

*An Affirmation of
the Divine-Human Personality
of the Person of Christ;*

*His Human "I" and Human Will,
With a Note on His Impeccability*

*Second Edition
Revised and Augmented*

Roy A. Huebner



Present Truth Publishers

*274 East Veterans Highway
Jackson NJ 08527 USA*

Made and Printed in the USA
Second Edition, Revised & Augmented
May 2007

Website: presenttruthpublishers.com

Table of Contents

Part 1: Affirmation of the Divine-Human Personality of the Person of Christ

Introduction	1
T. H. Reynolds' and F. E. Raven's Denial of the Lord's Human Personality	3
T. H. Reynold's Formula	3
Affirmation of Human Personality in Christ by J. N. Darby	4
The Lord Jesus Is a Human Being	4
“What Is Really Denied Is Christ's Individuality as a Man”	4
In Christ There Is Both Divine and Human Nature	5
The Conscious “I” Is Personality	5
The Lord Has Human Personality -- Human “I” (Ego)	5
Christ Here Personally as Man	7
Man Taken into Union with God in One Person	7
He Took Our Nature	7
Christ's Humanity Is of its Own Order: Sinless, Impeccable, and in Christ's Person	8
“The Person Is Not Changed”	9
Discussing the Person of Christ	10
What Is the Issue in “Discussions” of the Person of Christ?	11
The Lord's Human Will Expressed in Gethsemene	14
Every Word, Work, and Way of the Lord Jesus Had a Divine Spring	17
Affirmation of Human Personality in Christ by F. E. Raven's Opposers	19
J. Hennessy	19
W. T. Whybrow	20
G. J. Stewart	20
Theo Davis	21
Anonymous	21
W. Kelly	21
F. W. Grant	24
P. A. Humphreys	25
A. C. Ord	26
No Two Distinct (Separate), or Dual, Personalities in Christ	28

Part 2: Denial of Human Personality in the Man Christ Jesus is a Form of Apollinarianism

No One Knows Who the Son Is	30
On the False Notion of No Human Personality in Christ: “Anhypostasia”	33
Dr. Phillip Schaff a Denier of Human Personality in Christ	33
Divine-Human Personality in Christ Avoids Both Nestorianism and Apollinarianism	37
Christ's “Reasonable Soul,” “Two Centers of Consciousness,” <i>and “One Self-consciousness”</i>	39
An Anhypostasia View	39
W. G. T. Shedd's Rejection of the False Use of This “ <i>One Self-Consciousness</i> ” of the Anhypostasia View	39
J. N. Darby's Rejection of the Anhypostasia View	40
The Anhypostasia View Is Apollinarian-ish	42
Apollinarius' View	42
F. E. Raven an Apollinarian	44
T. H. Reynold's Apollinarian-ish View	45
Some Additional Affirmations of Human Personality in Christ's Person	46
A. A. Hodge's True View on Christ's Person	46
Robert L. Dabney	49
L. Berkhof Rejects Human Impersonality in Christ	49
Emory H. Bancroft	50
William G. T. Shedd	50
Benjamin B. Warfield	50
William Cunningham	51
Augustus H. Strong	52
Comments by A. B. Bruce on The Prevailing Reformed View	52
Conclusion	53
Appendix 1: Extracts from A. C. Ord Concerning the Unity of the Two Natures in Christ as Expressed in Scripture	55
Appendix 2: The Impeccability of Christ's Person	57
Recommended Reading Concerning Ravenism Available from Present Truth Publishers	58

* * * * *

NOTE: Thanks are due Dennis P. Ryan for helpful editorial suggestions.

Part 1:

An Affirmation of the Divine-Human Personality of the Person of Christ

Introduction Christians do say that “Christ is God and man in one Person.” However, what some believe concerning the meaning of “man” in that sentence varies, from what is truth to what is fundamentally evil teaching. Christians say that Christ’s manhood is spirit, soul, and body. That is true. But some may not understand that man’s soul has will and “I” -- an “I” of *identity*. Christ’s having a human soul means just that -- a human soul with human will and human “I.” Yet Christ is one Person. How this can be so is not within human capability to understand. But in an attempt to bring the person of Christ within human ability to explain and to understand the union of the divine and human in Him, fundamentally evil teachings have been taught.

Human personality has to do with human “I.” That human “I” has human will. In the garden, the Lord Jesus prayed: “not my will, but thine be done.” There was the expression of the human “my” and the human will -- but not, of course, apart from what He is as God, for all is said in accordance with that inscrutable unity of His Person as the God-man. Every word, work, and expression had a divine spring in it.¹

I think all Christians can accept by faith these Scripture facts about Christ without thinking that they have to be explained; i.e., without knowing how this can be in one Person. They can believe that Christ is God in Person and that He is man in Person.

By the human personality of the Lord Jesus is meant that He had a human spirit, a human soul, a human will, and human “I” (meaning human ego), and a human body; i.e., that He is *fully* man. The result of denying that the Christ had human will and human “I” is, in effect, to assert an incomplete manhood in Christ; i.e., an *impersonal* humanity in Christ. To have a soul without personal “I” and “will” would be incomplete manhood. Such was not our Beloved.

The truth is that being fully man does not make Him two persons. The incarnation prevented that from being the case. *The Son took humanity into His Person so that there is one Person*, though there be two natures, the divine and

1. “. . . every faculty in His humanity obeyed, and was the instrument of the impulse the divine will gave to it (*Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 16:28). See more on this, *ibid.*, 15:147.

the human. He is fully God and fully man in one Person. The human mind cannot fathom this wonderful truth. Nor is there some analogy by which it may be explained.

Human mental analysis may say, ‘that cannot be: therefore there was no human spirit and soul’ (**Apollinarianism**) – held by J. B. Stoney, F. E. Raven, C. A. Coates, James Taylor, Sr., and the Glattonite James Boyd, at least in the last five years of his life.

On the other hand, human mental analysis in divine matters may admit the two wills and two “I”s and say, ‘there cannot be one Person, so there must be two *distinct* persons (**Nestorianism**).

But human mental analysis in this matter may say: ‘yes, there was a human spirit and a human soul, but there was not both divine “I” and human “I” (two “I”s) and two wills in Christ, a human will and a divine will’ (this denial of two wills in Christ is **Monothelitism**).² Subjection to the Word shows that there was human personality in Christ: spirit, soul, body, human will, and human “I,” yet one Person (**Orthodoxy**), without pretending competency to comprehend or explain how this can be.

2. Here is a description of Monothelitism from *The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia*:

Closely connected with Monophysitism was Monothelitism (see Monothelites), or the doctrine that Christ had but one will, as he had but one person. The orthodox maintained that will is an attribute of nature, rather than of person, and consequently that Christ had two wills -- a human will and a divine will -- both working in harmony. The Monothelite controversy lasted from 633 to 680. The Emperor Heraclius proposed a compromise formula -- one divine-human energy (*mia theandrikē energeia*); but it was opposed in the West. The sixth ecumenical council condemned the Monothelite heresy, and repeated the Chalcedonian Creed, with the following supplement concerning the two wills (cf. Schaff, *Creeeds*, ii. 72-73):

And we likewise preach two natural wills in him [Jesus Christ], and two natural operations undivided, inconvertible, inseparable, unmixed, according to the doctrine of the holy Fathers; and the two natural wills [are] not contrary (far from it), as the impious heretics assert, but his human will follows the divine will, and is not resisting or reluctant, but rather subject to his divine and omnipotent will. For it was proper that the will of the flesh should be moved, but be subjected to the divine will, according to the wise Athanasius.

The same council condemned Pope Honorius I. (625-638) as a Monothelite heretic, and his successors confirmed its decision. Monothelitism continued among the Maronites on Mount Lebanon, who, however, afterward submitted to the Roman Church, as well as among the Monophysites, who are all Monothelites.

Monothelitism is leaven concerning the Person of Christ and requires separation from any evil fellowship that tolerates it. However, this will be resisted and rather than to separate from the evil, the messenger will be attacked, denounced, and accused of heresy, particularly of Nestorianism.

T. H. Reynolds' and F. E. Raven's Denial of the Lord's Human Personality

It bears repeating that the manhood of Christ means that He had a human spirit, and a human soul -- with human will, and human "I" (*ego*) -- and a human body. This the Son took into His Person in the incarnation. F. E. Raven (FER) and his supporter, T. H. Reynolds (THR) denied human personality in Christ. Whatever else they denied concerning His Person, they denied that Christ had human "I" (*ego*).³ This denial is fundamentally evil. Those that refused fellowship with FER held that Christ did indeed have a human will and human "I," else He would not be man. Such 'manhood' would be an *imagined manhood*, without human personality, thus not really human. Of course, in Christ's manhood there was not taint of, nor tendency to, sin, for He held humanity in a holy state, not in innocency as in Adam's unfallen state.

It is possible that THR was not an Apollinarian (denying Christ had a human soul and spirit). But he certainly did deny human "I" in Christ. After observing T. H. Reynolds' denial of Christ's human "I," we will consider some statements by the opposers of FER and THR, asserting the human personhood of Christ.⁴

T. H. Reynold's Formula

J. Hennessy pointed out this:

In the *Synopsis* {written by J. N. Darby} we read, "His complete person (5, 18).⁵ Let the reader note the presentation of the Lord's divine person on earth, *assuming to be what he was not*, according to these teachers, who deny to Him a human "I." T.H.R. wrote (Letter of December 3rd, 1895, circulated in Dublin):

The blessed Lord could say "I" as God -- before Abraham was "I" am. He could say "I" as Man -- "I will put my trust in Him (God)," but when we ask who was the conscious "I" the answer is, the Son of God speaking as Man on earth.

Thus the blessed Lord is represented as personating a human "I"! . . .

Where is the Man Christ Jesus in this "I"? This is F.E.R. and T.H.R.'s Christ! The doctrine involves the denial of Jesus Christ come in

3. I have dealt with FER's Apollinarian doctrine in *The Eternal Relationships in the Godhead*.

4. In the first edition I had said that THR denied human will in Christ. This is not certain though his denial of human personality *is* certain.

5. {*Synopsis* 5:12; also *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:101.}

the flesh (2 John 2:7), for it denies Him to be a perfect human *person*.⁶

This statement in the letter by THR is quoted also in N. Noel's *History* where he condemned it, writing:

That Christ was God, possessing an *impersonal humanity*, became the Christ of Mr. Raven, as well as of his lieutenants.⁷

Affirmation of Human Personality in Christ by J. N. Darby

THE LORD JESUS IS A HUMAN BEING

He was really and truly a human being.⁸

Of course He was a human being. He is "the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5).

"WHAT IS REALLY DENIED IS CHRIST'S INDIVIDUALITY AS A MAN"

Let us emphasize this heading:

. . . the moment you deny personality in the man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors. What is really denied is Christ's individuality as a man . . .⁹

6. *An Answer to . . . What is Ravenism?* pp. 22, 23.

7. *The History of the Brethren* 2:547.

8. *Synopsis* 3:202.

9. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:212.

In replying to the evil Apollinarian doctrine held by F. E. Raven, that in Person He is God, in *condition* (i.e., not in Person) He is man, A. C. Ord wrote:

To insist upon "Christ's *individuality* as a man," is not to teach "two individualities," nor does "the simple faith that Jesus was *God* and *Man* in *one person*" in any sense involve "a dual personality." In Him Godhead and Manhood are united in His holy Person; God in person and Man in person; yet but one Person -- "the Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever" ("*The Man Christ Jesus*" 1 Timothy 2:5, *Remarks on a Tract Entitled "The Person of the Christ,"* available from Present Truth Publishers).

FER's doctrine of Christ means that Christ had no human soul and spirit. In his view the Son filled the place of the human soul and spirit and was thus the spirit of the body. A. C. Ord likened this, quite correctly, to a gem being placed in a casket. Thus, in FER's scheme, there really is no union of the human and divine in the Person of Christ. Of course, there being no human soul, there was no human will and no human "I," the supporting idea being that if there were, then Christ would be two persons (Nestorianism). A. C. Ord wrote:

It {FER's teaching} allows *only* that He is a Divine Person in human "*condition*" as opposed to "*person*" (*ibid.*, p. 5).

When we speak of some person, we cannot deduce from that how the incarnation could be, or how the union of the human and the divine in Him is. Yet, He is one Person, though God and man. How

(continued...)

Denying that the Lord had a human will and human “I” is denying Christ’s individuality as a man. Without that human will and human “I” there is no true manhood -- “the man Christ Jesus.”

IN CHRIST THERE IS BOTH DIVINE AND HUMAN NATURE

If there is the divine and human nature in Him, there is only one Person.¹⁰

There is no human nature without a human will and a human “I.” These are in the soul.

THE CONSCIOUS “I” IS PERSONALITY

It is true concerning humanity that:

As regards personality, the conscious “I” is personality . . .¹¹

THE LORD HAS HUMAN PERSONALITY -- HUMAN “I” (EGO)

But as I am on this point, I add, they have no true Christ at all. I read,

How such human nature, as body, soul, and spirit, including a human will, could be held in personal union with the divine, so that this humanity was complete, without a human personality or ego,¹² we cannot understand, but we believe it is a mystery revealed for faith.

Where? Why does the blessed Lord say, “Not my will but thine?” Why does He say, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” if there was no ego, no human personality? Why does Hebrews quote, “will I sing praise,” and “will put my trust in him,” “behold I and the children which God hath given me,” if there was no I (ego)? Why does He say, “My God and your God, my Father and your Father” (not our), if there was no personality? * And this last remark, that Christ never says “our” with His disciples, I borrow from a European minister of some note, thoroughly imbued with the German system, where it is at home, not borrowed, and itself spoiled, as it is at Mercersburg. And this last statement, that Christ had no human personality, no ego,¹³ which is really heresy (though God and man were united in one person), and the mere folly of man attempting to fathom the mystery of His Person, when He has said, “No man knoweth the Son, but the Father,” is found in the article of one by no means the

9. (...continued)

the human entered into the Person of the Son we cannot know, but it is the fact. And that humanity is body, soul, and spirit; and that soul has a human will. Since our Lord Jesus has a human soul, there is human “I” (human ego), and human will. Without this there would have been no true manhood, no human personality.

10. *Letters of J. N. Darby* 3:107.

11. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 32:43.

12. {Take note that JND is refuting the idea that Christ had no human “I.”}

13. {Take note that JND equates the human personality of Christ with having an ego, i.e., an “I.”}

worst of their doctors.¹⁴

* I am quite aware of and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one person,¹⁵ though what was at first insisted on as orthodox as to *upostasis* was afterwards condemned, and the meaning of the word changed; but the statements quoted in the text are really **Monothelite**. It shows the danger of those early discussions, for the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in one Person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth; but the moment you deny personality in the man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors. What is really denied is Christ’s individuality as a man, as it is in terms elsewhere {emphasis added}.

So, JND affirmed that Christ had human personality, human *ego*, i.e. “I”, and also rejected Monothelitism. Who is going to charge him with being a Nestorian?

We see the same rejection of Monothelitism in his reply to Mr. Sen:

Mr. Sen’s statements are old workings of the human mind mixed up, as was not unnatural, with Hindoo pantheism. As to Christ it is what was in early Christianity called “Monothelism,” or really the Monophysite heresy -- one will, or one nature¹⁶ . . . I do not at all suppose Mr. Sen borrowed these ideas -- probably knew nothing of them; but they show the same workings of the human mind. Our business is with the Person of the Lord.¹⁷

CHRIST HERE PERSONALLY AS MAN

14. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:212.

15. {Later, some of the orthodox on the subject of the two natures will be quoted.}

16. {It should be clear that JND refers to Mr. Sen’s view as Monothelism and the Monophysite heresy, which JND rejects. That is, JND rejects the idea that there was only one will in Christ.}

17. *Notes and Comments* 2:278.

Eastern Christendom was always discussing points, Rome pushing its power. In the East they got a new point, on which it is surely not my purpose to dwell here: -- Christ had only one will, or at any rate His divine and human will coalesced, though He had two natures (*Collected Writings* 22:145. See also p. 86).

Here again JND rejects the idea of only one will in Christ.

Andrew Miller gave a concise statement of the issue in the **Monothelite** heresy:

. . . the so-called **Monothelite** controversy, may be described generally as a revival, under a somewhat different form, of the old Monophysite, or Eutychian, heresy . . . The Monophysites denied the distinction of the two natures in Christ; the Monothelites, on the other hand, denied the distinction of the will, divine and human, in the blessed Lord (*Miller’s Church History*, Addison: Bible Truth Publishers, pp. 340, 341, 1980 reprint).

For some detail on these controversies, see *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* 7:474-484; Phillip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* 4:490-500, “The Doctrine of the Two Wills in Christ”; and for exhaustive detail, see I. A. Dorner, *History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ* 3:120-240. Dr. Schaff is unsound on our Lord’s human personality.

He is made flesh, is full of grace and truth as a living Person down here as a Man, and of this have we all received. The former part was nature, witness, and how received; this fulness communicable as a source to others, and the Object of their faith, declaring God, withal the only-begotten Son as in the bosom of the Father. This is important in John, for while showing He was I AM, yet we always find Christ personally as Man, the recipient of all from God . . .¹⁸

MANHOOD TAKEN INTO UNION WITH GOD IN ONE PERSON

He who had this place {as eternal Son} with the Father was made flesh -- God's delight down here, God manifest in flesh; grace to man, grace in man, man taken into union with God in one person . . .¹⁹

The union of man and God is the sole prerogative of the Word made flesh. It is incarnation, and that is true of none but Him. And when the Word was made flesh, it was in a divinely ordered and miraculous way, He was conceived by the Holy Ghost so that that born of the virgin was a holy thing, true flesh and blood surely, but untainted by sin. And this is true now of no other humanity. All are born in sin, and there is no question of any union or reunion with God, nor is the idea in any way scriptural, nor is there union with the Lord in incarnation. He was among them "the holy thing;" but He was alone, God and man in one person, but not united to men, to sinful corrupt man; but, having miraculously-formed sinless manhood in His own person. The union with Godhead was now, for the first time, and only here.²⁰

. . . the union of Godhead and manhood in one Person.²¹

A wondrous and blessed thought! He who had this place with the Father was made flesh -- God's delight down here, God manifest in flesh; grace to man, grace in man, man taken into union with God in one person -- the pledge of peace on earth . . .²²

HE TOOK OUR NATURE

He did not take sinful flesh but was "in likeness of flesh of sin" (Rom. 8:3). He had humanity in a *holy state* (Luke 1:35). In Heb. 2:14 we read:

Since therefore the children partake of flesh and blood, he also, in like

18. *Notes and Comments* 5:179. Emphasis has been added.

19. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 30:151.

20. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 15:347.

21. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:358.

22. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 30:152.

manner, took part in the same . . .²³

It would be, of course, absurd to say that Christ's humanity was only a body (Apollinarianism). As JND says:

He took our nature that He might die . . .²⁴

Man's nature includes a human will and a human "I," else there is no human personality.

CHRIST'S HUMANITY IS OF ITS OWN ORDER: SINLESS, IMPECCABLE, AND IN CHRIST'S PERSON

His humanity, it is said {by B. W. Newton}, was not *sui generis*. This too is confusion. The abstract word humanity means humanity and no more: and, being abstract, must be taken absolutely, according to its own meaning. But, if the writer means that in fact the state of Christ's humanity

23. See the footnote in JND's translation of this verse. Answering some questions, W. Kelly wrote:

(3.) To bring about this relationship to Himself incarnation was requisite with a view to redemption. Since then the children partake, or are partakers of (κεκοινώνηκεν) blood and flesh, He Himself also similarly participated in (μετέσχευ) the same. The former verb supposes a common share in what belonged to the children, as indeed to all men. For there is no difference in the human nature of godly and of ungodly. The latter verb means to take or get a share in anything (in this case, humanity).

(4.) "Likewise," "in like manner," "similarly" (as I have rendered it), is the true force of παραπλησίως. It is not correct to say that the rendering in our common Bible is not sufficiently strong. Bengel gives *similiter* and remarks, not that it is equivalent to but "idem fere atque mox κατα πάντα per omnia v. 17, c. iv. 15." The Docetae may have perverted the word to their own wicked folly; but no scholar who examines the matter can deny that π. does not go as far as δυοίως or ἴσως; but as Alford justly remarks, it expresses "a general similitude, a likeness in the main: and so not to be pressed here, to extend to *entire identity*, nor on the other hand, to imply, of purpose, *partial diversity*; but to be taken in its wide and open sense -- that He Himself also partook, in the main, in like manner with us, of our nature." The Docetae did not believe that Christ really μετέσχευ τῶν αὐτῶν, which words do predicate sameness in essence. It is ignorance to found this on παραπλησίως, which simply asserts similarity of manner: while on the other hand, even this could not have been truthfully said, had not the Word been made οὐ δοκητῶς ἀλλ' ἀληθινῶς, οὐ φανταστικῶς ἀλλ' ὄντως. (Cp. Phil. 2:27.)

(5.) Christ took human nature most really, though not in a state identical with ours (as is more fully explained -- strange that it should be needed by the believer! -- in Heb. 4:15); but He took it to die, that through death He might destroy (annul, render void) him that has the power of death, that is, the devil, and might deliver, etc. To avail for God's glory or even for us, it was into *death* that grace led the Savior. There only could Satan's might be brought to nought; thus only could redemption be wrought, a ruined creation be reconciled to God, guilty souls be atoned for effectually and for ever. All this and more was done by the death of Christ, though its power be displayed in resurrection alone. All else fails to vindicate God, annul Satan, or deliver man (*The Bible Treasury* 6:79).

24. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 27:343.

was not *sui generis*, it is quite wrong; for it was united to Godhead, which no one else's humanity ever was; which, as to fact, alters its whole condition. For instance, it was not only sinless, but in that condition incapable of sinning;²⁵ and to take it out of that condition is to take it out of Christ's person.²⁶

"THE PERSON IS NOT CHANGED"

For the Person is not changed.²⁷

Thus, JND held that the Son took humanity into His person, yet he says that the Person is not changed. That is, He remained the Son and He remained the Word. JND did not mean by such a statement that there was no union of the divine and human in Christ. The fact is, then, by saying the Person did not change, JND did not mean that there was *not* something added to His Person, for he held that the Son took humanity into His Person, yet he remained the Son and the Word. The fact is that there was addition to His Person, but He remained the Son and the Word and the eternal life. That is the sense in which is meant "the Person is not changed."

The reader is specifically warned about the abuse of the words, "the Person is not changed" because FER and his followers say 'the person is not changed' and use those words with a different, new meaning from JND; namely, they use

25. {On the other hand Jesus had no sin. Although perfectly man, every thought, feeling, and inward motion was holy in Jesus: not only not a flaw in His ways was ever seen, but not a stain in His nature. Whatever men reason or dream, He was as pure humanly as divinely; and this may serve to show us the all-importance of holding fast what men call orthodoxy as to His person. I shall yield to none in jealousy for it, and loyally maintain that it is of the substance and essence of the faith of God's elect that we should confess the immaculate purity of His humanity, just as much as the reality of His assumption of our nature. Assuredly He did take the proper manhood of His mother, but He never took manhood in the state of His mother, but as the body prepared for Him by the Holy Ghost, who expelled every taint of otherwise transmitted evil {cp. Luke 1:35}. In His mother that nature was under the taint of sin: she was fallen, as were all others naturally begotten and born in Adam's line. In Him it was not so; and, in order that it should not be so, we learn in God's word that He was not begotten in a merely natural generation, which would have perpetuated the corruption of the nature and have linked Jesus with the fall; but by the power of the Holy Ghost He and He alone was born of woman without a human father. Consequently, as the Son was necessarily pure, as pure as the Father, in His own proper divine nature, so also in the human nature which He thus received from His mother: both the divine and the human were found for ever afterwards joined in that one and the same person — the Word made flesh.

Thus, we may here take occasion to observe, Jesus is the true pattern of the union of man with God, God and man in one person . . . The Christian never has union with God, which would really be, and only is in, the Incarnation (W. Kelly, *Lectures introductory to the Study of the Minor Prophets*, London: Broom, pp. 214, 215.

26. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 15:147.

27. *Synopsis* 5:230 note. Also *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 25:2. So W. Kelly, *F.E.R. Heterodox*, p. 124 (and *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 4:78).

it to deny the Son's taking manhood into His Person. It is well to observe how heresy changes the use and meaning of words and phrases. Thus, the reader may find words such as that the Person is not changed -- and there was no addition to His Person. That is a denial that the Son took manhood into His Person and is a fundamentally evil denial of the truth of Christ's Person.

DISCUSSING THE PERSON OF CHRIST

Sorry to say, there are persons who warn about "discussing" the Person of Christ when His Person has been under attack. Perhaps those who do this are trying to ward off the implications of fellowship with evil teaching concerning His Person. They are resisting that souls should be preserved from evil teaching. A balanced view of this matter was stated by JND:

We must take care not to pretend to know all that concerns the union of humanity and divinity in the Person of the Lord. This union is inscrutable. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father." Jesus grew in wisdom. What has made some Christians fall into such grave errors is, that they have wished to distinguish and explain the condition of Christ as man. We know that He was and that He is God; we know that He became man, and the witness to His true divinity is maintained, in that state of humiliation, by the inscrutability of the union. One may show that certain views detract from His glory, and from the truth of His Person; but I earnestly desire that brethren should not set to work to dogmatize as to His Person: they would assuredly fall into some error. I never saw any one do it without falling into some unintentional heresy. **To show that an explanation is false, in order to preserve souls from the evil consequences of the error, and to pretend to explain the Person of the Lord, are two different things . . .**²⁸

So, when JND states that the Lord had a human will and human "I," was that dogmatizing (or "discussing," or "dissecting") concerning Christ's Person? -- and JND is self-condemned? Hardly! Let us continue with his warnings:

I have not entered into the discussions on {Henry} Craik's doctrines. I dread dissecting, if I may venture so to speak, Christ, it is not the way to honor Him. Very few will speak so as not to commit themselves; "No man knoweth the Son but the Father." We may know many precious things of Him which enable us to condemn error, but nice definitions of what He was, and how He was it, human language and human thoughts are not competent to, I judge. I do condemn many things I have heard said . . .²⁹
 . . . Our precious Savior was Man, as truly as I am, as regards the simple abstract idea of humanity, but without sin, miraculously born by divine power; and more than this, He was God manifest in flesh.

28. *Letters of J. N. Darby* 2:310. Boldfacing is added.

29. *Letters of J. N. Darby* 3:262.

Now, having said so much, I entreat you with all my heart not to try to define and to discuss the Person of our precious Savior; you will lose the savor of Christ in your thoughts, and you will get in its place only the barrenness of the human mind in the things of Christ, and in the affections which belong to them. I have begged the brethren to refrain from this, and they are all the better for it. It is a labyrinth for man, because he works from his own resources. It is as if one were to dissect the body of one's friend, instead of delighting in his affections and his character. In the church, it is one of the worst signs I have met with. It is very sad to get into this way, very sad that this should be shown in such a light before the church of God, and before the world. I would add, that so deep is my conviction of man's incapacity in this matter, and that **it is outside the teaching of the Spirit to wish to define the manner of the union of divinity and humanity in Jesus**, that I am quite ready to suppose that even while desiring to avoid it, I may have fallen into it, and thus may have spoken in a mistaken way in something which I have said to you.

That He was truly Man, Son of man, dependent on God as such, and without sin in that condition of dependence -- truly God in all His ineffable perfection: this I hold, I trust, dearer than life. To define everything is what I do not presume to do. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father." **If I find anything which weakens one or the other of these truths, or which dishonors Him who is their subject, I shall oppose it with all my might, as God may call me to do so.**

May God grant you to believe all which the word teaches with regard to Him -- Jesus. It is our food and sustenance to understand all which the Spirit has given us to understand, and not to seek to define that which God does not call upon us to define, but to adore on the one hand and to feed upon on the other, and to love in every way according to the grace of the Holy Spirit.³⁰

Since JND taught that the Lord had a human soul and a human "I," did he violate what he said here and did he, in fact, "seek to define that which God does not call upon us to define"? Certainly not! That is among the things the Spirit has given us to believe. This is not defining, or discussing, things not revealed concerning His Person. **It is a matter of a true confession of His Person as the God-man.**

WHAT IS THE ISSUE IN "DISCUSSIONS" OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST?

The Confession of the True Humanity of Christ is not What is Meant by "Discussing His Person." The warnings about discussing the Person of Christ has to do with speculations on the union of the two natures in one Person. Men want to understand the inscrutable, the how it can be. Thus, they use reasoning and logic to bring the union into scrutiny of the human mind. This is what has

30. *Letters of J. N. Darby* 1:282. Boldfacing is added.

fathered the host of evil teachings concerning His Person. And this has fathered denying human personality in the Person of Christ. To insist on the Scripture teaching that Christ had a human will and/or "I" is not "discussing" Christ's Person. JND wrote:

The questions you put make me feel deeply all that there is sorrowful in the walk of one whom nevertheless I love very sincerely, our friend M. G. To enter upon subtle questions as to the person of Jesus tends to wither and trouble the soul, to destroy the spirit of worship and affection, and to substitute thorny enquiries, as if the spirit of man could solve the manner in which the humanity and the divinity of Jesus were united to each other. In this sense it is said, "No one knoweth the Son but the Father." It is needless to say that I have no such pretension.³¹

We have seen above that he asserted the human will and the human "I" in Christ.

To this these observations about discussing the Person of Christ may be added:

. . . (John 14:9) . . . Clearly the mystery of His Person is in question; to the captious, the irreverent, the curious, a stone of stumbling in all ages, but to the humble and reverent soul a source of unending gladness and thanksgiving. Of course there is a sense in which we do know Christ -- most really know Him, albeit not the mystery of His Sonship. Our Lord gently reproved Phillip for not knowing Him, for not discerning that all that infinitude of moral glory was the manifestation of the Father. To know Him was to know the Father, so that this verse in John is in the fullest accord with the passage in Matthew {11:27}. But, as we know, it is the union of the divine and the human in His blessed Person that is unknowable. All manner of ingenious speculations have been exhausted in the attempt to analyze it. In vain! No such impregnable tower ever rose four-square to heaven. The would-be interpreters are ever baffled, and the burning of their own fingers is the least part of the damage. What of the wide-spread injury to the flock of Christ? Surely it had been better, instead of such unhallowed dissection, to have bowed before the "mystery of godliness," or even to have taken up, may be, the words of the ancient creed, for "God and Man are one Christ." Such is the incarnation.³²

Scrutinizing the Person of Christ. Scrutinizing the Person of Christ refers to the attempt to explain the union of God and man in His Person:

We cannot fathom who He was. Our hearts should not go and **scrutinize** the Person of Christ, as though we could know it all. **No human being can understand the union of God and Man in His Person** -- "No man knoweth the Son but the Father." All that is revealed we may know; we may learn a great deal about Him. The Father we know: "No man knoweth

31. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 10:181.

32. R. B. Jr., *The Bible Treasury* 18:218.

the Father but the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son shall reveal him." We know Him to be holy; we know Him to be love, etc. But when I attempt to fathom **the union of God and man -- no man can**. We know Christ is God, and we know He is man -- perfect man, apart from sin; and if He is not God, what is He to me? What difference between Him and another man? Christ came in flesh. Every feeling that I have (save sin) He had.³³

Confessing that Christ has a human "I" (ego) and a human will is *confessing* the truth of Christ's Person, *not scrutinizing* the union of the two natures so as to explain it. As an example, consider again this stricture by JND:

And this last statement, that Christ had no human personality, no ego {means, no "I"}, which is really heresy . . . and the mere folly of man attempting to fathom the mystery of His Person . . .³⁴

Such rejection of a human "I" (ego) in Christ's Person is the result of scrutinizing His Person.

Looking Into the Ark. The men of Bethshemesh looked into the ark of God and God smote 70 persons (1 Sam. 6:19). Confessing the truth of Christ's humanity is not the sin of looking into the ark. What answers to looking into the ark of God is what the Monothelites as well as deniers of human personality in Christ did. Such want to explain the union of the divine and human in the Person of Christ, reducing it to what their minds could understand. Of course, it is not unexpected that such a paper as this one which is in the reader's hands will be, by some, likened to looking into the ark of God -- in an effort to put down the truth of Christ's human "I" (ego) and human will. It follows from this reversal of the charge (a not uncommon way of dealing with matters) that JND, quoted above, and all the persons quoted in what follows, are all like the men of Bethshemesh. Those who make such a charge must be holding evil teaching on the union of the divine and human in Christ, else why would they do such a thing?

33. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 27:357. Boldfacing is added.

34. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:213.

The Lord's Human Will Expressed in Gethsemene

Father, if thou wilt remove this cup from me: – but then, not my will, but thine be done (Luke 22:42).

Here in Gethsemene we see the perfect submission of the Lord's human will to the will of the Father. His human will was a part of the perfection of His perfect humanity; He shrank from being made sin, and bearing sins in His own body on the tree, and bearing wrath. His perfection includes that He shrank from it. It was in accordance with His holiness to do so.³⁵ Indeed, the Son took *holy* humanity into His Person. Luke 1:35 expresses this:

[The] Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of [the] Highest overshadow thee, wherefore the holy thing that shall be born shall be called Son of God.

Son of God eternally, He must be Son of God in holy manhood also. Though become man, He remained the same Person, the Son of God. And though Godhead and manhood united in Him, there was but one Person, not two persons -- one of which was the Son of God and one of which was a man. He took holy manhood, body, soul (with a human will and human "I"), and spirit, into His Person. *The manhood entered into His person* and there was but one Person. The finite mind, seeking to explain how this could be, falls into evil teaching, as it seeks to make this inscrutable truth comprehensible to the finite mind. We, as taught by the Spirit through the Scriptures, may *apprehend* that there is the unity of the two natures in Him, the human and the divine, one Person, but we cannot *comprehend* how this can be.

Concerning the expression of His human will in Gethsemene, W. Kelly wrote:

It was impossible that He who was life could desire such a death from His Father -- from God in wrath against Him. It would have been hardness,

35. W. Kelly wrote:

In Him there was the absolute surrender of every thought and feeling to the will of God. There was but one apparent exception, where He prayed in His agony, "Let this cup pass from me." But how could He, who ever enjoyed the unbroken sunshine of God's favor throughout His career on earth, desire to be forsaken of God? It would have been indifference and not love, it would have been to despise the blessed fellowship between the Father and Himself. Therefore was it a part of the perfectness of Christ to say, "Let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not my will but thine be done." His humanity because perfect (may I say?) could not wish for that unutterable scene of wrath: but here too He was, as in all things, subject to the will of God. "The cup which my Father giveth me, shall I not drink it?" (*In Christ Tempted and Sympathizing*).

not love; but although He felt it perfectly according to God His Father, yet He entirely submits **His human will** to the Father's. "Abba, Father," He says, "all things are possible unto Thee. Take away this cup from Me; but not what I will, but what Thou [wilt]." He had a real soul, what is dogmatically called a reasonable soul, not a mere principle of vitality. He could not have said this, had it been true, as some have asserted, that the Divine nature in our Lord took the place of a soul. He would not have been perfect man had He not taken a soul as well as a body. Therefore could He say: "Not what I will, but what Thou [wilt]." ³⁶

In a book that appears to have had the evil teachings of F. E. Raven in view, F. W. Grant remarked:

He shrank from it and could not take it as of His own will, but only as the divine will for Him. Here, surely, we have a perfect and therefore **a real, human will**. He is as true man as any man can be; and personally man, as such a will must prove Him. ³⁷

He also wrote:

To realize the subject of prayer is not to solve the mystery of it. It certainly gives us to see how true, while perfect, the humanity of the Lord Jesus was. In the seventh century, the words "Not My will, but Thine be done" were used against the Monothelites to prove the distinctness of the human from the divine will in Christ. But while we recognize their competency {of the words quoted} for such a purpose, it is for us to acquiesce in the Lord's own assurance that "No one knoweth the Son but the Father," and to refrain from seeking to penetrate beyond what is ours to know. **The truth of His humanity, and its personality** (without which it would not have been true) we may thank God for showing us in so clear a manner; and we must hold it fast as essential to the proper Christian faith. Analysis of His inscrutable nature we should not venture upon. ³⁸

Let us look at some remarks by J. N. Darby regarding what transpired in Gethsemane:

. . . and without entering into it one moment as a temptation which might have for its effect in Him to awaken His own will. Such is Gethsemane; not the cup, but all the power of Satan in death and the enmity of man taking their revenge (so to speak) on God ("the reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon me"): all perfectly and entirely felt, but brought to God in an entire submission to His will. It is the Christ -- marvelous scene! -- watching, praying, struggling in the highest degree; all the power and the weight of death pressed upon His soul by Satan, and augmented by the sense

36. *Exposition of the Gospel of Mark*, London: Race, pp. 197, 198, ed. by E. E. Whitfield, 1907. This is also found in *The Bible Treasury* 6:138. Boldface emphasis is added.

37. *The Crowned Christ*, Kilmarnock: Ritchie, p. 54, 1945 reprint. Boldfaced emphasis is added.

38. *The Numerical Bible, The Gospels*, p. 251. Boldfaced emphasis is added.

He had of what they were before God, from whose face nothing then hid Him. But He always kept His Father absolutely before His face, referring everything to the Father's will, without flinching for a moment, or trying to escape that will by giving way to His own. Thus He takes nothing from Satan or men, but all from God. ³⁹ ♦

As regards our obedience, it is essential for the true character of our path as Christians that we should lay hold of what this obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ was. Legal obedience in us is a different thing. We have got a will of our own: this was not true of Christ. **He had a will in one sense, as a man**, but He said, "Not my will, but thine, be done." But we have got a will of our own; it may be checked and broken down. But if the law is applied to us, it is as stopping this will, but it finds it here, and such is our notion of obedience constantly. Take a child! there is a will of its own; but when the parents' will comes in, and the child yields instantly without a struggle, and either does what it is bid or ceases to do what it is forbidden, you say, This is an obedient child, and it is delightful to see such an obedient spirit. But Christ never obeyed in that way. He never had a will to do things of His own will in which God had to stop Him. It was not the character of His obedience. It is needed with us, and we all know it, if we know anything of ourselves; but it was not the character of His obedience. He could not wish for the wrath of God in the judgment of sin, and He prayed that this cup might pass from Him. But the obedience of Christ had quite another character from legal obedience. His Father's will was His motive for doing everything: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God."

This is the true character of the obedience of Jesus Christ, and of ours as Christians. ⁴⁰ ♦

. . . said "Therefore," **as a man**, "**not my will** but thine be done." ⁴¹ ♦

This reflective self-consciousness is man's distinctive prerogative, as having a spirit. "I" {which resides in the soul} has the power of using the upper faculty {i.e., the spirit} to reflect on the workings of "I." I reflect, but the capacity is in the spirit of man. "There is," says Elihu, "a spirit in man." But how was this before the fall? I mean as to "will." And here I have to remark that I think "will" is used in two ways -- intention, the tendency of nature or "I," towards something, and the determination of "I" to go out towards that something, and where this question is raised in a moral ground.

All will is sin, because it is not obedience, i.e., is assumed independence of God, and much more. Now unfallen Adam had no such will as this. It was tested in the tree, and he ought to have said "I can have no will -- I obey" -- but he distrusted and willed. But in the place where God had set him, as dressing the garden and keeping it, nature was free in the sphere

39. *Collected Writings* 29:319.

40. *Collected Writings* 16:175; repeated in 28:175. Boldfaced emphasis is added.

41. *Notes and Comments* 2:256. Boldfaced emphasis is added.

God had given it authority in; and so as to animals. Here God had given authority, and will was in its place while the whole man was subject to God. But he used a will in the sphere of testing obedience and was lost -- Christ in the most perfect testing said "Not my will but thine be done." His tendency of nature and "I" to escape suffering was right -- that suffering eminently so. **He had, being a perfect Man, a will of nature and morally too**, but no will which willed when God's will was there. This is commonly, in its grosser form, called "Self-will." It is the determination of "I" to have its own way.⁴²

Every Word, Work, and Way of the Lord Jesus Had a Divine Spring

Replying to an evil paper on the Lord's humanity (written by B. W. Newton) J. N. Darby wrote:

Mr. N. goes beyond scripture in saying (p. 35) that "To say that there was in His humanity a divine spring of thought and feeling, is to deny His real humanity." Was His humanity then without a divine spring of thought and feeling? Had he said it was not of or from His humanity, I should have nothing to say; but to say there was none in it unsettles the doctrine of Christ's person. There was the fulness of the Godhead bodily; and the divine nature was a spring of many thoughts and feelings in Him. This is not the whole truth; but to deny it is not truth. If it merely means that humanity has not in itself a divine spring, that is plain enough; it would not be humanity. I am equally aware that it will be said that it was in His person; but to separate wholly the humanity and divinity in springs of thought and feeling is dangerously overstepping scripture. Is it meant that the love and holiness of the divine nature did not produce, was not a spring of, thought and feeling in His human soul? This would be to lower Christ below a Christian. Perhaps this is what Mr. N. means in saying He was dispensationally lower than the church. If so, it is merely a roundabout road to Socinianism . . .

To turn, then, to scripture, we are told of the sinless infirmities of human nature, and that Christ partook of them. Now, I have no doubt this has been said most innocently; but, not being scripture, we must learn in what sense it is used. Now, that Christ was truly man, in thought, feeling, and sympathy, is a truth of cardinal blessing and fundamental importance to our souls. But I have learnt, thereby, not that humanity is not real humanity, if there is a divine spring of thought and feeling in it; but that God can be the spring of thought and feeling in it, without its ceasing to be truly and really man. This is the very truth of infinite and unspeakable blessedness that I have learnt. This, in its little feeble measure, and in another and derivative

42. *Notes and Comments* 2:315, 316. Boldface emphasis added.

way, is true of us now by grace. He who searches the hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit. This is true in Jesus in a yet far more important and blessed way. There was once an innocent man left to himself; the spring of thought and feeling being simply man, however called on by every blessing and natural testimony of God without: we know what came of it. Then there was man whose heart alas! was the spring, "from within," of evil thoughts and the dark train of acts that followed. What I see in Christ is man, where God has become the spring of thought and feeling. * And, through this wonderful mystery, in the new creation in us, all things are of God. That, if we speak of His and our humanity, is what distinguishes it . . . Sinless humanity, sustained in that state by Godhead, is not the same as sinful humanity left to itself. If it be said it was in the same circumstances, this is a question of fact, and to what extent? And here we have to guard against confounding relationships and circumstances. Thus deprivation of paradise is stated by Mr. N. as one thing which the blessed Lord had in common with ourselves. As to circumstances, it is quite clear it was so; but as to relationship to God -- was Christ deprived of paradise as we are as guilty outcasts from it? Clearly not.

[* Did He hereby cease to be man? not at all. It is, though "according to God," in man and as man these thoughts and feelings are to be found. And this extends itself to all the sorrows and the pressure of death itself upon His soul in thought. He had human feelings as to what lay upon Him and before Him, but God was the spring of His estimate of it all. Besides, the manifestation of God was in His ways. We had known man innocent in suitable circumstances; and guilt, subject to misery; but in Christ we have perfectness in relation to God in every way, in infallibly maintained communion in the midst of all the circumstances of sorrow, temptation, and death, by which He was beset, the spring of divine life in the midst of evil, so that His every thought as man was perfection before God, and perfect in that position. This was what marked His state as being down here this new thing.]⁴³

Thus, though Christ's death on the cross was a human death, we do not separate it from the value and glory of His Person. His sufferings, death, and bloodshedding had all the value and glory of His Person as their value and glory. This is because of the *unity* of the two natures in Him. Indeed, it is so precious stated in 1 John 2:2:

and *he* is the propitiation for our sins . . .

Thus, the propitiation is commensurate with the value and glory of His Person. Every word, work, and way had a divine spring, and could not be human words, ways, and acts as if they were apart from the unity of the two natures. All that He did and said had a divine spring, and all was done in the power of the Spirit. There

43. *Collected Writings* 15:147-150.

was no, and could be no, exception. Christ was not two persons. Fully man, and of course fully God, yet there is one Person. This the mind cannot comprehend, cannot scrutinize, yet by faith we receive the truth into our souls that He is God and man (fully so) in one Person, and our souls bow in worship.

Affirmation of Human Personality in Christ by F. E. Raven's Opposers

J. HENNESSY

Among some quotations he included in his valuable paper, J. Hennessy cited this:

A late writer, Dr. T. C. Edwards (*Davies Lectures*, 1895, "The God-Man"), has thus written:

All the writers of the New Testament represent Jesus Christ *as a man*, an *individual* man, as well as *the* man, as truly a man as Paul or Peter . . . Personal acts are ascribed to His humanity, such as prayer . . . human nature without personality of some sort would seem impossible and inconceivable. It is like assuming all the separate elements of humanity without the *suppositum* which gives them personal identity and continuance. **Scripture, for instance, plainly teaches that Christ had two wills -- a human, as distinct from the divine will -- and that is the doctrine of the church.** If He, being a person, in any real and perfect sense became human, then He became a human person. The incarnation gave a divine person human personality, but He has not ceased to be a divine person. It only changes the condition. As the Logos does not cease to exist in the Trinity by becoming the Logos incarnate, so He does not cease to be Logos incarnate by becoming man. ⁴⁴

Who is going to accuse J. Hennessy of being a Nestorian for such teaching? Moreover, as we will see below, two wills in Christ is the teaching of the orthodox on the Person of Christ. Under the heading "THE HERESY OF THE DOCTRINE OF NO HUMAN "I" IN CHRIST INCARNATE," he quotes from JND's "Christological Pantheism," in which JND labels the denial of human "I," i.e., human *ego*, as heresy. Of course it is heresy. In effect, it denies true manhood in Christ's Person.

W. T. WHYBROW

In his *The Truth of Christ's Person: Is It Taught by Mr. F. E. Raven*, W. T. Whybrow has a heading that reads, "TO SAY THAT CHRIST HAD NO HUMAN PERSONALITY IS HERESY." Notice also that the notion of charging opponents with Nestorianism seems to come from FER:

44. *An Answer to . . . What is Ravenism?* p. 26. Boldfaced emphasis added.

Mr. R. considers that to reject his teaching on this subject approaches very near to heresy, and infers a dual personality. But he may remember Nestorius was anathematized because he taught that there was a separate basis of personality in the human nature of our Lord, that He was, in fact, a double being.⁴⁵ It is Mr. R. who now would view Christ as man, *distinct and apart* from what He is as God and divine. And in avoiding the Scylla of Nestorianism he has fallen into the Charybdis of an impersonal humanity . . . There is no human personality, but only human condition. This is the High-church doctrine of the incarnation. It is strange that Mr. R. should have imbibed it, coupled, indeed, with other thoughts, which they and most Christians would repudiate with abhorrence. It is this, too, that Mr. Darby so strongly condemned in his article on "Christological Pantheism" {quoted previously, above} . . . (pp. 12, 13). ⁴⁶

The High-church doctrine to which he refers was not, however **Apollinarianism** (FER's evil teaching) but similar to what is called **Monothelism**. While Apollinarianism necessarily involves the idea that Christ had no human will and no "I" of humanity, Monothelism allows a human soul and spirit, but no human will. Thus, both evils deny full human personality in the Person of Christ.

G. J. STEWART

Since the Lord had a human soul, He had a human "I." The "I" is in the soul. Responding to Ravenism in *The Man Christ Jesus*, G. J. Stewart wrote:

If the Lord were not personally Man He could not die for men. If He had no human soul, no human personality, His blood could not make atonement for the "soul," in which lies the "I" of individuality and responsibility . . . (p. 4).

Yes, the will and the "I" of manhood is in the soul, and Christ had a human soul. A soul without that would be an impersonal soul, not a human soul.

THEO DAVIS

In *On the Human Personality of Christ*, p. 3, the writer says:

To those who urge He cannot be two persons {and we agree on that, but}, the same faith would say I believe He is a Divine Person, I believe He is a human Person, I believe He is One Person. I cannot explain or understand, nor do I expect to do so, remembering "No man knoweth the Son but the Father" (Matt. 11:27).

ANONYMOUS

A copy of F. E. Raven's 1895 paper, *The Person of the Christ*, was printed with footnotes to the various paragraphs, the footnotes objecting to the doctrine of the

45. {Actually, it is disputed that Nestorius himself did really hold that, though some followers did.}

46. His paper is reprinted in *The Eternal Relationships in the Godhead*, pp. 91-97, available from Present Truth Publishers.

paper and asserting the human personality of the Lord in a number of places. The writer of the footnotes concluded with this:

The following Scriptures prove without the shadow of a doubt the personality of Jesus as man, and consequently by the sturdy evidence of the facts, the falseness of F.E.R.'s rationalistic conclusions that, because Jesus is personally God, He therefore cannot be personally man.

Matt. 26:39 -- not as I will, but as thou wilt.

Matt. 27:46 -- my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? . . .

We know what this anonymous author meant by "the personality of Jesus as man," not only because being personal, man includes a will and an "I," but also because the writer supplied definitions taken from a Dictionary:

Person -- A human being as including body and mind; an individual. Any being having life, intelligence, will, and separate individual existence.

Personality -- That which constitutes a person; conscious separate existence as an intelligent and voluntary being. The attributes, taken collectively, that make up the character and nature of an individual; that which distinguishes and characterizes a person.

This shows that the writer regarded the Lord Jesus as having a human will and a human "I," but not in "separate existence," of course, which would mean that there were two persons.

W. KELLY

The Soul is the seat of human "will," and "I" (ego), and Thus of Personality.

Commenting on what constitutes manhood, W. Kelly pointed out that the soul is the seat of personal identity and that soul is the *ego*; that is, the *I*:

Again, our Lord in Luke 24:39, compared with 37 (and see Matt. 14:26), explains "spirit." "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have," even when risen. He had a "spiritual body," and was not a mere "spirit," though a quickening spirit. Granted that angels are spirits, but so is man when disembodied, whether the Lord Himself before He rose (Matt. 27:50; John 19:30), saints (Acts 7:59; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 22:6, as rightly read), or the unbelieving (1 Pet. 3:19). Soul (ψυχή) is the "ego" or "I," the seat of personal identity, and therefore predicable of men alive or dead, as in ver. 20, etc., for the former; or Rev. 6:9; Rev. 20:4, for the latter; while πνεῦμα expresses the spiritual capacity, inseparable from the soul, wherein is the working of the will. They compose the inner man, as the body is the outer.⁴⁷

And, of course, where the seat of personal identity is, there, he pointed out, is the *will* as well as personality:

In man, personality, self-consciousness, will, is in the soul; capacity is by

47. *The Preaching to the Spirits in Prison*, London: Race, pp. 120, 121, n.d.

the spirit. Each has his own soul, and so is personally responsible. The spirit is faculty or power; and so John Baptist was to come in the spirit and power of Elias, not in any other's soul but his own.⁴⁸

That is man's constitution. Such was he in innocence, as in Adam unfallen, and such was man's constitution after the fall -- only that there was added to him the knowledge of good and evil as well as what we call the old nature, called "sin in the flesh" in Rom. 8:3. The constitution of manhood is true of Christ's manhood, but we must bear in mind that He had manhood in a holy state intrinsically, free of any taint of evil; and, in fact, *impeccable* -- that is, *He could not sin*, not only because of the Godhead in Him, but also because of the holy state of that humanity (cf. Luke 1:35). Christ had a human soul.

FER Denied Human "Will," And "I" (ego), and Human Personality in Christ. Here is a lengthy quotation from W. Kelly's *F.E.R. Heterodox on the Person of Christ*:

Now who does not know that a person among men consists of both parts and unity? There are spirit and soul and body; and yet they constitute the person. There may be temporary dissolution of the outer tie by death; there will surely be their unity in one person for eternity. But for the true believer Christ's Person is distinguished from every other by the infinite fact of God and man united thus. These are in Him for ever indissoluble, though no saint doubts that He is Son of God and Son of man. Whatever His profound emotion in spirit, whatever the conflict when He prayed more earnestly, and His sweat became as great drops of blood, that Man was inseparably God; and as from His conception, so fully in His death and resurrection. Thus had His every word, work, thought, and suffering divine value. It is not the Son alone, but "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." The man Christ Jesus is not only the one Mediator, but the true God and eternal life; the sent Servant, and the "I AM"; Christ of the fathers as according to flesh, yet He that is over all, God blessed for evermore. Amen . . .

F.E.R. talks of . . . "two totally different *ideas* coalesced in one person!" Yes, it is not truth, but "ideas" for F.E.R. Is this to "abide in the doctrine of the Christ"?

It is to join Apollinarius of Antioch (the son). He too made the Logos simply form Christ's Person, as F.E.R. does, and was therefore justly branded as an antichrist; so Nestorius was for dividing the Person, and Eutyches for confusing it: all of them, strict Trinitarians. For if the Logos had not been united to the soul as to spirit and body in the Christ, Christ was not and is not very Man as well as very God. ***Without that union there must have been two distinct {separated} personalities, the divine and the human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth***

48. In *The Soul - Neither Mortal Nor to Sleep*.

*according to scripture.*⁴⁹ F.E.R. with shameless self-confidence vaunts his idea, which is plain heterodoxy. He does *not* “bring the doctrine” of Christ. The Son did not change His Person, but took up manhood into unity, and this in soul as in body.⁵⁰

In some such way deadly false doctrine befalls such as venture to pry into what is only known to the Father and immeasurably above man’s ken. The Apollinarian heterodoxy prevails largely at present;⁵¹ as the error which led to it is a relic of heathen philosophy, accepted by early Fathers such as Clement of Alexandria, and exceedingly common among “thinkers” now as at all times. It pervades Franz Delitzsch’s Psychology and its English analogue, The Tripartite Nature of Man. They (and F.E.R. follows them) make the self-conscious “I” or individuality to reside in man’s spirit. But scripture abundantly proves its seat to be in the soul.⁵² The spirit is inner capacity *as to* which man is responsible to God; but the soul is that *in* which he is so; and the body is the outer vessel which displays the result, whether by grace for God’s will or by self-will in Satan’s service.

To the soul belongs the working of the will, and now also since the fall the instinctive knowledge of good and evil; so that one is enticed into fleshly lusts which degrade man, as well as into reasonings of the spirit and every high thing that lifts itself up against the knowledge of God. Hence we read of soul-salvation or “salvation of souls” as in 1 Pet. 1:9. Hence Ezek. 18:4, “Behold, all souls are Mine,” and the regular use of “souls” for persons in both O. & N. Testaments. For the self-conscious individual, the responsible person, is in the “I.” It is the “I” in self-will without God; the “I” when converted to God, but in bondage of spirit; and the “I” when Christ’s deliverance is known in peace and liberty; as for the latter we see in Rom. 7, 8. Read also Gal. 2:20 . . .

Beyond doubt the union of God and man in one Person is the wondrous and unfathomable One revealed, not for our comprehension, but for unquestioning faith, love, and honor as we honor the Father. He is thus at once the weary man and the only-begotten Son that *is* (not “was” merely) in the Father’s bosom; the Son of man here below that *is* in heaven, and the “I am” on earth threatened by the Jews with stoning because He told them the

49. {Emphasis added to draw attention to the union of two personalities in the Person of Christ.}

50. {Take note that we have already observed JND’s statement that the Son did not change His Person, that He remained the Son and the Word, but humanity was taken into His Person.}

51. {This is an intriguing remark. He may not have been speaking of actual denial of soul in Christ, but of denial of human personality in Christ, which later herein shall be called Apollinarian-ish.}

52. {He is pointing this out because in the Apollinarian view (FER’s view), the “I” is regarded as in the spirit of a man. In Christ, such say, the Divine was the “spirit” of the body; that is, the self-conscious “I.” Rather, the self-conscious “I” in man is in the soul. It is clear that W. Kelly held that Christ had a human, self-conscious “I.” And, there is no reason to doubt that he believed that Christ had a “divine-human personality,” as F. W. Grant stated it.}

truth. He must have been the Logos to have been what He was here as man. His soul was united to the Logos: else the Person had been doubled or severed, and He could not be true and complete man. He cried, Let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt. There was His holy will; and it was right to lay it before His Father, but in entire submissiveness to His will and glory; of which none but a divine Person was capable. It was not therefore the Logos superseding the spirit (still less the soul), but perfectly associated with the soul in His one Person. He was true man and true God in the same indivisible Person. In Him dwelt and dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Yet it is deep pain to feel compelled to speak out plainly, on such a theme not only before others liable to stumble, but in the sense of one’s own danger of offending against God’s word in defense of what is dearer than life, and far beyond man’s thought . . .⁵³

F. W. GRANT

An Open Letter to F. E. Raven. F. W. Grant wrote to FER:

Your very illustration of how He was *not* Man in the sense that He was God is that He was *personally* God, but man in condition.

You had said this also before, and the question has been thereupon put, “Why is He *not personally* man?” and you reply, “He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one” (p. 132).

This makes it plain also what you mean by “He could not change His person.” We all believe that in the sense in which, no doubt, J.N.D. said it. When the Word became flesh, He was still the Word; the eternal Son in manhood was still the Son . . .

The glorious “Man” that Scripture presents to us has disappeared. **Divine-human personality** you must own is not in your mind; and what this means every Christian heart should be able to say.⁵⁴

Yes, your Christian heart should be able to say it is fundamentally evil teaching.

Comment on Heb. 2:14. W. Kelly has already been quoted at length concerning this verse, in a footnote ON P. 8. Here is a comment on this verse by F. W. Grant:

It must be noted here, as it often has been, that while the children are said to be partakers of flesh and blood, -- this “partaking” being a real having in common, a participation of the most thorough kind, - in His own “taking part” another word is used which implies limitation. It does not indeed show the character of the limitation: but the difference between the words makes

53. *F.E.R. Heterodox*, London: Weston, pp. 122-127, 1902. This may also be found in *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 4:78-80, “F.E.R. Heterodox on the Person of Christ.” See also *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 5:62, closing paragraph.

54. *Open Letter to Mr. F. E. Raven*, of Sept. 28, 1897. Boldfaced emphasis added.

us necessarily ask what, in fact, that was: and the answer comes to us immediately, that while **His was true humanity in every particular necessary to constitute it that**,⁵⁵ yet humanity as men have it {i.e., the *state* in which they have it}, the humanity of *fallen* men, was *not* His. Here there must be strict limitation. We must add, as the apostle does afterwards with regard to His temptation, “sin apart.” Sin, with the consequences of sin, He could not take. Death could have no power over Him, except as He might submit Himself voluntarily to it, and this He did; but it was obedience to His Father’s will, and no necessity of His condition, as it is of ours.⁵⁶

The Son Assumed Humanity Into His Own Person.

. . . the manhood He has assumed He retains forever: He has assumed it into His own Person, and it is part of Himself.⁵⁷

P. A. HUMPHREYS

Quoting from the Ravenite *Notes of Addresses and Readings at Quemerford, May, 1895*, P. A. Humphreys wrote:

Some one remarked “Mr. Darby says in the Synopsis on Colossians 1, Christ is God and Christ is man; one Christ.” Mr. Raven’s reply was: “Yes; but you must be careful how you take up an expression like that. In Person He is God; in condition He is man.”

(Reference to the Synopsis shows that what Mr. Darby does say is: “Christ is God, Christ is man; but it is Christ who is the two.” A flat denial of Mr. Raven’s theory.)

However, a questioner asked: “Why is He *not personally* man?” The sophisticated nature of Mr. Raven’s reply needs little comment to any simple-hearted believer. It was: “He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one . . .”

The pretense that the truth leads to the doctrine of a dual personality (“two personalities”) {i.e., two separate personalities} is mere dust for the eyes; every believer can see the truth of the unity of our Lord’s adorable Person, God and Man, but one Christ who is both, can involve no such absurdity.⁵⁸

A. C. ORD

I am quite aware of, and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one person . . . the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in one person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth; but the moment you *deny* personality in the Man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors. What is

55. {“In every particular” includes a human will and a human “I.”}

56. *Numerical Bible, Hebrews, in loco*. Boldfacing is added.

57. *The Crowned Christ*, p. 23.

58. *Remarks on a Paper Entitled “The Person of the Christ,” by F.E.R., Sept. 1895.*

really denied is Christ’s individuality as a man.⁵⁹

This extract from Mr. Darby’s paper “Christological Pantheism,” applies with equal force to Mr. R.’s {F. E. Raven’s} doctrine upon “The Person of Christ” and to those teachings of which it was written. Christ’s human personality is, we shall find, denied by the teaching of the tract before us, as really as it was by the doctors of whom the foregoing sentence was written. To insist upon “Christ’s *individuality*”⁶⁰ as a man, is not to teach “two individualities,” nor does “the simple faith that Jesus was *God and Man in one person*” in any sense involve “a dual personality.” In Him Godhead and Manhood are united in His holy and blessed Person; God in person and Man in person: yet but one Person -- “the Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever.”⁶¹

To acknowledge the truth of the *mystery* of the incarnation is necessarily to own His *humanity* in its proper position as essential to His *Person*, as having now become Man. To us the fact that He became “*in person*” man, (i.e., by taking manhood into union with Himself) is, next to the atonement, which indeed it underlies, the most precious and fundamental truth of Christianity.⁶²

We believe that Scripture, by the enlightening power and grace of the Holy Spirit, teaches in the most unmistakable manner, to the simple soul, these unfathomable truths concerning the Person of Christ, and that, although *no change* has taken place in His eternal Being and Nature, no change of the Person -- He is the same Person, the Son -- yet that this Person *has become*, in assuming humanity, that which He was not before -- He *has become Man*: nor do we confound this truth with that which is inseparable therefrom, and is indeed collateral therewith, namely, the *status* or *condition* or *form* of humanity He took . . .

We fully accept and, by grace, tenaciously hold the truth both of the eternal and unchangeable personality of Christ, and of that which is expressed by the words “form or condition” in their connection with the Person of Christ. The truth of Phil. 2, that He who subsisted in the form of God, emptied Himself, and assumed a servant’s form, is only rightly apprehended when the truth of His human as well as Divine Being is acknowledged. The truth, that the personal identity of the One who was in the form of God and who assumed a servant’s form is unchanged, is absolutely essential to the truth of His Person. It cannot be too strongly insisted on. But together with it the truth must be maintained, that He whose personal identity is unquestionably unaltered and unalterable, who was,

59. {*Collected Writings* 29:212.}

60. The italics are not necessarily in the originals, throughout the quotations; nor the capitals.

61. “*The Man Christ Jesus*” *1 Timothy 2:5 Remarks on a Tract Entitled “The Person of the Christ,”* Present Truth Publishers, p. 1.

62. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

when He became Man, the same Divine Person that He was from eternity, yet this *Person* is He who became something -- “was made flesh” -- He *Himself* became “something which He was not before.”⁶³

That holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God {Luke 1:35}

was spoken of His humanity, as conceived by the Holy Ghost. So indissoluble and inscrutable is this union. But it is plainly seen that the incarnation in this sense has no place in Mr. R’s system. On the one side is a Divine Person in a *condition* of humanity: on the other God Himself -- the Son -- become Man in Person. Will saints reject the truth of the latter for the unreality of the former? If Christ is not personally MAN there is no redemption.⁶⁴

Let us observe one more quotation, noting it carefully regarding the dilemma for the human mind that will not accept the truth of the union of God and man in one Person. The reasoning condemned by A. C. Ord is the same character of reasoning engaged in by those who hold the **Monothelite** heresy, or one of its variants, that Christ could have only one will and one “I”:

The mystery of the union of manhood with Godhead in the Person of Christ, yet in the absolute unity of that Person, leads Mr. R. to reason that there must be either a dual personality {i.e., two separate personalities}, or that He had not true humanity united to Godhead. He has chosen the latter heresy {of these two heresies} : and, because reason can see no escape from the dilemma, he charges his opponents with the former {i.e., what is known as Nestorianism}. Faith bows to the truth of God as revealed in His Word, and refuses either avenue of escape to the difficulty discovered by unbelief. Christ’s manhood is as real as His Godhead. Yet, on the one hand, there is no dual personality, nor, on the other, is His manhood merged in His Godhead by fusion or identity. There is but One Person, who is both God -- really and truly God in Nature and Being and Person, and who is also Man -- really and truly Man in Nature and Being and Person.⁶⁵

No Two Distinct (Separate), or Dual, Personalities in Christ

We just saw that A. C. Ord wrote:

Yet, on the one hand, there is no dual personality, nor, on the other, is His

63. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

65. *Ibid.*, p. 20, note 44.

manhood merged in His Godhead by fusion or identity.

And, we have already observed that W. Kelly said:

Without that union there must have been two distinct personalities, the divine and the human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth according to scripture.⁶⁶

F. W. Grant said:

Divine-human personality you must own is not in your {FER’s} mind; and what this means every Christian heart should be able to say.⁶⁷

These quotations affirm that there was one personality in Christ. Just as He is one Person, so there is one personality. Just as in the one Person there is the human and the divine, so in the one personality there is the human and the divine. It may be expressed this way:

PERSON: God-man

PERSONALITY: divine-human

The soul of the manhood entered Christ’s personality and, of course that soul of manhood had a human will and human “I” (ego), i.e., human personality.

A. C. Ord wrote:

For, as *Nature* is inseparable from “*person*,” it is plain that to deny that He is “*in person*” man, is to deny that His humanity is true human *nature*.⁶⁸

May saints be aroused, and see to it that they are not robbed of Christ in all that He is as a real, true *Man*, yet God withal; the expression bodily of the substance of the Godhead. Inscrutable in Person as incarnate, having united Godhead and Manhood: human as well as Divine as to His Person, having become (“*in person*”) Man, and thus God and Man, but in One Person: accomplishing the work of redemption, as the Man who united in His own Person all the value of His Godhead with the humanity that He took that He might give Himself up: exercising Priestly service towards us in virtue of having taken human *nature*, in which He could suffer and be tempted, and by means of which He is “able to sympathize with our infirmities”: receiving Divine attributes as Man, even in humiliation, and going back as the risen Man into the Divine glory {John 17:5}.⁶⁹ ♦

The denial that He is in *Person* Man, as well as God, robs His work

66. *F.E.R. Heterodox*, p. 124 (*The Bible Treasury*, New Series 4:79).

67. *Open Letter to Mr. F. E. Raven*, of Sept. 28, 1897. Boldfaced emphasis added.

68. “*The Man Christ Jesus*” *1 Timothy 2:5 Remarks on a Tract Entitled “The Person of the Christ,”* Present Truth Publishers, p. 26.

69. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

-- the work of "the *Man* Christ Jesus" -- of all its atoning value by separating it from His Person. By His Manhood alone the work of redemption could not be accomplished. His Godhead is needed to give value thereto. It is the work of *His whole Person*: the infinite value of His Godhead Being in a taken nature -- God and Man -- being essential to the working out of atonement. He brings all the value of all that He is -- He in whom was life -- into His humanity. This glorious Person -- the Son of God -- the Man Christ Jesus -- unites all the infinite worth of His Divine Being with the ability which was required for one who offers Himself to God as a sacrifice in death to accomplish redemption. He gives Himself up in all the infinite meetness and holy perfections of His inscrutable *Person* "for the putting away of sin by His sacrifice."

The two errors mentioned, undermine the truth of life and propitiation so blessedly brought together in 1 John 4:9, 10, "God sent *His only begotten Son* . . . that we might *live* through *Him*," and "God . . . sent *His Son* a *propitiation* for our *sins*." The whole fabric of the glad tidings is overthrown with the denial of these truths. The *Person* of Christ having been touched *nothing* is left untouched.

Are saints *willing* to give up *the truth* of the PERSON of Christ -- His *whole Person* -- for the systematized error of men? or will they not rather awake to the significance of this shameless rejection of Divine truth, and in a day when men "will not endure sound doctrine," be found through God's mercy among those who "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints?"⁷⁰ ♦

70. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

Part 2:

Denial of Human Personality in the Man Christ Jesus is a Form of Apollinarianism

No One Knows Who the Son Is

A. C. Ord wrote:

Though He is rejected by man because of His humiliation (in Matt. 11) -- for the pride of man is "offended" by the lowly guise and form of manhood which He has assumed -- He bows to His Father, who hides these things from the wise and prudent, and reveals them unto babes; and we there learn that so glorious and profound is this mystery of His Person, that it is inexplicable to man. But what is most remarkable, and shows how, on account of His humiliation, His sacred character is guarded, it is not so affirmed of the Father; for while it is said that no man or creature "knoweth the Son but the Father," it is permitted to us by the indwelling of the Spirit to know the Father. "Neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son wills (βούληται) to reveal Him." There is not in the Father that complex glory which exists in the Person of the Son become man, but pure and simple divine character and nature, which could be revealed and made known by the Son. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him" (cp. John 1:18, 14:8, 9, 16:25, 17:6, 25, 26). Hence the glory of the Son who became man, and in consequence exposed Himself to be scrutinized and treated with indignity by the wretched ingratitude of the heart of man, for whose sake He humbled Himself, is safeguarded by the inscrutability which surrounds it. And so jealous is the Holy Ghost, by whom the Gospels are indited, on this subject, that the same truth is repeated still more emphatically in Luke 10:22: "All things are delivered to Me of My Father; and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son wills to reveal Him" {Luke 10:22}. The difference of the language here observable is remarkable; it is not only "no man knoweth the Son, but the Father," but no man knoweth (τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς) who the Son is but the Father," that is, not only His Person cannot be fathomed, but the manner of His existence is wholly incomprehensible to the human understanding.

Who, for instance, can form an idea of the effect of the presence, action, and power of the Holy Ghost in that human nature, the Seed of the woman conceived of the Virgin by His power? For though it was "the

Seed of the woman,” and conceived *of her* according to the promise, and thus of her nature and substance, the action of the Spirit was such, in the miraculous conception of that holy humanity {Luke 1:35}, that the angel says that that Holy Thing born of her could, on this account (as well as in His own higher nature), bear the title of the Son of God. Thus all His human life was in the power of the Holy Ghost, infinitely beyond His marvelous action on saints in earlier days. This explains how, in the sacrificial aspect of His giving up Himself to death, it is said by the apostle Paul in Heb. 9, that He, “*through the Eternal Spirit*, offered Himself without spot to God”; for the Holy Ghost acts in being Himself, in an infinite way, the power of those motives and feelings, which led Him to devote Himself thus for the glory of God, in His death. So again we read, “He was led of the Spirit into the wilderness” to be “tempted of the devil,” and “Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee” (Luke 4).

This was signified of old in the type when the fine flour was *mingled*, as well as *anointed* with oil. We have pointed out the activity of the Spirit of God from the earliest moment in John the Baptist; how then can we limit His energy, and the effect of His *all-pervading presence* thus specially marked, in the case of our Lord Himself? Before the scene in the temple, even from His infancy, we read what could not be said of another, He was “filled with wisdom.” Now wisdom is not only knowledge, but the power or capacity of adjusting the relations of things, or using knowledge rightly. Where can we find another who could tell us what was addressed to Him at the moment of His birth? “I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art My Son; *this day have I begotten Thee*. Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession” (Psa. 2:7, 8). We have seen . . . in Psa. 22 how the sense of conscious relationship, confidence, and hope was expressed by the Lord when He was upon His mother’s breasts; but this goes even farther, for He declares how He was addressed as Son and heir by the Father, on the day of His birth, and what was then pledged to Him, and on what ground.

Of Him alone, in contrast with all others, it is said, “He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him” (John 3:34). A prophet might communicate messages which were given to him, but at other times he spake as other ordinary men; whilst Jesus spake only and always *the words of God*, and nothing else, just because He was God, and spake always by the Spirit of God. If He cast out devils, it was by the finger of God, and by the Spirit of God (Matt. 12:28); but He could also whilst on earth confer on others the power of doing the same and working miracles, to impart which is the prerogative of God alone (Luke 9:1; Mark 6:7). What above all marks the import of the passage, that none knows who the Son is but the Father, is the statement in Colossians, twice repeated, that in Him all the fullness (of the Godhead) is pleased to dwell. Not only this, but “in Him dwelleth all

the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” This statement, true of Him when on earth, is generally supposed to express that He is God incarnate; but far more than this is contained in it. He is corporeally the center of the presence and action of all the divine Persons. He is the Son in His own Person. He manifests perfectly the Father in all His blessed nature; for He can say, “I and My Father are one,” and, “He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.” And all the energies and working of the Holy Ghost, in the scene of evil that surrounded Him, proceeded from Himself as their center. This is expressed in the Revelation, when He is said to be, both now and in the future, possessor of the seven Spirits of God (originally seen before the throne, and subsequently sent forth into all the earth), first in the address to the church at Sardis, and afterwards when seen as the Lamb that had been slain, in the midst of the throne, with seven horns and seven eyes, emblematic of the fullness of divine intelligence, and of active power which He wields in all the universe (Rev. 1:4; 4:5).

It is important to observe, that in both the passages which specially speak of the Lord before the assumption of humanity, and subsequently to His becoming man, His divine personality is always maintained. Nor did He take another personality by becoming man. It is one and the same Person that Scripture presents to us throughout. In Heb. 10, “Then said I, Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God”; “A body hast Thou prepared Me.” The statement, “In the volume of the book it is written of Me,” comprises all that He fulfilled, *after* that He had taken as well as in taking the body prepared for Him. In what follows we read, “But *this man*, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God.” In Phil. 2 He who is subsistent in the form and glory of God, empties *Himself*; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbles *Himself*. The divine personality is not lost by His becoming man, but is marked or distinguished even then, by these acts ascribed to Him. Hence He carried with Him the infinite sense of what He was, and what He came to do. “Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God.” And the result of His intervention never falls below the height of this infinite purpose and presence, as is distinctly shown in His still *humbling Himself*, and fulfilling what was written in these eternal counsels concerning Him. At no moment of His life, from His birth, when He takes the body prepared for Him, to His giving it up on the cross, could this be wanting.⁷¹

71. From *The Collected Writings of A. C. Ord*, Jackson: Present Truth Publishers, pp. 104-105.

On the False Notion of No Human Personality in Christ: “Anhypostasia”

Dr. Phillip Schaff a Denier of Human Personality in Christ

In writings concerning the Person of Christ, by *anhypostasia* is meant that there was no human personality in Christ’s person. This notion is supposed to prevent the result that if there was human personality in Christ, He would be two persons. Philip Schaff, the noted Church historian, who did not believe there was human personality in Christ’s Person, wrote:

The *anhypostasia*, *impersonality*, or, to speak more accurately, the *enhypostasia*, of the human nature of Christ. This is a difficult point, but a necessary link in the orthodox doctrine of the one God-Man; for otherwise we must have two persons in Christ . . .⁷²

There are two things wrong with what he here wrote:

1. “For otherwise we must have two persons in Christ” is his dictum, not the fact, for the union of the two natures means that there is divine-human personality, yet one Person, just as there is divine-human will in Christ, yet one Person.
2. Note that he here asserts that *enhypostasia* is more accurate than *anhypostasia* -- which implies they mean essentially the same thing but one explains it in a better manner. This is false (deceptive) and he was in a position to know that.

Enhypostasia is a term invented, during the ancient Christological controversies, subsequent to the Chalcedon Definition (Oct 22, 451), to reject *anhypostasia*. *Enhypostasia* is meant to entail the (correct) teaching that the humanity of Christ never had existence apart from the incarnation, and no personality apart from the incarnation, but in the incarnation there is human personality. It is an in-hypostasia -- or in-personality -- so to speak.

So, underlying Dr. Schaff’s false statement, regarding two persons resulting from affirmation of human personality in Christ, is the denial that there is human personality in Christ. His claim that *enhypostasia* is a more accurate way to speak of this than *anhypostasis* is an obfuscation. The two words stand in opposition to each other. Still, there are those who use *enhypostasia* the false way that he does.

72. *History of the Christian Church*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 3:757 (1964 [1910]).

I find Dr. Schaff’s reasoning upon Christ’s person revolting to my soul. Here is a sample, the object of which is to deny human personality in Christ:

Nature or substance is the totality of powers and qualities which constitute a being; a person is the Ego, the self-consciousness, self-asserting, and acting subject. There is no person without nature, but there may be nature without person (as in irrational beings).⁷³

The horribleness and offensiveness of bringing in “irrational beings” into this matter ought to be manifest to the reader. Is Christ’s humanity like an irrational being? Well, yes according to this. Christ, He tells us, had human nature without human personality. But did not Dr. Schaff say that Christ had a *rational* soul? Yes.⁷⁴ Is a rational soul irrational? This is how persons writing on the Person of Christ use phrases with their “spin” on it to propagate evil teaching. His bringing up such a thing helps expose the true character of the *anhypostasia* which he holds. He denies the divine-human personality in Christ. Really, it is a denial of Christ’s Person as presented to us in Scripture. What is Dr. Schaff up to? Elsewhere he says

. . . hence he redeemed, not a particular man, but all men as partakers of the same nature,⁷⁵

the doctrine which J. N. Darby combated, as seen in the quotation, below, from him. The denial of human personality in Christ means the denial of His *individuality* as man. Notice that without that human personality, he finds himself able to treat Christ’s humanity as *generic*. Others who believe in an *anhypostatic* human nature in Christ may not embrace what he said in the last quotation above; be that as it may it is a false Christ.

Obfuscating, theological “spinning” of words does not change the real thrust of this denial of human personality in Christ. Vain accusations that you are a Nestorian if you believe in Christ’s divine-human personality is just that: vain dictum, that “otherwise we must have two persons in Christ,” as Dr. Schaff (and others) said, is the pretension of the finite mind to scrutinize Christ’s person. How else know that the result of the incarnation was not divine-human personality in Christ? It is arrived at by a reasoning process and then denying that in Scripture we find Christ saying “I” as man in order to be consistent with their human reasoning.

I do not believe those who say that the Chalcedon creed has “its doctrine of the impersonality of the human nature” as Dr. Schaff said, below. Here, from

73. *History of the Christian Church* 3:751.

74. “Christ has a rational human soul . . .” *ibid.*, p. 752.

75. *The Creeds of Christendom*, Grand Rapids: Baker 1:30, sixth ed. [1931].

him, is “The Symbol of Chalcedon” Oct 22, 451:

We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable [rational] soul and body; consubstantial [coessential] with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us,⁷⁶ without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the God-head, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the Manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, *inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably*; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one Subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets from the beginning [have declared] concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the Creed of the holy Fathers has handed down to us.⁷⁷

Dr. Schaff’s claim that,

. . . its doctrine of the impersonality of the human nature has most struck the eye,

is a figment of his imagination. David F. Wells wrote:

The Definition asserted that it was to a human nature (*ousia*) rather than a person (*hypostasis* of *prosōpon*) the divine Word was joined. This means that all of the human qualities and powers were present in Jesus, but that the ego, the self-conscious acting subject, was in fact a composite union of the human and divine . . . His human nature, therefore, had no existence except in that union with the divine which had created this single person; apart from this hypostatic union, the human nature had no personality of its own.⁷⁸

In, and only *in*, that union, then, -- i.e., because of it -- that human nature had personality of its own. Following are some questions in Dr. Well’s conclusion to his book, which I take to be rhetorical:

Can one have human nature that is devoid of a personal center? And if it is devoid of this center, is it not lacking the very thing which needs most to be redeemed? Does the Cyrilline doctrine, if understood in this way

76. {Really? but without human personality, as Dr. Schaff claims, He would not be in all things like us.}

77. Phillip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* 2:62-63.

78. *The Person of Christ*, p. 108.

{i.e., answering yes to these questions}, not also fall under the same condemnation as did Apollinarianism?⁷⁹

Of course; yes, yes, and yes. We will consider further this matter of denial of human personality in Christ’s Person being Apollinarian, below. Dr. Wells also rightly noted that:

The truth is, however, that it was possible to be Chalcedonian in theory but to formulate principles concerning the relation of the natures which in practice subverted the orthodoxy which was believed.⁸⁰

Dr. Schaff’s doctrine *is* subversive of the truth of Christ’s Person and is Apollinarian-ish in character.

Sorry to say, the Chalcedon Definition emerged in a context of foul and fleshly violence, as many history books document. But the truth of Scripture does not rest on creeds.

There is another important thing to point out concerning the abuse of the word *enhypostasia*. It was Leontius of Damascus that brought forward enhypostasia as expressing that Christ’s humanity never had existence prior to, or outside of, the incarnation and the human personality never had existence outside the incarnation, but received human personality in the incarnation. David H. Wells wrote:

Chalcedon had merely stated, without supporting explanation, that there were two natures in Christ. This seemed to pose an awkward choice if an explanation were to be sought. Either the natures were joined in hybrid union or they were merely loosely associated in a common personality. Both solutions had their difficulties. Leontius broke through this dilemma by employing Aristotelian reasoning. He argued that nature cannot exist separately from its concrete expression in personhood. It cannot be *anhypostatic* (existing impersonally), but must be *enhypostatic* (finding its expression in personhood). This, of course, challenged the common Platonic habit of imagining that forms could be known apart from their concrete realization in this world. It meant that for Leontius the full humanity of Christ was only completed in its union with the Word. This was, of course, less than what the monophysites hoped for. They contended that Christ’s human nature was impersonal. By contrast, the Western Antiochenes argued that it had full personality prior to incarnate union. Leontius’ enhypostatic union was a *via media* between these positions.⁸¹

79. *Ibid.*, p. 177.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 124.

81. *The Person of Christ*, p. 112.

Let us now observe that the designation Nestorianism is used to indicate the idea that Christ was actually two Persons -- not a union of two natures in one Person. (It appears that scholars are more and more believing that Nestorius (died 451) himself did not believe what was attributed to him, but that followers of him did hold such a view of Christ, i.e., that Christ was two persons.)⁸² Apollinarius the younger (c. 310 - c. 390) denied that the Lord had a human spirit and having but an animal soul, the deity filling the place of the rational soul.⁸³

It was the purpose of the Chalcedon Definition to state the doctrine of Christ's person as lying between these two views, excluding them as well as several other heresies. Chalcedon actually limited certain things but did not explicitly address some matters directly (though really implicitly) such as Christ having two wills, which was affirmed later in church history. However, the words in the Chalcedon Definition, "consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, . . ." ⁸⁴ are implicitly sufficient to include human will and human personality in the words "consubstantial with us"; but in Christ the union of the divine and human in Him results in divine-human personality as it does in divine-human will.

Divine-Human Personality in Christ Avoids Both Nestorianism and Apollinarianism

Another wrote:

To take what are generally regarded as the most conspicuous points in the history of Christology, there was in Apollinarianism a sort of pruning away of the humanity of Christ, excluding a rational human soul, principally with the idea of maintaining intact the singleness of His personality.⁸⁵ Nestorianism, again, brought the two natures into no more

82. See, for example, David F. Wells, *The Person of Christ*, Westchester: Crossway books, p. 106 (1984).

83. Generally, "rational soul" in these discussions meant combined in one what Scripture speaks of as spirit and soul (called dichotomy: rational soul and body) as opposed to trichotomy, that is the three-fold composition of man: spirit, soul, and body -- which I hold but the discussion will use "reasonable soul" as the participants in these discussions generally do. Some say Apollinarius believed in the tripartite nature of man. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, thinks that cannot be definitely said.

84. {Really? but without human personality, as Dr. Schaff claims, He would not be in all things like us, not complete man, nor made in all things like His brethren, sin apart.}

85. {Yes, and the Chalcedon Definition was supposed to deny Apollinarianism, which was maintaining the singleness of Christ's personality; i.e., denying human personality in Christ, i.e., (continued...)

than sympathetic harmony with one another, and by holding them too far apart the person was no longer an irrefragable unity.⁸⁶ Eutychianism, in the very opposite direction, merged the two natures into one compound, a confusion not at all counterbalanced by the singleness of personality still retained. The statement of the Council of Chalcedon propounds no theory; but merely asserts the unity of personality and duality of the natures.⁸⁷

It may be objected to this correct statement that the Chalcedon Definition does not use the word personality. True, the word is not there but the truth of it is there. Therefore let it be repeated again: "consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us, . . ."

In Apollinarianism, the Logos took the place of the "rational soul." Since the personality is in the "rational soul" -- as the non-material part of man was designated -- presumably this (evil) solution avoided making Christ into two persons. Many evil teachings have arisen out of claiming to be protecting the truth. Do supporters of *anhypostasia* mean there is nothing between Apollinarianism and Nestorianism but their *anhypostasia* view? Apparently so. But the fact is that an *anhypostasia*-Christ is not complete man, fully man, nor is such a human nature lacking human personality, for He is "consubstantial with us." He was made in all points like us, *sin apart* (Heb. 4:15 -- for His humanity was *holy*, Luke 1:35). He is "the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. 2:5). Deny divine-human personality in Christ and you deny His individuality as man, making His manhood a generic thing, impersonal.

The understanding given in this paper is not Nestorian. Not at all, for the union of the two natures means the union of personality (divine-human personality in irrefragable unity) as the union of the two natures means the union of will (divine-human will in irrefragable unity). The alleged consequence that having divine-human personality would result in Christ being two persons is mere assertion -- dictum. Why does this mean two persons? Because those who say so, say so. They have scrutinized the Person of Christ with their finite intelligence and decree that divine-human personality is an impossibility. Why is it impossible? Because they say so.

The truth of what is at work in the denial of divine-human impersonality in Christ is that the *anhypostasia* view seeks to accomplish what Apollinarianism was supposed to accomplish: namely, the avoidance of two personalities in

85. (...continued)

denying divine-human personality in Christ. This remark is connotation-loaded; pay attention to it.}

86. "Irrefragable" means "incapable of being refuted; unanswerable; incontestible; undeniable." It may contain the thought of unbreakable.

87. J. T., *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 8:143.

Christ because, they say, that would mean a Nestorian-type Christ. And why would that mean a Nestorian Christ? Because they say so.

To believe in the union of the two natures, in irrefragable unity, is not the belief of a Nestorian, and means that Christ is two persons.

***Christ’s “Reasonable Soul,”
“Two Centers of Consciousness,”
and “One Self-consciousness”***

An Anhypostasia View

It is asserted by some holding the *anhypostasia* view that Christ had a “reasonable soul,” “two centers of consciousness,” and “one self-consciousness.” I suppose that in the *anhypostasia* view personality must be connected with one center of consciousness (the divine) and no personality with the other center of consciousness (the human). I suppose that means that the center of consciousness *without personality* (the human) must be centered in the “reasonable soul.” This is semantic juggling and obfuscation.

It is also held that there are two wills in Christ, divine will and human will. I suppose that means that these wills are in the respective centers of consciousness. Because of the union of the two natures, that means in Christ there is divine-human will. Yet the human will may express itself. But the *anhypostasia* view rejects human personality in Christ. WHY? because their reason (not faith) says that cannot be -- as the Apollinarian F. E. Raven said that you cannot have two personalities in one -- another human dictum of intrusion of the mind. It is the mind of man scrutinizing the inscrutable.

The truth is that as the human will in Christ may be expressed without dividing the person, so may the human personality in Christ be expressed without dividing the person. In Christ’s Person there is divine-human will and divine-human personality.

Christ’s “reasonable soul” does not lack human personality merely because the *anhypostasia* view asserts that it is so.

***W. G. T. Shedd’s Rejection of the False Use of This
“One Self-Consciousness” of the Anhypostasia View***

W. G. T. Shedd (1820-1894, American Presbyterian) remarked upon Christ’s self-consciousness:

For, if we have reference merely to his *self-consciousness* or personality, Jesus Christ is neither human, nor divine, but is Divine-human. Contemplating Him as the resultant of the *union* of God and man, He is not to be denominated God, and He is not to be denominated man; but He is to be denominated *God-Man*. The “person” of Jesus Christ, as distinguished from the “natures” that compose it, is a *theanthropic* person.⁸⁸

. . . His personality is as truly infinite as it is truly finite.⁸⁹

He is saying that the personality of Christ, the self-consciousness of Christ, is neither divine or human alone, but is Divine-human. But for those who hold the *anhypostasia* view and speak of the self-consciousness of the Person of Christ, they strip that self-consciousness of the union of the divine-human self-consciousness. That is Apollinarian-ish. We shall see what the character of this false view is below, in the words of J. N. Darby.

The truth is that in Christ there is both divine “I” and human “I” -- divine-human “I” in irrefragable unity -- which human “I” may express itself as does the human will, but *never otherwise than in the irrefragable unity in His Person*.

***J. N. Darby’s Rejection of
the Anhypostasia View***

The doctrine of no human personality in Christ’s Person opens the door for the notion that Christ in the incarnation united Himself with humanity, as such, or in Dr. Schaff’s case, “He redeemed, not a particular man, but all men as partakers of the same nature,” opening the door for all sorts of evil teachings, as shown in J. N. Darby’s papers, “Union in Incarnation, The Root Error of Modern Theology,” and “Christological Pantheism,” in *Collected Writings*, vol. 29.⁹⁰ Christ’s humanity was *sui generis*,⁹¹ (of its own order, and united to God the Son, as no one else’s humanity was) and not united to men or mankind.⁹² Moreover, our Lord’s holy humanity was the instrument of the impulse the divine will gave to it. Here in manhood He had taken the place of submission

88. W. G. T. Shedd, *A History of Christian Doctrine*, Minneapolis: Klock and Klock, 1:401 (1978 [1889]). I understand, and appreciate his defense of the truth of Christ’s Person, but we do speak of Him as the man Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 2:5), etc.

89. *Ibid.*, p. 404.

90. See also *Collected Writings* 31:223, *Letters* 2:395; *Notes and Jottings* p. 189.

91. *Collected Writings* 15:147-149.

92. *Collected Writings* 31:223; 29:191.

and dependence. The union is inscrutable.

Say, "Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight." Such is His yoke, and thus we learn of Him, who ascribed all to the Father, not to the circumstances. Hence He gave thanks to the Father always for all things, as we may and ought to do in His name. "It seemed good in thy sight." That was enough. It was perfect submission, and the Father beamed out in it. Its value hangs on the perfect knowledge of sonship. The whole is most blessed, and to be learned only in Christ. The infiniteness of the Son's divinity was kept up, in His humanity, and therefore apparent humiliation and present inferiority, by His absolute inscrutability therein thus specially and signally maintained; while His oneness with the Father was made known in His competency to reveal, and supremacy of will in revealing, the Father. Both hold their place most beautifully, maintaining the Person in the glory of communion with the Father, and the inscrutability of God thus manifested while the Father was revealed.⁹³

Such a One might on occasion express His human will, as in submission to the Father Who was ever displayed in every word, work, and way of the Son. So it was that human "I" was displayed -- never in independence of divine "I" on account of that irrefragable union of divine-human personality in the man Christ Jesus. Concerning that human "I" J. N. Darby wrote:

But as I am on this point, I add, they have no true Christ at all. I read,

How such human nature, as body, soul, and spirit, including a human will, could be held in personal union with the divine, so that this humanity was complete, without a human personality or ego,⁹⁴ we cannot understand, but we believe it is a mystery revealed for faith.

Where? {is that a mystery revealed for faith?}

Why does the blessed Lord say, "Not my will but thine?"

Why does He say, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" if there was no ego, no human personality?

Why does Hebrews quote, "will I sing praise," and "will put my trust in him," "behold I and the children which God hath given me," if there was no I (ego) ?

Why does He say, "My God and your God, my Father and your Father" (not our), if there was no personality? *

And this last remark, that Christ never says "our" with His disciples, I borrow from a European minister of some note, thoroughly imbued with the German system, where it is at home, not borrowed, and itself spoiled, as it is at Mercersburg. And this last statement, that Christ had no human

93. *Collected Writings* 21:26.

94. {Take note that JND is refuting the idea that Christ had no human "I."}

personality, no ego,⁹⁵ which is really heresy (though God and man were united in one person), and the mere folly of man attempting to fathom the mystery of His Person, when He has said, "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father," is found in the article of one by no means the worst of their doctors.⁹⁶

* I am quite aware of and accept the ordinary orthodox statement of two natures in one person, though what was at first insisted on as orthodox as to *upostasis* {i.e., hypostasis} was afterwards condemned, and the meaning of the word changed; but the statements quoted in the text are really Monothelite. It shows the danger of those early discussions, for the simple faith that Jesus was God and man in one Person can be easily accepted as plain and vital truth; but the moment you deny personality in the man Christ Jesus, you run into a thousand difficulties and errors. What is really denied is Christ's individuality as a man, as it is in terms elsewhere.

The Anhypostasia View Is Apollinarian-ish

Apollinarius' View

The *anhypostasia* view appears to avoid Apollinarianism by asserting that Christ has a "reasonable soul" -- for Apollinarius believed that the Logos filled the function of the spirit in man (with which the rational faculty is connected). But when the *anhypostasia* view uses the words "reasonable soul," it excludes human personality from the soul. Such a view *denies His individuality as a man*, rather imposing a generic manhood on the Person of Christ.

Thus, Apollinarius removed what for him was the 'problem' of human personality in Christ by removing the "reasonable soul," as some would call it, from Christ's Person (by saying the Logos filled the place of the human soul). The *anhypostasia* view leaves the "reasonable soul" and removes the human personality from the "reasonable soul" allowed to be in Christ's Person. So, like Apollinarius, they, too, get rid of the human personality. This is important to consider when the charge of Nestorianism is leveled against the totally non-Nestorian understanding that in Christ's person there is divine-human personality in irrefragable unity, in one Person. The untrue charge is leveled from an Apollinarian-ish view of Christ's person.

In an article, "Nestorius," we read:

. . . the personality in Christ resided in His divinity, not in His humanity.

95. {Take note that JND equates the human personality of Christ with having an ego, i.e., an "I." Well, of course.}

96. *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:212.

So in fact, the reasonable soul of man, which is the center of the human personality, participates in the suffering and the death-struggle of the body, though the soul itself does not and cannot die. The Antiochian theology, however, could not conceive a human nature without a human personality, and this it strictly separated from the divine Logos.⁹⁷

Here the Antiochian (Nestorian) theology is (rightly) rejected, for the human personality in Christ is not to be “strictly separated from the divine Logos”; but, by stripping the human personality from the reasonable soul of man and making the personality of Christ reside in the divinity (that would be the Logos, as Apollinarius said) in an Apollinarian-ish manner, the result is an Apollinarian-ish evil teaching instead of the *divine-human* personality in irrefragable unity.

Millard Erickson (1932 - Southern Baptist) wrote:

The major point of anhypostatic Christology is that the man Jesus had no subsistence apart from the incarnation of the Second Person of the Trinity.⁹⁸ It supports this thesis by denying that Jesus had any individual human personality.

The problem with this position is that to think of Jesus as not being a specific human individual suggests that the divine Word became united with the whole human race or with human nature; taken literally this idea is absurd. It is true that we occasionally say that Jesus was united with the whole of the human race, but we do so figuratively on the grounds of basic characteristics shared by all its members. We do not have in mind a literal physical uniting with the whole human race. An additional difficulty with anhypostatic Christology is that in attempting to avoid one heresy, it may fall into another. The insistence that Jesus is personal only in his divine dimension manifestly excludes something vital from his humanity. Denying the individual humanness of Jesus intimates that he was predominantly⁹⁹ divine. And that smacks of Apollinarianism.¹⁰⁰

Yes, we may say of the denial of human personality in Christ: “*And that smacks of Apollinarianism.*”

Stanley J. Gretz, *et. al.*, say:

Traditionally, the church has rejected the anhypostasis theory as an

97. McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, Baker reprint (1981 [1867-1887]), 6:973.

98. {This much expresses the truth. The next sentence points to the error.}

99. {“Predominantly” does not seem the best choice of word here.}

100. *Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 748, sec. ed., 1998.

inadequate explanation of Christ’s person.¹⁰¹

The *anhypostasia* theory is worse than an “inadequate explanation of Christ’s person. It really, in effect, denies His true Manhood, His complete, full, Manhood, His individuality as man, a most solemn thing! He is “the man, Christ Jesus” (1 Tim. 2:5).

“*God and man are one Christ.*”

F. E. Raven an Apollinarian

William Kelly said something in his strictures on F. E. Raven, who held the doctrine of Apollinarius, concerning the doctrine of Christ when he wrote these words in 1890:

It is to join Apollinarius of Antioch (the son). He too made the Logos simply form Christ’s Person, as F.E.R. does, and was therefore justly branded as an antichrist; so Nestorius was for dividing the Person and Eutyches for confusing it, all of them strict Trinitarians. For if the Logos had not been united to the soul as to spirit and body in the Christ, Christ was not and is not very Man as well as very God. Without that union there must have been two distinct personalities, the divine and the human. It is the union of both in one Person which alone secures the truth according to scripture. F.E.R. with shameless self-confidence vaunts his idea, which is plain heterodoxy. He does *not* “bring the doctrine” of Christ. The Son did not change His Person, but took up manhood into unity, and this in soul as in body.

In some such way deadly false doctrine befalls such as venture to pry into what is only known to the Father and immeasurably above man’s ken.
*The Apollinarian heterodoxy prevails largely at present . . .*¹⁰²

I much doubt that by the emphasized remark he meant that the “Apollinarian heterodoxy” prevailing largely in his day (1902, when written) means the denial in actual words of the “reasonable soul” in Christ, but rather he meant the denial of human personality in Christ.

Concerning F. E. Raven, one of his dicta was this. Quoting from the Ravenite *Notes of Addresses and Readings at Quemerford, May, 1895*, P. A. Humphreys wrote:

. . . However, a questioner asked: “Why is He not *personally* man?” The sophistical nature of Mr. Raven’s reply needs little comment to any simple-

101. *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms*, Downers Grove, Inter-Varsity Press, p. 10 (1999). See also Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, Grand Rapids: Baker (1985), in which *anhypostasis* appears under the word **persona**.

102. “F. E. R. Heterodox,” *The Bible Treasury*, New Series 4:79; emphasis added.

hearted believer. It was: “He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one . . .”

The pretense that the truth leads to the doctrine of a dual personality (“two personalities”) {i.e., two separate personalities} is mere dust for the eyes; every believer can see the truth of the unity of our Lord’s adorable Person, God and Man, but one Christ who is both, can involve no such absurdity.¹⁰³

T. H. Reynolds’s Apollinarian-ish View

Regarding F. E. Raven’s lieutenant, T. H. Reynolds, J. Hennessy pointed out this:

In the *Synopsis* {written by J. N. Darby} we read, “His complete person” (5, 18).¹⁰⁴ Let the reader note the presentation of the Lord’s divine person on earth, *assuming to be what He was not*, according to these teachers, who deny to Him a human “I.” T.H.R. wrote (Letter of December 3rd, 1895, circulated in Dublin):

The blessed Lord could say “I” as God -- before Abraham was “I” am. He could say “I” as Man -- “I will put my trust in Him (God),” but when we ask who was the conscious “I” the answer is, the Son of God speaking as Man on earth.

Thus the blessed Lord is represented as personating a human “I”!! . . .

Where is the Man Christ Jesus in this “I”? This is F.E.R. and T.H.R.’s Christ! The doctrine involves the denial of Jesus Christ come in the flesh (2 John 2:7), for it denies Him to be a perfect human *person*.¹⁰⁵

This statement in the letter by THR is quoted also in N. Noel’s *History* where he condemned it, writing:

That Christ was God, possessing an *impersonal humanity*, became the Christ of Mr. Raven, as well as of his lieutenants.^{106 107}

This statement by T. H. Reynolds is put forward today as if it is the truth of Christ’s person. ***It is a form of Apollinarianism.***

Commenting on what is quoted below from J. N. Darby, A. C. Ord wrote:

This extract from Mr. Darby’s paper “Christological Pantheism,” applies

103. *Remarks on a Paper Entitled “The Person of the Christ,”* by F.E.R., Sept. 1895.

104. {*Synopsis* 5:12; also *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 29:101.}

105. *An Answer to . . . What is Ravenism?* pp. 22, 23.

106. *The History of the Brethren* 2:547.

107. Quoted from my *Human Personality of the Man Christ Jesus Denied by F. E. Raven and T. H. Reynolds: Heretics and Heterodox*, p. 3, Jackson: Present Truth Publishers (2004).

with equal force to Mr. R.’s {F. E. Raven’s} doctrine upon “The Person of Christ” and to those teachings of which it was written. Christ’s human personality is, we shall find, denied by the teaching of the tract before us, as really as it was by the doctors of whom the foregoing sentence was written. To insist upon “Christ’s *individuality*¹⁰⁸ as a man,” is not to teach “two individualities,” nor does “the simple faith that Jesus was *God and Man in one person*” in any sense involve “a dual personality.” In Him Godhead and Manhood are united in His holy and blessed Person; God in person and Man in person: yet but one Person -- “the Christ, who is over all, God blessed for ever.”¹⁰⁹

Again:

The writer of the tract is surely not unaware of the fact that J. N. D. taught that in John’s Gospel “We always find Christ *personally as Man*,” and yet F. E. R. at Quemerford, in reply to the question “Why is He not *personally* man?” replied, not with J. N. D. that He was so, but that, “He is personally the Son. You cannot have two personalities in one.” Did then J. N. D. teach “the idea of two personalities”? Mr. R. knows he did not. Yet he taught distinctly and unequivocally that He was personally Man. Why then the effort to square these contrary teachings? They distinctly clash.

Some Additional Affirmations of Human Personality in Christ’s Person

A. A. Hodge’s True View on Christ’s Person

In contrast to *anhypostasis* is A. A. Hodge (1823-1886 American Presbyterian, son of Charles Hodge). We will hear his edifying words at length and attention is directed especially to points 7-9 and 14 where he wrote:

7. What are the three points involved in the true doctrine of the person of Christ as the incarnate Son of God?

1st. The absolute divinity of Christ as the eternal Son of God, the second person of the Trinity. 2d. The perfect manhood of Christ; the presence in his divine person of a true body and a reasonable soul, which, beginning to exist only in union with the Godhead, never had a distinct personal subsistence. 3d. The person, therefore, is the eternal Son of God, into which personality has been assumed, and in which is ever more sustained a perfect human nature; so

108. The italics are not necessarily in the originals, throughout the quotations; nor the capitals.

109. The *Collected Writings of A. C. Ord*, Jackson: Present Truth Publishers, p. 150. The paper quoted is available as a pamphlet also: “The Man Christ Jesus.”

that he ever more continues one person, constituted of two entire and distinct natures.

8. *How may it be proved that Christ is really a man?*

He is called man, 1 Tim. 2:5. His most common title is Son of Man, Matt. 13:37, also seed of the woman, Gen3:15 ; the seed of Abraham, Acts 3:25; Son of David, and fruit of his loins, Luke 1:32; made of a woman, Gal. 4:4. He had a *body*, ate, drank, slept, and increased in stature, Luke 2:52; and through a life of thirty-three years was recognized by all men as a true man. He died in agony on the cross, was buried; rose, and proved his identity by physical signs, Luke 24:36-44. He had a *reasonable soul*, for he increased in wisdom. He exercised the common feelings of our nature, he groaned in spirit and was troubled, he wept, John 11:33, 35. He loved Martha and Mary, and the disciple that Jesus loved leaned upon his bosom, John 13:23. . .

9. *How may it be proved that both these natures constituted but one person?*

In many passages both natures are referred to, when it is evident that only one person was intended (Phil. 2:6-11). In many passages both natures are set forth as united. It is never affirmed that divinity abstractly, or a divine power, was united to, or manifested in a human nature, but of the divine nature concretely, that a divine being was united to a human being. -- Heb. 2:11-14; 1 Tim. 3:16; Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3, and 1:3, 4; 9:5; John 1:14; 1 John 4:3.

The union of two natures in one person is also clearly taught by those passages in which the attributes of one nature are predicated of the person, while that person is designated by a title derived from the other nature. Thus human attributes and actions are predicated of Christ in certain passages, while the person of whom these attributes or actions are predicated is designated by a divine title. -- Acts 20:28; Rom. 8:32; 1 Cor. 2:8; Matt. 1:23; Luke 1:31, 32; Col. 1:13, 14.

On the other hand, in other passages, divine attributes and actions are predicated of Christ, while his person, of whom those attributes are predicated, is designated by a human title. -- John 3:13; 6:62; Rom. 9:5; Rev. 5:12.

10. *What is the general principle upon which those passages are to be explained which designate the person of Christ from one nature, and predicate attributes to it belonging to the other?*

The person of Christ, constituted of two natures, is one person. He may therefore indifferently be designated by divine or human titles, and both divine and human attributes may be truly predicated of him. He is still God when he dies, and still man when he raises his people from their graves.

Mediatorial actions pertain to both natures. It must be remembered, however, that while the person is one, the natures are distinct as such. What

belongs to either nature is attributed to the one person to which both belong, but what is peculiar to one nature is never attributed to the other. God, i.e., the divine person who is at once God and man, gave his blood for his church, i.e., died as to his human nature (Acts 20:28). But human attributes or actions are never asserted of Christ's divine nature, nor are divine attributes or actions ever asserted of his human nature.

11. *What were the effects of this personal union upon the divine nature of Christ?*

His divine nature being eternal and immutable, and of course incapable of addition, remained unaffected by this union. The whole immutable divine essence continued to subsist as the same eternal person. That divine person now embraced a perfect human nature, exalted by, yet dependent upon, the divine nature, to which it is united.

12. *What were the effects of that union upon his human nature?*

The human nature, being perfect after its kind, began to exist in union with the divine nature, and as one constituent of the divine person, and as such it ever continues distinct and unconfounded.

The effect of this union upon Christ's human nature, therefore, was not so much change as exaltation of all natural and possible human excellence, in degree above every other creature, John 1:14; 3:34; Isa. 11:2; together with an unparalleled exaltation of outward dignity and glory, above every name that is named, and a community of honor and worship with, the divinity in virtue of its union therewith in the one divine person.

13. *How far is the human nature of Christ included in the worship due to him?*

We must distinguish between the object and the grounds of worship. There can be no proper ground of worship except the possession of divine attributes. The object of worship is not the divine excellence in the abstract, but the divine person of whom that excellence is an attribute. The God-man, consisting of two natures, is to be worshiped in the perfection of his entire person, because only of his divine attributes.

14. *If Christ had a reasonable soul how can we escape the conviction that he was a human person?*

It is indeed a great mystery that the unity of personality ¹¹⁰ should remain in the God-man, while there are two centers of consciousness, an infinite knowing on the one hand, and a finite knowing on the other, and two distinct

110. {"The unity of personality" is what I have been calling "divine-human personality in irrefragable unity."}

though ever harmonious wills. The fact, however, that God took, not a man, but a human nature into his eternal personality, is clearly revealed in Scripture. The one person is both God and man. The mystery remains for the exercise of our faith.¹¹¹

Robert L. Dabney

In refuting the notion of peccability in Christ, Robert L. Dabney (1820-1898) wrote:

But, 1st, It is the unanimous testimony of the Apostles, as it is the creed of the Church, that the human nature never had its separate personality. It never existed, and never will exist for an instant, save in personal union with the Word.¹¹²

“It never existed . . .” apart from the incarnation, of course, and it exists in personal union with the Word. Neither did His human soul exist apart from the incarnation. Neither did His human will exist, save in personal union with the Word. And this is conveyed by the word *enhypostasia*.

L. Berkhof Rejects Human Impersonality in Christ

Louis Berkhof (1873-1958 (?), Christian Reformed Church), under the heading “The Unipersonality of Christ,” with the sub-heading, “Propositions in Which the View of the Church May be Stated,” wrote:

- b. The human nature of Christ as such does not constitute a human person. The Logos did not adopt a human person, so that we have two persons in the Mediator, but simply assumed a human nature. Brunner declares that it is the mystery of the person of Jesus Christ that at the point where we have a sinful person, He has, or rather is, the divine person of the Logos.
- c. At the same time it is not correct to speak of the human nature of Christ as impersonal. This is true only in the sense that this nature has no independent subsistence of its own. Strictly speaking, however, the human nature of Christ was not for a moment impersonal. The Logos assumed that nature into personal subsistence with Himself. The human nature has its personal existence in the person of the Logos. It is in-personal rather

111. *Outlines of Theology*, New York: Carter, pp. 283-286 (1861).

112. *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 471 (1980 [1878]).

than impersonal.¹¹³

Emory H. Bancroft

In connection with the subject of human personality, Emery H. Bancroft stated it this way:

It was a human nature that found its personality only in union with the divine nature. In other words, it was human nature impersonal in the sense that it had no personality separate from the divine nature and prior to its union therewith.

By the impersonality of Christ’s human nature we mean only that it had no personality before Christ took it, no personality before its union with the divine. It was human nature whose consciousness and will were developed only in union with the personality of the Logos.¹¹⁴

Beware of someone who says that the Son took impersonal humanity and lets the matter stand thus without adding that humanity in the Person of Christ was personal humanity.

William G. T. Shedd

In a chapter on “Christ’s Unipersonality,” William G. T. Shedd (1820-1894, Presbyterian) wrote:

That the two natures constitute only one person, is also proved by the fact that in Scripture human attributes are ascribed to the person as designated by a divine title; and divine attributes are ascribed to the person as designated by a human title. This interchange of titles and attributes¹¹⁵ in respect to one and the same person proves that there are not two persons, each having its own particular nature and two classes of attributes in common . . .

Similarly, there arises in the person of the God-man two general forms of consciousness . . .¹¹⁶

It should be kept in mind that there cannot be two centers, or forms, of consciousness without there being two wills and two “I”s.

113. *Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, p. 322 (1979 [1941, Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition])

114. *Christian Theology*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, p. 102, 153 (1961).

115. {See *Collected Writings of J. N. Darby* 10:49.}

116. *Dogmatic Theology* 2A:316, 320, Minneapolis: Klock and Klock (1979 [1889]).

Benjamin B. Warfield

Benjamin B. Warfield (1851-1921, Presbyterian) said:

What is meant is that our Lord took up into His personality a human nature . . .

Nevertheless, from the beginning to the end of the whole series of books {of the NT}, while first one then the other of His two natures comes into repeated prominence, there is never a question of conflict between the two, never any confusion in their relations, never any schism in His unitary personal action; but He is obviously presented as one, composite indeed, but undivided personality . . .

The mysteries of the relations in which the constituent elements in the more complex personality ¹¹⁷ of Our Lord stand to one another are immeasurably greater than in our simple case {of spirit, soul, and body}. We can never hope to comprehend how the infinite God and a finite humanity can be united in a single person; and it is very easy to go astray in attempting to explain the interactions in the unitary person of natures so diverse from one another. ¹¹⁸

William Cunningham

William Cunningham (1805-1861, Scotch Presbyterian) wrote:

Christ had been from eternity God over all; He assumed human nature into union with the divine. The divine nature of course continued unchanged, because it is unchangeable. Did the human nature also continue unchanged, distinct from the divine, though inseparably united with it? Christ is uniformly represented to us in Scripture as being *prima facie* a man -- a full partaker of human nature in all its completeness. If it be asserted that He had not human nature in its entirety and perfection, or that anything essential to human nature was wanting in Him, the *onus probandi* must lie upon those who make this assertion; for the obvious import of the general declaration of the incarnation, and the general bearing of the representation

117. Why speak of the "complex personality or Our Lord," if there is only divine personality in Christ? No doubt divine-human personality is meant. W. E. Ward wrote:

. . . especially the one unified personality of Christ the Son in his two natures, human and divine ("Hypostasis" in Walter A. Elwell, ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*, Grand Rapids: Baker, p. 539, 1985).

C. A. Blaising wrote:

The human nature, not an impersonal appendage, has its personal subsistence in the Logos (*Ibid.*, article "Hypostatic Union," p. 540).

118. Article, "Person of Christ," in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 2340, 2347, (1949 [1939]).

given us of Christ during His abode upon earth, plainly lead to an opposite conclusion. There is no evidence whatever in Scripture that Christ wanted anything whatever to make Him an entire and perfect man, or possessor of human nature in all its completeness; and, on the contrary, there is direct and positive proof that He had every essential property of humanity . . .

He took a reasonable soul, possessed of all the ordinary faculties of the souls of other men, including a power of volition {i.e., will}, which is asserted in opposition to the error of the Monothelites . . .

That word {of God} plainly represents Christ to us as being and continuing a true and perfect man, after the human nature had been assumed into union by the divine. ¹¹⁹

Augustus H. Strong

Augustus H. Strong (1836-?), Baptist) approvingly quoted William G. T. Shedd, as above. He also quoted Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 136:

Yet this humanity never had a separate personal existence, -- its personality had been developed only in connection with the divine nature. ¹²⁰

He himself remarked:

The two natures are bound together . . . by a bond unique and inscrutable, which constitutes them one person with a single consciousness and will, -- this consciousness and will including within their possible range both the human nature and the divine. ¹²¹

Comments by A. B. Bruce on The Prevailing Reformed View

In view of the following quotation, recall that Dr. Schaff wrote:

The *anhypostasia*, *impersonality*, or, to speak more accurately, the *enhypostasia*, of the human nature of Christ. This is a difficult point, but a necessary link in the orthodox doctrine of the one God-Man; for otherwise we must have two persons in Christ . . . ¹²²

He is using *enhypostasia* as if it means no personality in Christ. Dr. Bruce wrote:

119. *Historical Theology* 1:312, 313, London: The Banner of Truth Trust, (1969 [1862]).

120. *Systematic Theology*, Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society 2:679 (1907).

121. *Ibid.*, p. 684.

122. *History of the Christian Church*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 3:757 (1964 [1910]).

The Reformed theologians were not altogether of one mind as to the relations of the humanity of Christ to the category of personality. The prevailing view, however, was that the human nature of our Lord, while *anhypostatos* in itself, was *enhypostatos* through the logos.¹²³

This uses the two words regarding the matter of human personality in Christ and Dr. Bruce's comment quite clearly lets us know that the prevailing view among the Reformed was that in Christ's Person is human personality. This is the scriptural doctrine of Christ. This is Jesus Christ come in flesh.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article is to affirm the human personality of the Lord Jesus in the face of the heretical denial of His human personality that has continued for over a century, being presently repeated -- an heretical denial in the form of denying that He had a human personality, a human "I", particularly in the form of expression enunciated by T. H. Reynolds (a lieutenant of the Apollinarian, F. E. Raven), who specifically denied it in this formula:

The blessed Lord could say "I" as God -- before Abraham was "I" am. He could say "I" as Man -- "I will put my trust in Him (God)," but when we ask who was the conscious "I" the answer is, the Son of God speaking as Man on earth.

As J. Hennessy said:

Thus the blessed Lord is represented as personating a human "I"! . . .

We have read the sound words of J. N. Darby affirming the human personality of our Lord -- that He had a human will and human "I", human *ego*, a human personality. We have read the sound words on the Person of Christ from W. Kelly, F. W. Grant, and others, who opposed F. E. Raven's denial of human personality in the Person of Christ. And, we have read similar affirmations of the human personality of the Lord Jesus from a selection of authors in Christendom who are orthodox on the Person of Christ. Well, then, how is it with you and me? Let us hold fast the truth of Christ's Person:

affirming His manhood: spirit, soul -- with human "I" (ego) and human will -- and body;

affirming the union of two personalities, the divine and the human, in One Person;

affirming His "divine-human personality";

affirming that He is in person Man and in person God, yet One Person, the God-man;

affirming His individuality as a Man, the Man Christ Jesus.

The wonderful truth is that the Son of God *took complete humanity into His Person!* -- at the instant of the incarnation, by the overshadowing power of the Holy Spirit.

123. *The Humiliation of Christ* . . ., New York: Armstrong, pp. 384-385 (sec. ed. 1887).

Appendix 1:
Extracts from A. C. Ord Concerning
the Unity of the Two Natures in Christ
as Expressed in Scripture

Faith knows and delights to recognize “both what is human and what is divine” in the blessed Person of Christ. But this distinguishing, now generally advocated by rationalistic writers, is most dangerous ground to get upon, and it is wholly false to say that the Gospels ever do this. On the contrary, as we have said, they ever keep Him before us in the unity of His Person. No doubt they present, as has been stated, sometimes more of the divine and sometimes more of the human; and doubtless some acts are more characteristically divine in their nature, and others more characteristically human. But even in specifically human acts, to attempt to draw the line, even as to these, or to *exclude* what is divine from them, and *vice versa*, is not permissible; and if reverence and faith and love for that blessed One are allowed to have their place, such an attempt will be at once checked. Take, for instance, the Lord touching the leper. No doubt it was with a human hand that He does so; but that blessed hand conveys divine virtue and power, and dispels the leprosy in a moment. And the words, “I will, be thou clean,” expressive of divine title and authority, coming forth from human lips, and a heart filled with infinite love, accompany His touch, which in any other than His would have involved defilement. So when “the whole multitude sought to touch Him,” the Spirit of God adds, “for there went virtue out of Him and healed them all.” Even in death (which is an act of a specific human character), we have seen that the divine purpose and nature (Heb. 10), not only gave all force and meaning to the assuming the body prepared for Him, but characterized the wondrous offering of that body on the cross; so that God could find His infinite pleasure and satisfaction in it. No man could take His life from Him. He had power to lay it down, and power to take it again. In a similar way we are not only told, that, whilst voluntarily submitting to it for our sakes, He could not be holden of death, for He was the Prince of Life; but He gives His flesh for the life of the world, and he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever. This life in Him overcomes all the power of death, and this is here extended distinctly to His humanity.

In this His divine title and exemption from death, save by His own act, as well as His resurrection power, appear. He adds, “Therefore doth My Father love Me, because I lay down My life, that I might take it again”; i.e., it was the voluntary nature of this act, and loving obedience to His Father in it, that constituted its value.

Thus, though we do not call divine acts human nor human acts divine, the Scripture shows us that, in His acts, the human and divine combine or mingle. If

this is denied, His blessed Person is divided, and all the value of what He does, and is, is lost. This does not imply any confusion or transformation of the human into the divine, or the divine into the human; but it implies a union intimate and perfect, in His blessed Person, which will be our joy, as it is the ground of our confidence, throughout eternity. An union which is impenetrable and unfathomable, but because of which it could be said, when He was on earth, “The Son of man which is in heaven.”¹²⁴ ♦

First, as to the union of the divine and human natures in His glorious Person, we affirm that this unity is everywhere implied or expressed in Scripture.

Secondly, as to the names, titles, or designations that He bears, we assert that they all, without exception, include or carry with them Divine attributes.

Thirdly, as to the relations, positions, and offices, between God and man, which He fills, we declare that they all, and in every aspect, imply and involve the whole glory of His Person.

Fourthly, as to the work of expiation which He has accomplished, we appeal to every Christian that the thought as well as the reality of what He was, as God, in accomplishing it, must always and of necessity be brought into it.

Far be it from us to pretend to comprehend or explain the mode or manner of the precious and all-important union of the divine and human natures in the Person of Christ. The very thought of thus subjecting that ever blessed Person to such intrusion of the human mind is abhorrent to us. Love and loyalty alike forbid the thought of thus dishonoring, by irreverent curiosity, Him whom faith, whilst allowed to gaze on His perfections, contemplates with holy adoration and worship. But whilst owning that in the depth of His Person this Holy One of God is altogether unfathomable,¹²⁵ yet we may bring forward the universal testimony of Scripture as to *the fact*, the necessity, and the display of this unity; for all this is distinctly revealed to us.¹²⁶ ♦

124. *The Collected Writings of A. C. Ord*, Present Truth Publishers, pp. 107, 108.

125. Even in our own persons we have an illustration of this incomprehensibility, for we also are constituted of two natures, body and soul being united in one person. But *how* these two natures, the physical and the spiritual, are united, or how they mutually act and react upon one another is beyond our power to conceive or fathom; and though the natures are distinct, to separate them in practical actions is impossible. I take up a child in my arms and embrace it; a man would be a fool to say “You did this with your body, not with your spirit” for, being but one person, none can say how far my spirit entered into the action. If we are thus baffled, and get out of our depth in attempting to penetrate the mystery of our own being, how much more, *without making a parallel*, must this be the case with the infinite Person of the Son of God. {Emphasis added.}

126. *Ibid.*, p. 135

Appendix 2:

The Impeccability of Christ's Person

The reader might have thought the title would read: "The Impeccability of Christ's Humanity." Such a title would be, of course, quite correct. However, we have seen that the humanity that the Son of God took, He took *into His Person*, and that there is but one Person, not two -- not, 'one divine person and one human person.' That this is so precludes the possibility of there being in His Person a peccable humanity.

I have seen a Calvinistic explanation that the Lord could not sin because His humanity was like a wire welded to a strong steel bar which cannot bend -- the union of the human and divine. While I appreciate the teaching of impeccability by such a writer, the truth is that the humanity the Son took into His Person was not innocent, as was Adam when ignorant of good and evil -- Christ's humanity was holy (Luke 1:35); thus not capable of sinning. It was holy humanity by the overshadowing power of the Spirit. It was humanity in a holy state, not merely in an innocent state (which is capable of falling -- as happened, in fact in Adam's case). Once the Lord comes and the old nature in us is gone, there will be only the new nature and the life of Christ in us. Thus, that seems to me to be a holy state also. Moreover, humanity can be in a glorified state, which is true of the Lord consequent upon resurrection; so will it be with us when we are with Him and like Him.

So, humanity can be in various states, but it is the same humanity. For example, the Lord's humanity in a glorified state is the same humanity as was His when here on earth in a non-glorified state. So Adam fell from an innocent state to a fallen state, but he was the same Adam. And when born again, he was the same Adam. And in glory, he will be the same Adam, though having passed through these various states. There is an "I" of identity, so to speak, that subsists in the various states.

The Lord's humanity had human "I" and a human will. It was a complete humanity. This humanity was taken into the Person of the Son in such a (inscrutable) manner that there did not result the situation that He was then two persons -- two persons who could be split apart because the human person could have sinned and gone into eternal punishment. The reader ought to be able to understand that the notion of a peccable Christ implicitly includes that the result of such a teaching is that He is two persons! This is an evil concept of Christ. The result of the union of the human and the divine was that there was one Person. People say, "I cannot understand how that could be." And what makes them think that that inscrutable union is understandable to man's mind? He is the God-man and has divine-human personality. He is not two separate persons. He is not two

separate personalities. Such is the union of the human and divine in Him.

Let our souls get hold, by faith, of the truth that the holy Son of God took holy humanity into His person, and there is but one Person.

I repeat, the peccability view is an implicit denial of the union of the two natures. Implicit in the peccability view is the idea that the humanity can be separated from the Person of Christ. Implicit in the peccability view is that Christ is two persons, one of which could sin and be sent to hell -- by the other of the two persons. It is utterly shocking and revolting evil. I do not say that all persons who hold to the notion that Christ was peccable have thought this through, but that does not change the meaning of their doctrine.

* * * * *

Present Truth Publishers has available a paper dealing more fully with this matter, called, *Could Christ Sin?*

Recommended Reading Concerning Ravenism Available from Present Truth Publishers

- ❖ *The Collected Writings of A. C. Ord*, containing magisterial papers examining the doctrine of FER and setting forth the truth of Christ's Person. Those papers were highly recommended to me by A. C. Brown many years ago.
- ❖ "The Man Christ Jesus" 1 Timothy 2:5, *Remarks on a Tract Entitled "The Person of the Christ,"* by A. C. Ord, not found in the above book.
- ❖ *Human Personality of the Man Christ Jesus Denied by F.E. Raven and T. H. Reynolds* {including two papers:} *Heresy as to the Person of Christ*, by W. S. Flett, and *Heterodoxy Ancient and Modern on the Personality of the Lord Jesus Christ*, by J. Hennessy, edited by RAH.
- ❖ *An Answer to . . . What is Ravenism*, by J. Hennessy.
- ❖ *The Eternal Relations in the Godhead*, RAH, containing exposition of fundamental truths denied by FER, and also containing photostatic copies of numerous papers exposing FER, as well as being the most complete history of the Raven division.
- ❖ *Divine Attributes and the Second Man*, by W. T. Whybrow; and, *The truth of Christ's Person: Is It Taught by Mr. F. E. Raven? by W. T. Whybrow.*
- ❖ *Denial of Human Personality in Christ's Person as Published by F. E. Raven (1837-1903), T. H. Reynolds (1830-1930), J. A. Trench (1839-1922), Hamilton Smith (1862/3-1943), W. R. Dronsfield (today).*