p. 13, "In the separate state I do not find them spoken of together. I find souls and I find spirits, but not both together except in living men." Now you come to the point of his theory: "That the Son was the spirit of His own body I have not the slightest question." He evidently feels that this will not be received by everybody, but he calls it, notwithstanding, "A scriptural verity." Great as is my ignorance, I do not hesitate to say that the scriptures he alludes to afford no ground for such a conclusion; and that Mr. James Boyd in this has gone utterly beyond what is written...The whole paper is thoroughly Ravenite in its mode of reasoning and handling of Scripture; and Mr. J. Boyd has, I am satisfied, overstepped the barrier imposed: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father;" and in so doing he has disclosed a state of insubjection, and darkness of soul, that should appeal loudly to all! "Take heed to thyself!" It is a striking evidence of the value of Mr. J. N. D's warning, where he says that directly you begin to discuss the Person of Christ you fall into a thousand errors." N. L. Noel.
Address, 4 Herschell Rd., Walmer, Deal, Kent, England. April 6, 1937

J. N. DARBY AND BETHESDA.

It would be an invidious thing after so many years to rake up evil without a cause; but as there is a bold effort just now (and now again after twenty years) to whitewash, it becomes a duty to speak plainly for the Lord's sake and those who desire to be faithful. A good deal, calculated to mislead those who do not know the facts, has been made of Mr. J. N. Darby's gracious visit to Mr. George Muller, as soon as he had opportunity after the seven meetings. At length they seemed uprightly to judge the heterodox tracts of Mr. B. W. Newton. Among others who examined, there had been no doubt whatever of his heinously antichristian error. For themselves as Christians it was hailed as far as it went. But not a few were grieved that the meetings was kept from its clear duty to put away the persons come into their midst, who not only held these evil doctrines, but diligently circulated the incriminated tracts. Yet this paramount duty was evaded by the request made privately that they should withdraw for peace' sake. To this the Newtonians acceded, only adding their title to return when they thought well, or to that effect; which I never heard who denied them. Proof, however, that the strong denunciation of the heterodoxy was hollow and transient becomes evident after the breaking of the Newtonian meeting, which the seceding pair of the ten leaders set up and carried on with Mr. B. W. Newton's presence and help. For, as already stated, whose two, R. A. and J. W., on its failure, sought fellowship again at Bethesda, and were received without question of the heterodoxy and of their deliberate and public support of that Antichrist (though George Muller said his Christ would need a Saviour for himself)!. All that Bethesda ~~xxxxx~~ asked, all that R. A. and J. W. gave, was confession of the wrong of leaving Bethesda !! Its leaders' sole care was to vindicate themselves, not an atom for the traduced Lord Jesus. It is therefore a suppression of the truth, and a suggestion of falsehood to imply that all was cleared away by Bethesda in Mr. Darby's eyes.

To remove every doubt, let the following extract of a letter of Mr. Darby's, written in 1873, (many years after), tell its own tale. "When the loose brethren pretended that Bethesda had changed, and acted in discipline, G. declared they had not, and as far as he knew, they would do the same in like case, and that he did not know a single person at Bethesda who held Mr. Newton for a heretic. This was Mr. Craik's published statement long after the thing happened. It was the open support of blasphemy, and the breach took place by an effort on the part of the neutrals to force us to go on with Bethesda, as they openly stated, and I personally know." LETTERS, Vol. II., P. 263.

To avail oneself of a particular point in the history, which was a mistake however, well meant, is it anything less than a fraud, and all the more because it touches the truth and the will of the Lord so seriously? Neither Mr. Newton nor Bethesda ever said or did ought to mitigate the evil done in His name during the many years that have elapsed. Conceive too the strange folly, and insensibility of reading the subsequent writings of one acknowledged to be a false Christ, and never disowning it! From Bible Treasury, Nov. 1905, New Series.

It has recently been stated, in an outside periodical (Serving & waiting), "Newtonianism never again lifted up its head among them. And as for Mr. Newton himself... in all his later teaching there is no hint of the views held at the time of the strife. Neither have his early teachings 'leavened' the brethren of either class, for as intimated above it is everywhere repudiated" Now beside these statements place the facts that in 1867 there was published Newton's "Fundamental Truths," in which he maintains that the fires of Sinai "Burnt against Him as the sinner's surety always." And then the advertisements in "The Christian:" "Benjamin Wills Newton-Free lending library of the late Mr. Newton's writings. List includes: 'Europe and the Beast;' 'David, King of Israel;' 'Europe's Future Considered;' Full list publications; Stephen Gottery."

W. F. Knapp, Denver, Colo.

EXTRACT FROM LETTER TO A GLANTON BROTHER IN CANADA. DATED AUG. 22, 1922.

"I think dear James Boyd is on a wrong tack. The fact is that the so-called Lowe and Kelly Brethren are determined to have nothing to do with us until such time as we pronounce F. E. R. a heretic. Alas, some seem ready almost to say anything to get numbers and rid themselves of the reproach of division! For my own part, I would prefer to stand apart from all brethren altogether rather than to throw overboard F. E. R. And I regret that I allowed my mind to be in any wise warped by meeting with these prejudiced (and I must add, ignorant) people. I have recently read with care the second Vol. of F. E. R.'s American Addresses, and I must say with great profit and pleasure. Next to J. N. D. I know of no one amongst brethren who has thrown so much light (!) on Scripture. IF MR. BOYD IS TRUE TO THE LIGHT HE HAS I DO NOT THINK THE GRANT BROTHERN WILL WANT HIM," Signed, Hamilton Smith, Cardington, Grange Road, Sutton, England.

The writer of the above is in fellowship with Glanton and is (or was) a frequent contributor to their magazine, Scripture Truth. It now comes out that his "dear James Boyd" was not true to "the light" he was supposed to have had, till just a few weeks before his sailing for England, when he put out his heretical tractate called "The Incarnation of the Son", which is nothing more than a rehashing of the Apollinarism of the fourth century, condemned and exposed by the great Athanasius as anti-Christian, saying "it was running into Arianism." Did he not know all these years when he was passing in and out freely amongst us and given access to our platforms that if he was "true to the light he had" the Grant brethren would not have him? He may judge them "ignorant," but not so ignorant as not to detect the evil of his doctrine the moment he came plainly out with it. But he waits till his passage is engaged for England, and then reveals his heterodoxy on the Person of the Lord.

What must be thought of the ethics of such conduct? When on the eve of sailing he throws out his poison-gas, and then refuses to remain behind to face his brethren whom he has so grievously wronged by his duplicity. It is much like the "hit-and-run" act of the automobile driver, who when he hits and knocks down or kills the pedestrian, speeds off to make his escape; words fail to characterize such dastardly cowardice, and the law has a bitter punishment in store for the man who thus refuses to stop and face the consequences of his deed.

I take full responsibility for the above and any one wishing to find me may do so by addressing me at Delmar, N. Y. Signed, Christopher Knapp,