

A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century  
– Vol 3 Theology – Vol 4 Christology –  
Vol 5 Pneumatology



A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century –  
Vol 3 Theology – Vol 4 Christology – Vol 5  
Pneumatology

Dr. Edward Rice

Copyright: Creative Commons Attribution 2.0

"Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format, and Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially."

Published by  
Good Samaritan Baptist Church GSBaptistChurch.com  
54 Main St.. Box 99, Dresden, NY 14441  
<https://www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch>

ISBN 978-1-387-47335-9



Cover Design and Photographs by:  
Edward G. Rice

Principle Scripture Quotations are from the non-copyright  
King James Authorized Version

## Table of Contents

<u>Volume 3 Theology Proper.....</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Chapter 1 Where did God come from?.....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Chapter 2 A Proper Theology Proper.....</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Chapter 3 A Proper Naturalistic Theism.....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Chapter 4 Theology Proper in Bible Doctrine.....</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>Cambron's Ch 1 Theology (The Doctrine of God).....</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>I. The Names and Titles Of God.....</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>II. The Existence of God.....</u>	<u>26</u>
<u>III. The Nature of God.....</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>IV. The Attributes of God.....</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>V. The Fatherhood of God.....</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>Chapter 5 Critique of Other Systematic Theology Works.....</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>Critique of Chafer's Chapter 10-13 Theology Proper (129-180).....</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>Critique of Chafer's Chapter 14 The Attributes of God (187-224).....</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>Critique of Chafer's Chapter 15 Divine Decrees (pg. 225-259).....</u>	<u>68</u>
<u>Critique of Chafer's Chapter 16 The Names of Deity (260-271).....</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>Critique of Chafer's Chapter 17-19 Trinitarianism (272-317).....</u>	<u>70</u>
<u>Chapter 6 Theology Proper Conclusion.....</u>	<u>72</u>
<u>Bibliography for Theology.....</u>	<u>74</u>
<u>Volume 4 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ.....</u>	<u>79</u>
<u>Chapter 1 – Christology Introduction.....</u>	<u>79</u>
<u>Chapter 2 Christology in Bible Doctrine.....</u>	<u>82</u>
<u>Cambron's Ch II Christology (The Doctrine of Christ).....</u>	<u>83</u>
<u>I. Names and Titles of Christ.....</u>	<u>84</u>
<u>A. Jesus.....</u>	<u>85</u>
<u>B. Christ.....</u>	<u>88</u>
<u>C. Messiah.....</u>	<u>89</u>
<u>D. Lord.....</u>	<u>89</u>
<u>E. Jesus Christ.....</u>	<u>90</u>
<u>F. Christ Jesus.....</u>	<u>91</u>
<u>G. The Lord Jesus Christ.....</u>	<u>91</u>
<u>H. I Am.....</u>	<u>91</u>
<u>I. The Son of God.....</u>	<u>92</u>
<u>J. The Son of Man.....</u>	<u>92</u>
<u>K. The Son of Abraham.....</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>L. The Son of David.....</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>M. The Son of the Highest.....</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>N. Second Man.....</u>	<u>93</u>
<u>O. Last Adam.....</u>	<u>94</u>

P. The Word.....	94
Q. Emmanuel.....	94
R. Saviour.....	94
S. Rabbi.....	94
T. Rabboni.....	94
U. Master.....	95
<b>Chapter 3 – Christ The “I AM” and Modernist Deletions.....</b>	<b>96</b>
The “I AM” references of Christ.....	96
The Modernist bibles vs Names of Christ.....	103
<b>Chapter 4 – The Incarnation of Christ.....</b>	<b>106</b>
Cambron's Christology Section II. The Incarnation of Christ.....	106
A. The Fact of the Incarnation.....	107
B. The Manner of the Incarnation.....	108
C. The Objections to the Incarnation.....	111
D. The Objects of the Incarnation.....	114
E. The Perpetuity of the Incarnation.....	117
F. The Proofs of the Incarnation.....	118
The Wolves Without Attack.....	118
The Wolves Within Attack.....	119
<b>Chapter 5 – The Two Natures of Christ – Cambron's III.....</b>	<b>122</b>
A. The Humanity of Christ.....	123
B. The Deity of Christ.....	127
C. The Blending of the Two Natures in One Person.....	132
D. Errors Concerning the Two Natures of Christ.....	132
<b>Chapter 6 - Christ's Human Limitations and Kenosis.....</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>Chapter 7 – The Death of Christ – Cambron's IV.....</b>	<b>145</b>
A. The Fact of the Death.....	145
B. The Form of the Death.....	146
C. Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Death.....	147
D. Scriptural Names of Christ’s Death.....	148
E. The Objectives of the Death.....	150
F. The Extent of the Death.....	150
G. The Results of the Death.....	151
<b>Chapter 8 – The Resurrection of Christ – Cambron's V.....</b>	<b>155</b>
A. The Importance of the Resurrection.....	155
B. The Meaning of the Resurrection.....	156
C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Resurrection.....	157
D. The Proofs of the Resurrection.....	159
E. The Result of the Resurrection.....	162
<b>Chapter 9 – The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ – Cambron's VI.....</b>	<b>164</b>
A. The Meaning of the Ascension and Enthronement.....	164
B. The Message of the Ascension and Enthronement.....	165
C. The Nature of the Ascension and Enthronement.....	166
D. The Necessity of the Ascension and Enthronement.....	166

E. The Purpose of the Ascension and Enthronement .....	167
F. The Results of the Ascension and Enthronement .....	167
<b>Chapter 10 – Critique of other Systematic Theology Christology</b>	
<b>Works.....</b>	<b>169</b>
Critique of John Miley's 1892 Methodist Christology.....	169
Miley's Chap V. Leading Errors In Christology.....	171
Answering Miley – Kenosis Does Harmonize Scripture.....	189
Critique of Charles Hodge's 1878 Presbyterian Christology.....	192
Critique of Augustus Strong's 1907 “Baptist” Christology.....	193
Critique of Thiessen's 1949 “Baptist” Christology.....	197
Thiessen's Christology .....	201
Thiessen's Little Value Added .....	201
Critique of Chafer's 1948 Christology.....	202
Dr Chafer's Introduction to The Pre-incarnate Christ.....	205
Dr Chafer's seven fold divisions of Christology.....	206
Dr. Chafer's "The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate".....	211
+Critique of Geisler's 2002 Christology.....	213
<b>Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ.....</b>	<b>216</b>
<b>Chapter 12 – Christology Conclusion.....</b>	<b>230</b>
<b>Volume 5 Pneumatology The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit.....</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Pneumatology Introduction.....</b>	<b>232</b>
The Holy Ghost vs The Holy Spirit of God.....	236
The “Comforter” Is The Best English Word.....	239
<b>Chapter 2 Cambron's Doctrine of the Holy Ghost (Pneumatology). .241</b>	
I. Personality of the Holy Spirit.....	243
II. The Deity of the Holy Spirit.....	246
III. The Work of the Holy Spirit.....	249
<b>Chapter 3 The Baptism of vs The Filling of the Holy Ghost.....</b>	<b>278</b>
Finney's Ch 1 Power From On High .....	278
Finney's Ch 2 What Is It? .....	282
Finney's Ch 3 The Enduement of The Spirit .....	286
<b>Chapter 4 Holiness – Pentecostal Movement Touching Pneumatology</b>	
.....	289
The Bible and the Role of the Woman.....	295
The Woman's Role in Home, Church, and Society.....	298
<b>Chapter 5 Other Systematic Theologies on Pneumatology.....</b>	<b>299</b>
Charles Hodge's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology .....	299
Augustus H. Strong's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology .....	303
Charles Finney's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology .....	305
Henry Clarence Thiessen's 1949 “Baptist” Pneumatology.....	306
Thiessen's Pneumatology .....	309
Thiessen's Little Value Added .....	310
Lewis Sperry Chafer's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology .....	310
<b>Chapter 6 Pneumatology Conclusion.....</b>	<b>313</b>





# Preface

Greetings in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

As a USAF retired systems engineer turned Baptist Preacher of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and armed with a staunch belief in the preserved accuracy of the inspired Scriptures, I praise the Lord that he has provided me the unique opportunity to assemble “A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.”



As a systems engineer for thirty years (since 1972), I focused on systems analysis. Systematic theology has intrigued me ever since my first Bible institute course in 1975. I have amassed multiple systematic theology books and never found one that is wholly Biblical. In 2013 my seminary work at Louisiana Baptist Theological Seminary, under Dr. Steven Pettey, assigned me to read and analyze six volumes of “Systematic Theology” by Lewis Sperry Chafer, the founder and previous president of Dallas Theological Seminary. Initial critique of this neo-evangelical's voluminous, wordy, often unorganized work, answered the question, “Is there not a cause?” A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century is indeed a valid need. It cried out to be written and it was a work that I was privileged to endeavor.

God says he built man with an inner knowledge of the Creator's eternal power and Godhead. Further, God reveals from heaven, to every man, his wrath against all ungodliness. This true Light “*lighteth every man that cometh into the world.*” The Bible says the righteous God, The LORD of hosts, tries the reins and the heart of every man. The prophet Jeremiah writes of God, “*I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.*” The psalmist says, “*my reins also instruct me in the night seasons.*” With his tugs on the reins of your heart, you have come far in your studies, be sure that you have come to a knowledge and submissive acceptance of God's only begotten Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. The beloved Apostle John wrote, “*And many*

*other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.”*

Every Bible student is encouraged to follow through a list of Bible verses called by some the Romans road to heaven. The believing Bible student is encouraged to memorize them. That quintessential list of verses is John 3:16-19, 36, 5:24, Romans 3:10, 23, 5:8, 12, 18-19, 6:23, and 10:9-13. That last reference is God's formal acceptance policy for your receiving his free gift of salvation and eternal life. Got life? The beloved Apostle John writes, *“He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.”* Selah! It is Hebrew for “go-figure”, and it intends that you pause, meditate, and consider what you just read.

After due consideration of the sole source of a systematic theology an appropriate course of study would entail the study of God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. That is course of study for Volume 03 – Theology, Volume 04 – Christology and Volume 05 – Pneumatology. Such a discipline establishes a foundation for the other studies of this systematic theology.

When I began work on my Ph.D. in 2014 I set a goal to finish this Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century in a five year period. When I finished my Ph.D. in 2017, I reestablished the same goal. This year, after publishing at least a draft of all twelve volumes in 2019, the goal remains. My plea for critique and correction also remains the same. I prefer friendly and constructive critique, but have found the hostile ones to be enlightening and beneficial for rounding out a stronger defense of truth. Feel free to engage in this effort, the many inputs I have received have strengthened the cause.

There is a cause. I pray that this prolegomena fully captures at least that.

Theology Proper

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century –

Vol 3 Theology

Dr. Edward Rice

### Volume 3 Theology Proper

Theology proper is the thorough study of God the Father and is distinguished from the larger study of “Theology” that might engulf the whole study of the Godhead and all things about God.

Learning about God is paramount for a Christian and fundamental for all humanity, as is borne out in scripture:

*That all the people of the earth may know that the LORD is God, and that there is none else.* 1Kings 8:60<sup>1</sup>

*Who is like unto the LORD our God, who dwelleth on high, Who humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven, and in the earth!*

Psalm 113:5-6

*O taste and see that the LORD is good: blessed is the man that trusteth in him.* Psalm 34:8

*Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that the LORD he is God; there is none else beside him.... Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the LORD he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else.*

Deuteronomy 4:35,39

*I am the LORD, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me:... That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the LORD, and there is none else.* Isaiah 45:5-6

Having knowledge of God is to be paramount, overriding, and preponderant, having superior power and influence, is to be predominant, very common and prevalent, and is to predominate,

---

1 The Holy Bible

become larger in quantity, power, status or importance.

For Israel it was paramount:

*Hosea 4:1 Hear the word of the LORD, ye children of Israel: for the LORD hath a controversy with the inhabitants of the land, because there is no truth, nor mercy, nor knowledge of God in the land.*

*Hosea 6:6 For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.*

For the Christian it is paramount:

*1Corinthians 15:34 Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak this to your shame.*

*2Corinthians 10:5 Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;*

*Colossians 1:10 That ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God;*

*2Peter 1:2 Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord,*

Its quest is ongoing and not easily attained:

*Romans 11:33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!*

For every human, a knowledge of God starts as a first instinct and ingrained commodity; the Bible says “*For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.* (Romans 1:18,19) It goes on to clarify that this knowledge of

God's eternal power and Godhead was visible and seen in man since God first made him, *“For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse”* (1:20). This sentence of scripture continues to clarify that both mankind corporately and every human individually, in their fallen depraved nature, suppress this knowledge of God, *“Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened”* (1:21).

Further the Bible says the righteous God, The LORD of hosts, tries the reins and the heart of every man. The prophet Jeremiah writes of God, *“I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.”* (Jeremiah 17:10). The psalmist says, *“my reins also instruct me in the night seasons”* (Psalm 16:7). With his tugs on the reins of every heart, the Bible says there is also a knowledge of his Only Begotten Son, the Messiah (Christ) and Redeemer of mankind, the Word that became flesh was the True Light and it says in that tremendous introduction of the Apostle John, *“That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”* (John 1:9).

This instinctive God induced knowledge of God does not become paramount until it grows. Philosophers of society likes to pretend that every human has a small spark of “goodness” inside them and if this spark is fanned before it is extinguished it will grow to produce a man that is good in heart. In Bible reality it is a spark of the knowledge of God, it is never extinguished, and God has the fan. Even so there are steps to be taken that can grow this knowledge and make it paramount.

To find and grow this knowledge of God there are eight steps given in the first sentence of Proverbs 2.

*My son, if thou wilt (1) receive my words, and (2) hide my commandments with thee; So that thou (3) incline thine ear unto wisdom, and (4) apply thine heart to understanding; Yea, if thou (5) criest after knowledge, and (6) liftest up thy voice for understanding; If thou (7) seekest her as silver, and (8) searchest for her as for hid*

*treasures; Then shalt thou understand the fear of the LORD, and **find the knowledge of God.***

In the next three volumes of this systematic theology the pursuit of this knowledge of the Godhead will be predominant and is meant to predominate.

Theology Proper is designated 'Proper' to distinguish this study from the larger use of the word Theology. It is thus narrowed to just the study of *Theos*. literally the study of God, but such is not by any means narrow. Again, the second part of the term, *ology* comes from the word *logos*, and means a “*word, a discourse, a doctrine, a teaching, a matter under discussion, a thing spoken of or talked about, also the mental faculty of thinking, meditating, or reasoning about*” Again, the English word *science*, cannot capture the depth of *ology* in *Theology*, nor can the English word *study*. Ergo, Theology Proper shall be genuine *Theology* and it shall be thorough.

A legitimate beginning of such a topic might be framed in a question. Where did God come from?

## Chapter 1 Where did God come from?

Previous systematic theologies spend undo time and effort wrestling with the ontological<sup>2</sup> and teleological<sup>3</sup> proof that there is a God. The Bible spends no effort in such vain philosophies of man. The Bible asserts, as previously presented, that man was created with an instinctive knowledge of the existence of God. This instinctive knowledge of his existence does not necessarily answer the common question, “Where did God come from?”

In a creation debate of years gone by Dr. Kent Hovind answered the question “Where did God come from?” with great finesse as follows:

The question where did God come from assumes, obviously it displays, that you are thinking of the wrong God, because the God of the Bible is not effected by time, space, or matter. If he is effected by time, space, and matter, then obviously he is not God. Time, space, and matter is what we call a continuum; all of them have to come into existence in the same instant. Because if there were matter and no space, where would you put it? If there were matter and space and no time, when would you put it?

You cannot have time, space, and matter independently, they have to come into existence simultaneously. The Bible answers that in ten words, “In the beginning...” there is time, “God. Created the heaven...” there is space, “and the earth,” there is matter. So there you have time, space, and matter, created. It is a trinity of trinities, because you know time is past, present, future, space has length, width, and height, and matter has

---

2 [www.merriam-webster.com](http://www.merriam-webster.com) › dictionary, s.v. ontology, “ 1 : a branch of metaphysics concerned with the nature and relations of being, Ontology deals with abstract entities. 2 : a particular theory about the nature of being.”

3 [www.vocabulary.com](http://www.vocabulary.com) › dictionary , s.v. teleological, “starting from the end and reasoning back, explaining things based on their end purpose. A teleological statement you've probably heard before is "everything happens for a reason."



solid, liquid and gas. You have a trinity of trinities created instantaneously, and the God who created them has to be outside of them.

If he is limited by time, he is not God. The god who created this computer is not inside the computer, he is not running around in there changing the numbers on the screen. The God who created this universe is outside of the universe. He is above it, outside it, beyond it, through it...he is unaffected by it. So in the concept that a spiritual force cannot have any effect on a material body... well then I guess you would have to explain to me things like emotions, and love, and hatred, and envy, and jealousy, and rationality.

I mean if your brain is just a random collection of chemicals that formed by chance over billions of years, how on earth can you trust your own reasoning processes and the thoughts that you think? (Applause) Your question, "Where did God come from?" is assuming a limited God, and that is your problem. The God that I worship is not limited by time, space, or matter. If I could fit the infinite God into my three pound brain, he would not be worth worshiping, that is for certain. So that is the God I worship, Thank you.<sup>4</sup>

Dr. Hovind certainly adds some sound *ology* to this topic but a more formal consideration of Theology Proper is in good order here.

---

4 Kent Hovind, *Creation vs Evolution Debate*, transcribed by the author from a VHS tape, Kent Hovind has done hundreds of debates, this was in one of them, they may be viewed at <http://creationism.org/videos/index.htm> and purchased at <https://drdino.com/>. [After Dr. Kent Hovind's wrongful imprisonment he emerged with some foreign doctrines of eschatology which this author does not endorse.]

## Chapter 2 A Proper Theology Proper

A systematic theology section titled “Theology Proper” is always found a little wanting in previous works. Christianity needs one to capture all the organization of Charles Hodge and all the detail of Augustus Strong, while avoiding, yeah even exposing, all the error of Westminster decrees and the other foreign sources they cited. One which instead uses the Holy Bible as its sole source and final authority. One which sidesteps the overriding bearing of Hodge's reformed theology. One which exposes Strong's evolutionary blunder and glorifies the LORD God in detailing his wondrous work of creation. A systematic theology needs to have Holy Scripture as its sole authority and expose the vain philosophies of man and dogma's of the Romans. Such a work is want to be made, and its draft is presently before you.

Excellent organized works of theology have gone before. Charles Hodge, known as the Father of Printed Systematic Theologies, is best organized, and Augustus Strong is most detailed. Both outlines are shown below and they should, in reality, be merged into one work for completeness in a thorough and sound work. Such merging would need sound and careful attention because neither Hodge, nor Strong used the Holy Bible as their sole source. Indeed, neither did Thiessen, Chafer, or Geisler. Previous systematic theologies all attempt to compile “everything that was ever believed about God,” whether that be philosophers or Roman theologians. This work strives to document everything revealed about God, by God and that revelation comes only from the Holy inspired, inerrant, infallible, preserved words of God.

Charles Hodge organized his Theology Proper in 436 pages thus:

- 1) Origin of the idea of God, 191-203 (13pgs 3%);
- 2) Theism, 204-240 (37 pgs 8%);
- 3) Anti-Theistic theories, 241-334 (94pgs 22%);
- 4) knowledge of God, 335-365 (31pgs 7%);
- 5) The Nature of God and His Attributes, 366-441 (76pgs 17%);
- 6) the Trinity, 442-482 (41pgs 9%);
- 7) The Divinity of Christ, 483-521 (39pgs 9%);
- 8) The Holy Spirit, 522-534 (13pgs 3%);
- 9) The Decrees of God, 535-549 (15pgs 3%);
- 10) Creation, 550-574 (25pgs 6%);

- 11) Providence, 575-616 (42pgs 10%);  
and
- 12) Miracles, 617-636 (20pgs 5%).

Augustus Strong had a far more detailed even exhaustive organization of his theology proper. It is shown below:

PART IV. "THE NATURE, DECREES, AND WORKS OF GOD, 243-370

**Chapter I. The Attributes of God, 243-303**

- I. Definition of the term Attributes, 244
  - II. Relation of the Divine Attributes to the Divine Essence, 244-246
  - III. Methods of Determining the Divine Attributes, 246-247
  - IV. Classification of the Attributes, 247-249
  - V. Absolute or Immanent Attributes, 249-275
    - First Division. Spirituality, and Attributes therein involved, 249-254
      - 1. Life, 251-252
      - 2. Personality, 252-254
    - Second Division. Infinity, and Attributes therein involved, 254-260
      - 1. Self-existence, 256-257
      - 2. Immutability, 257-259
      - 3. Unity, 259-260
    - Third Division. Perfection, and Attributes therein involved, 260-275
      - 1. Truth, 260-262
      - 2. Love, 263-268
      - 3. Holiness, 268-275
  - VI. Relative or Transitive Attributes, 275-295
    - First Division. Attributes having relation to Time and Space, 275-279
      - 1. Eternity, 275-278
      - 2. Immensity, 278-279
    - Second Division. Attributes having relation to Creation 279-288
      - 1. Omnipresence, 279-282
      - 2. Omniscience, 282-286
      - 3. Omnipotence, 286-288
    - Third Division. Attributes having relation to Moral Beings, 288-295
      - 1. Veracity and Faithfulness, or Transitive Truth, 288-289
      - 2. Mercy and Goodness, or Transitive Love, . . . 289-290
      - 3. Justice and Righteousness, or Transitive Holiness, 290-295
  - VII. Rank and Relations of the several Attributes, 295-303
    - 1. Holiness the Fundamental Attribute in God, 296-298
    - 2. The Holiness of God the Ground of Moral Obligation, 298-303
- Chapter II. Doctrine on the Trinity, 304-352**
- I. In Scripture there are Three who are recognized as God, 305-322
    - 1. Proofs from the New Testament, 305-317

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

- A. The Father is recognized as God, 305
  - B. Jesus Christ is recognized as God, 305-315
  - C. The Holy Spirit is recognized as God, 315-317
  - 2. Intimations of the Old Testament, 317-322
    - A. Passages which seem to teach Plurality of some sort in the Godhead, 317-819
    - B. Passages relating to the Angel of Jehovah, . . . 319-320
    - C. Descriptions of the Divine Wisdom and Word, 320-321
    - D. Descriptions of the Messiah, 321-322
  - II. These Three are so described in Scripture, that we are compelled to conceive them as distinct Persons, 322-326
    - 1. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from each other, 322
    - 2. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from the Spirit, 322-323
    - 3. The Holy Spirit is a Person, 323 326
  - III. This Tri-personality of the Divine Nature is not merely economic and temporal, but is immanent and eternal, 326-330
    - 1. Scripture Proof that these distinctions of Personality are eternal, 326
    - 2. Errors refuted by the Scripture Passages, . . . 327-330
      - A. The Sabellian, 827-328
      - B. The Arian, 328-330
  - VI While there are three Persons, there is but one Essence, 330-334
  - V. These three Persons are Equal, 334-343
    - 1. These Titles belong to the Persons, 834-336
    - 2. Qualified Sense of these Titles, 335-340
    - 3. Generation and Procession consistent with Equality, 340-343
  - VI. The Doctrine of the Trinity inscrutable, yet not self contradictory, but the Key to all other Doctrines, 344-352
    - 1. The Mode of this Triune Existence is inscrutable, 344-345
    - 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity is not self-contradictory, 345-347
    - 3. The Doctrine of the Trinity has important relations to other Doctrines, 347-352
- Chapter III The Decrees of God, 353-370**
- I. Definition of Decrees, 353-355
  - II. Proof of the Doctrine of Decrees, 355-359
    - 1. From Scripture, 355-356
    - 2. From Reason, 356-359
      - A. From the Divine Foreknowledge, 356-358
      - B. From the Divine Wisdom, 358
      - C. From the Divine Immutability, 358-559
      - D. From the Divine Benevolence, 359
  - III. Objections to the Doctrine of Decrees, 359-368
    - 1. That they are inconsistent with the Free Agency of Man, , 359-362
    - 2. That they take away all Motive for Human Exertion, 363-364
    - 3. That they make God the Author of Sin, 365-368

IV. Concluding Remarks, 368-370

1. Practical Uses of the Doctrine of Decrees, 368-369
2. True Method of Preaching the Doctrine 369-370 <sup>5</sup>

Both Charles Hodge and Augustus Strong's outlines need to be stripped of their Presbyterian - "Doctrine of Decrees", but they each detail an exceptional consideration in this theology proper, Strong presenting an exhaustive coverage. A Theology Proper section in a new 21<sup>st</sup> century Systematic Theology work should be exhaustive but based solely on the revelations found in the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God. Since Hodge and Strong tried more-so to capture "everything ever believed about God" and their "everything" included the decrees and platitudes of Roman Catholic theologians and the Westminster Confession, this work will eliminate significant portions of their considerations but remain Biblically thorough.

We will herein consider, then, a Biblical naturalistic theism, a solid doctrine of God from Dr. Cambron's thorough and Biblically accurate Bible Doctrines book and then some pointed critiques of Dr. Sperry Chafer's Systematic Theology. In the Word of God there are steps given so that one might grow in the knowledge of God (Previously referenced first sentence of Proverbs chapter 2). As we take knowledge of those steps let's proceed into the *ology* of theology proper.

---

5 Augustus Strong, "*Systematic Theology*," Philadelphia, 1907, Table of Contents, iv.

### Chapter 3 A Proper Naturalistic Theism

What does man know about God with no exposure to the Scriptures wherein God reveals himself? The study and analysis of that question is called *naturalistic theism* because man by his nature knows of the existence of God. In times past otherwise genius theologians have left their Biblical mooring and ventured into rationalistic thinking and philosophical journals and made naturalistic theism some sort of traditional proof of the existence of God. A wise theologian assembling a valid systematic theology must be ever vigilant and circumspect to stay secured in his Biblical moorings and answer naturalistic theism by analyzing, “What does the Bible say about mans natural and intrinsic knowledge of God?” That analysis will always be all sufficient for a Biblical systematic theology.

In that other works of systematic theology have invested great effort in a rationalistic approach to naturalistic theism, their arguments are herein introduced, found baseless and philosophical and then a valid naturalistic theism is found more adequately answered in Scripture. It is caprice, i.e. a sudden unaccountable change of behavior, that any theologian would spend effort analyzing an *ontological* argument for the existence of God. But that they did, Hodge, pg. 204-207, Chafer, pg. 158-168, and unfortunately even Baptist theologians, Strong, pg. 85-89, and Thiessen, pg. 55-63. Ontology is the branch of philosophy, or metaphysics, which deals with the nature of being and the existence of reality. When Moses was nervous about the existence of God, God said to Moses, “I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shall thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you” (Exod 3:14). God spends no time, effort, or word in proving the existence of His being or the existence of reality, and it is, thus, capricious for a theologian to pursue the vain philosophies of man down the vein of ontology.

It is equally vain to incorporate a *teleological* philosophy lecture in a systematic theology. Supposing that “an ultimate purpose and design” proves the existence of God is trite. God does not use their verbose volumes but presents His teleological argument in four redundant questions: “*He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he*

*that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?"* (Psalm 94:9-10). This, God's profound acknowledgment of their whole teleological argument, is not given to the seeking saint or inquisitive theologian, it is given to the brutish and the fool! The verses preceding says "*Yet they say, The LORD shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it. Understand, ye brutish among the people: and ye fools, when will ye be wise?"*" (vr. 7-8). For the systematic theologian to set aside his task of systematizing truth, and pursue a proof of the existence of God to a group of unregenerate vain philosophers is worse than vain, it is unadulterated foolishness.

The whole point of this teleological proof text (i.e. Psalm 94:7-11) is "*The LORD knoweth the thought of man, that they are vanity*" (vr. 11). Ergo the theologian has no business wandering in the corridors of vain philosophy, nor attempting the proof of God's existence. If God himself does not dabble in the proof, neither will the wise theologian. One need not spend a good chapter developing such trite philosophy when God has already expressed it in a succinct thirty six words. Just give the infidel, agnostic or atheist God's words; they are quick and powerful, while philosophy is vain and conceited.

This teleological proof text (Psalm 94:7-11) rests in this context; "*Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O LORD, and teachest him out of thy law; That thou mayest give him rest from the days of adversity, until the pit be digged for the wicked*" (Psalm 94:12-13). God's law, our pure source text for theology, "*is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness*" (2Tim 3:16-17), and the brutish philosophers have only the itching ear, the wanting eye, ergo they need God's chastisement and the teaching of knowledge (cf Psalm 94:9-10). The parallels are not coincidental and the theologian should stay in his own camp, using Scripture as his sole authority.

Hodge, Strong, and Chafer also appeal to an anthropological argument and a cosmological argument in their effort to provide the vain, brutish philosopher a proof of the existence of God. Indeed analyzing the constitution of man may reveal some characteristics of God, for man is, after all, made in His image; and analyzing the constitution of the universe will reveal the glory of God and can reveal

his handiwork, exactly as Psalm 19 points out; however, again, the theologian that uses these entities to make a proof for the existence of God is not wise, and is not following a Biblical systematic theology. Just as Psalm 94 points the wise theologian to the perfect law of the LORD for his source of truth, so to does Psalm 19. It opens with a profound cosmological argument, but it has for its theme:

*The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward. Psalm 19:7-11*

To determine what natural man knows about God naturally the theologian should set aside all his philosophy books and look only into the perfect, sure, right, and pure sole source of theology, God's plenary, verbally inspired, infallible, inerrant Word.

Naturalistic Theism, what man knows about God naturally, what man intrinsically understands about God, is spelled out in God's Word. God's Word was previously categorically declared, even by these theologians, to be the sole authority of all faith and practice, ergo it is the supreme source for our naturalistic theism. It says...

*For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;*



*Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: Romans 1:16-20*

It says his Light lighteth every man that cometh into the world...

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men.*

*And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. ... He (John) was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. **That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.** John 1:1-5,8,9*

It says God tries the reins of every man...

*I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.... But, O LORD of hosts, that triest the righteous, and seest the reins and the heart, let me see thy vengeance on them: for unto thee have I opened my cause. Jeremiah 17:10, 20:12*

And again...

*And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works. Revelation 2:23*

And, God continues his letter to the Romans to contend that man

knows God...

*Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Romans 1:21-23*

One needs no further philosophy of man to understand a naturalistic theology. God has adequately revealed mans 'natural' knowledge of God, and even that is not natural, it is supernatural.

## Chapter 4 Theology Proper in Bible Doctrine

Bible Doctrine differs from systematic theology only in its level of thoroughness. Consequently, a sound Bible Doctrine book makes for a good foundation for a Biblical systematic theology. A good systematic theology does not separate itself from practical theology nor Biblical theology, nor exegetical theology, and ergo it cannot separate from a good Bible based Bible doctrine expose. There is no truer, or more thorough, published, Baptist, and Biblical doctrine than that of Dr. Mark G. Cambron.<sup>6</sup> His teachings on Bible Doctrine at Tennessee Temple Bible School thoroughly lay the foundation for this systematic theology. His book, *Bible Doctrines*<sup>7</sup> is, with the permission of the Cambron Institute,<sup>8</sup> given in block quotes throughout this effort. The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for most of this Systematic Theology.<sup>9</sup>

Believing in the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and believing that every single word is directly chosen by God, it is necessary to preserve and defend the doctrine extracted from Scripture and presented by Dr. Cambron. Below, in a block quote of his book, is his extensive analysis of Theology: [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible*

---

6 Dr. Mark G. Cambron, B.A., M.A., Th.B., Th.M., Th.D., D.D., L.L.D., Litt.D., was one of the foremost theologians of our times. Born in Fayetteville, Tennessee on July 31, 1911. He was born-again in 1919. It was during a Billy Sunday campaign in Chattanooga that he trusted in the Lord Jesus Christ as his personal Savior. He served for many years at Tennessee Temple College (1948-59) with Dr. Lee Roberson and served as Dean of the College. From <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org> accessed 10/16/2013

7 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

8 The Cambron Institute, 35890 Maplegrove Road, Willoughby, Oh 44094

9 It is noted here and amply reproved in the Bibliology section of this work, that it is fallacy for Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book to recommend using the R.V., instead of the Holy Bible, 41 times for 54 Bible verses. Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the "Bible Critics," the "Bible Correctors," the "Textual Critics," and the "Copyright Mongers" of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

Doctrines page 4-40 (Zondervan's 11-56)]

## Cambron's Ch 1 Theology (The Doctrine of God)

THEOLOGY (The Doctrine of God) 6

### OUTLINE FOR CHAPTER I

<p style="text-align: center;">THEOLOGY</p> <p>I. The Names and Titles of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A. Elohim.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">B. Adonai.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">C. Jehovistic Combinations.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">D. Eloistic Combinations.</p> <p>II. The Existence of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A. False and True Systems of Theology.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">B. Evidence of the Existence of God.</p> <p>III. The nature of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A. Definitions of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">B. Spirituality of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">C. Personality of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">D. The Trinity of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">E. The Self-existence of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">F. The Infinity of God.</p>	<p>V. The Attributes of God</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A. Omnipotence.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">B. Omniscience.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">C. Omni-sapience.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">D. Omnipresence.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">E. Eternity</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">F. Immutability.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">G. Love.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">H. Mercy.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">I. Grace.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">J. Faithfulness.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">K. Holiness.</p> <p>IV. The Fatherhood of God.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A. Old Testament Teaching.</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">B. New Testament Teaching.</p>
---	---

[pg7]

### Chapter I THEOLOGY

The word “theology” comes from the Greek word *theos*, meaning God. Thus, theology is the doctrine of God. To begin the study of the many Bible doctrines we must begin with the Source of all things - God! We must begin with God — there is no one, nothing, before Him. Before anything came into being, He *was*: “in the beginning *God*...” (Gen. 1:1); “*God*, who at sundry times and in divers manners (Heb.1:1); “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with *God*, and the Word was *God*” (John 1:1).

The first things we shall study are:

## I. The Names and Titles Of God

The name of a person, place, or thing is that by which it is known. The names of God are those by which He is known. They denote His character. Yes, the names of the Lord are those by which He is known to His people; “Save me, O God, by thy *name*” (Ps. 54: 1a); “They that know thy *name* will put their trust in thee” (Ps: 9: 10).

The King James Version distinguishes the names of God by the use of printer’s type. Thus, when you read in the Bible the word “God,” you know that it is translated from the Hebrew word *Elohim*; the words “LORD,” “GOD,” “LORD GOD,” “LORD God” are from the Hebrew word *Jehovah*; and the word “lord” is from the word *Adonai*. Each of these words, *Elohim*, *Jehovah* and *Adonai*, describes the character of God and of His actions toward mankind, distinguishing between the saint and the sinner.

### A. *Elohim*.

The word *Elohim*, which is translated as “God,” is found more than twenty-three hundred times in Scripture. Yet this is not a personal name of God, but it is God’s official title — what He is, God! — *Elohim!* The word *Elohim* is not only used for God, but for men (“I have said, Ye are *gods*; and all of you are children of the most High” — Ps. 82:6 with John 10:34, 35) and for idols (“Thou shalt make thee no molten *gods*” — Ex. 34:17). It is the title of God just as the word “president” is the title of an office. The President is the official title of the chief executive of the United States. It is not his name, but his title. And likewise, there are many kinds of presidents: of companies, missionary societies, etc. God’s *official* name is *Elohim* — His office.

*Elohim* is a plural noun. At once we say plural means two or more. This is true in English, but not so in the Hebrew language. We have two numbers in English: singular, meaning one; plural, two or more. In the Hebrew, however, we have three numbers: singular, meaning one; dual, equaling two; plural, denoting three or more. Thus, *Elohim* is a plural noun — three or more. Genesis 1:1 states: “In the beginning God [three or more] created the heaven and the earth.” Another suggestion of the Trinity is found in Genesis 1:26, 27: “And

God [*Elohim*] said, “Let *us* make man in *our* image.”

The literal meaning of *Elohim* is The Putter-forth of Power, The Strong One. And in the first chapter of Genesis, *Elohim* is described as putting forth His power in these ten words: created, made (fashioned), moved, said, saw, called, divided, set, ended and blessed.

No creature has power but that which God has given him. Power belongeth unto God. Man has to work for his power in all phases of life; God only has to speak, and it is done. God not only creates, but *keeps* what He brings forth out of nothing.

*Elohim* (God) has power in government. Daniel pointed this out, and Nebuchadnezzar had to experience it “that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men” (Dan. 4:17). With pride filling his heart, Nebuchadnezzar was struck with madness until he acknowledged that the Most High *did* rule. Then only did his reason return unto him, and he became a firm believer in this truth.

*Elohim* (God) has power in judgment, whether upon man or nation. When He smites, none can resist Him.

*El* is the singular form of *Elohim*. It is found two hundred and *fifty* times in Scripture. It is used in the proper names of men, such as Samuel (asked of God) and *Elijah* (Jehovah is my God).

#### *B. Jehovah.*

Remember, the words GOD and LORD (all capital letters) in the King James version are best<sup>10</sup> translated *Jehovah*. *Jehovah* is the *personal* name of God. It is that Name which is above every other name. The meaning of the word is Redeemer. Every time it is used in the Scriptures it is connected with deliverance by God: “And it came to pass, when the captains of the chariots saw Jehoshaphat, that they said, It is the king of Israel. Therefore they compassed about him to fight: but Jehoshaphat cried out and the LORD [*Jehovah*] helped him; and God moved them to depart from him” (II Chron. 18:31).

While the personal name of God, *Jehovah*, was written, it was

---

<sup>10</sup> When using this clause “best translated” in contrast to how the fifty-seven expert linguists translated the Authorized King James Bible from 1605 thru 1611, Dr. Cambron over steps his expertise; indeed the Authorized translators did do the best translation by using all caps for this name of God.

never pronounced. The Jews considered that name too sacred to be spoken by human lips. It is a possibility that this pronunciation is not correct even today, for the Hebrew language is written without any vowels. The name *Jehovah*, in the Hebrew, is spelled *JHVH*. We trust that we are pronouncing it correctly: It could be pronounced *Jeheveh*, or *Jihivih*, or *Jahavah*, or many other different ways. When the scribes came to this name *Jehovah* to copy, they washed their bodies, and the pens with which they spelled this name were cleansed. Even in public, when readers of sacred Scriptures came to this word they would not pronounce it, fearing they would take it in vain, but would substitute the word *Elohim* or *Adonai* in its place. One reason why the word *Jehovah* was suppressed was to impress its sacredness upon the minds of the people. [pg10]

When the LORD [*Jehovah*] appeared unto Moses in the burning bush, and commissioned him to lead the children of Israel out of Egypt into the Promised Land, Moses asked, “When I come unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them?” God said unto him, “I AM THAT I AM ... I AM hath sent me unto you” (Ex. 3:13, 14). *Jehovah* is the eternal *I AM*. There is no past nor future with *Jehovah*; He is the Eternal Present, the self-existent One — One that made Himself known.

In Exodus 20:2 we read: “I am the LORD thy God...” “I am Jehovah thy Elohim.” There were many different Elohim, but there was only one *Jehovah*. You read in the Word, the “Elohim of Israel”; but never, the “*Jehovah* of Israel”; for there were no more Jehovahs. When Elijah and the prophets of Baal had a contest, it was to determine which was Elohim (God), *Jehovah* or Baal.

Yes, *Jehovah* was always related in a redemptive way with his own people, but His relationship to His creatures (this includes unregenerate men) was always as Elohim. The same today. God is God of all the unsaved, but He is *Jehovah*, the Father, of all who are saved. The Book of Jonah illustrates this. In chapters three and four the people called upon Elohim, but Jonah called upon *Jehovah*! They were lost; he was saved. They became saved, and could, after their salvation, call God *Jehovah*. See other Scriptures: Judges 7:14, 15; II Chronicles 19:6-9; Genesis 7:16; I Samuel 17:46.

We have another name for God, and that is *JAH*. It is found only once in the King James version, but it occurs forty-eight other times in the corrected translations.<sup>11</sup> Some Bible scholars believe that *JAH* is an abbreviation of Jehovah. The meaning is the same. “Sing unto God, sing praises to his name: extol him that rideth upon the heavens by his name *JAH*, and rejoice before him” (Ps. 68:4). The name *JAH* is always connected with praise, and is first found in Exodus 15:2.

We believe that the word “God” (*Elohim*), being plural in Genesis 1:1, definitely suggests that the Trinity created the heavens and the earth. Yet we find that modern thought interprets this differently. Modern thought says that this portion of the Word should read, “In the beginning *Gods* created the heavens and the earth.” And the reason for this, they say, is that Israel, to begin with, believed in many gods, but that their religion evolved into monotheism. This form of reasoning has proved difficult to many college students. Is there any Scripture which will refute this? Absolutely. Turn to Deuteronomy 6:4 — “Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord.” Now, put the correct words of *Elohim* and *Jehovah* in this passage and you will see that the Word plainly reveals the Trinity of Genesis 1:1: “Hear, O Israel, JEHOVAH our ELOHIM [*three or more persons*] is one JEHOVAH.’ Therefore, man began with a belief in *one* God and later degenerated into the depths “and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things” (Rom. 1:23). [pg11]

### C. *Adonai*.

The term *Adonai* really means master, or owner; one who owns, one who rules, one who blessed his own. It is found first in Genesis 15:1, 2: “After these things the word of the LORD came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. And Abram said, Lord GOD, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus?”

---

11 When claiming there are “corrected translations” in contrast to how the fifty-seven expert linguists translated the Authorized King James Bible from 1605 thru 1611, Dr. Cambron over steps his expertise; indeed the Authorized translators did do the best translation by judiciously using this very personal reference to the name of our God.



*Adonai* can always be known by the word “Lord,” or “lord” in the Old Testament of the King James Version. There are two different forms of this word: *Adon*, which is singular, and *Adonai*, which is plural.

*Adonai* is used two ways in the Scriptures when related to man and his earthly relationships: As a *master* of his slaves — “And the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his *master*, and swore to him concerning that matter. And the servant took ten camels of the camels of his *master*, and departed; for all the goods of his *master*...” (Gen. 24:9, 10a); and as a *husband* to his wife — “Even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him *lord* [Adonai]...” (I Peter 3:6a). See also Genesis 18:12.

A Hebrew could sell himself to another Hebrew, who became his master. But he could not sell himself forever; for at the Sabbatical Year, or the Year of Jubilee, all slaves were freed. Yet, there was a way by which a slave could become a slave forever, and that was by *choice*: “And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul; and he shall serve him for ever” (Ex. 21:5, 6). Paul said that he was a bond slave (servant) of Jesus Christ, bought by blood and bound by Love! Every time you use the name Lord Jesus Christ, you say, “He is my Master.” “Ye call me *Master* and *Lord*: and ye say well; for so I am” (John 13:13).

#### D. Jehovistic Combinations.

1. *Jehovah-jireh* — “the Lord will provide.” “Abraham called the name of that place *Jehovah-jireh*: as it is said to this day, “In the mount of the LORD it shall be seen” (Gen. 22:14). This was the occasion when Abraham led his son, his only begotten son, Isaac, to the mount. Isaac carried the wood; Abraham carried the knife and the fire. His son asked the whereabouts of the sacrifice. To this Father Abraham replied, “God will *provide* himself a lamb for a burnt-offering.” And God did! Before Abraham could kill his son as a sacrifice demanded by God, the angel of the LORD stayed his hand; his eyes looked upon the thicket and saw the ram which the LORD had provided. Nearly two thousand years ago the Son of God carried,

Himself, a wooden burden, the Cross; and the Father held the fire (which speaks of judgment), and the knife (which speaks of death), and God *did* provide *Himself* a Sacrifice for our sins — His Son, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Have you found Him to be your *Jehovah jireh*? Whatever may come, remember, He is *Jehovah-jireh* — “the LORD will provide.” [pg12]

2. *Jehovah-Rapha* — “the Lord that healeth.” [“The LORD] said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the LORD [*Jehovah Rapha*] that healeth thee” (Ex. 15:26). He is LORD, The Physician. The way this is used is not, “I will *cure* your diseases”; but, “I won’t *put* sickness upon you.”

The world is called the “sick world”; Livingstone called Africa the “open sore”; and the reason for this is the deep wound of *sin!* The word “heal” is an interesting word and means to repair, mend, cure. And there is perfect cure in *Jehovah-Rapha*, for “by his stripes we are healed” (I Peter 2:24). See also Psalm 41:4.

3. *Jehovah-nissi* — “the Lord our Banner.” “Moses built an altar, and called the name of it *Jehovah-nissi*” (Ex. 17:15). The LORD is our Victory. Christ crucified is our Banner of Victory!

4. *Jehovah-Qadash* — “the LORD that doth sanctify.” “Ye shall keep my statutes, and do them: I am the LORD [*Jehovah-Qadash*] which sanctify you” (Lev. 20:8). And God is the same LORD of the Christian as of the Hebrew: “Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. . . . *By* the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10:9, 10). See also Hebrews 10:14, and Exodus 31:13.

5. *Jehovah-shalom* — “the LORD our Peace.” “Then Gideon built an altar there unto the LORD, and called it *Jehovah-shalom*: unto this day it is yet in Ophrah of the Abiezrites” (Judg. 6:24). There is only one way to secure peace today, and that is through the Lord Jesus Christ. He is our Peace: “For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us” (Eph. 2:14). See also Romans 5:1.

6. *Jehovah-Tsidkenu* — “the LORD our Righteousness.” “In his

days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS” (Jer. 23:6). Israel shall be restored to the Land of Promise once again, and during the Millennium Jehovah shall be called *Jehovah- Tsidkenu* — “the LORD our Righteousness.” The LORD did come, the only righteous one, yet they crucified Him. But one day He shall come the second time, and Israel shall claim the Lord Jesus Christ as their own Righteousness. Christ Jesus is the only Righteousness that any can claim.

7. *Jehovah-Shammah* — “the LORD is There.” “It was round about eighteen thousand measures: and the name of the city from that day shall be, The LORD [*Jehovah- Shammah*] is there” (Ezek. 48:35). When Israel is restored to the land, and the earth shall be full of knowledge of the LORD, Jerusalem shall be called *Jehovah-Shammah* — “the LORD is There.” [pg13]

8. *Jehovah-Sabaoth* — the LORD of Hosts.” “This man went up out of his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice unto the LORD of hosts [*Jehovah-Sabaoth*] in Shiloh” (I Sam. 1: 3a). Israel is the Host; the LORD is the LORD of Hosts. See also Exodus 12:41; II Kings 6:14-23; Romans 9:29; James 5:4.

9. *Jehovah Ra-ah* — “the LORD my Shepherd.” “The LORD [*Jehovah Ra-ah*] is my shepherd; I shall not want.” (Ps. 23:1). One time a little girl was quoting this verse, and this is the way she said it: “The LORD is my Shepherd, why should I worry?” Have you found that Source of Strength? Have you found perfect peace by following the Saviour wherever He leads? Fears will not annoy; darkness cannot distress; poverty is not able to destroy if Jesus is your *Jehovah Ra-ah* — your Shepherd.

#### *E. Eloistic Combinations.*

As there are the Jehovistic combinations, so are there the *Eloistic* combinations.

1. *El Elyon* — “Most High God.” “Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God [*El Elyon*]” (Gen. 14:18). Here in the King James Version the name is translated “most high God.” *Elyon* means highest; with *El* it means the most high God. See also Deuteronomy 32:8; Daniel 4:34, 35. Jesus Christ is our *El Elyon* — “All power [*authority*] is given

unto me in heaven and in earth” (Matt. 28:18b).

2. *El Olam* — “*Everlasting God*.” “Abraham planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the everlasting [*El Olam*] God” (Gen. 21:33). Yes, God is the “Everlasting God” — “the God of All Ages.”

3. *El Shaddai* — “Almighty God.” This is first found in Genesis 17:1: “When Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God [*El Shaddai*]; walk before me, and be thou perfect.” “El” means the Strong One. *Shaddai* comes from the word *shad*, meaning a breast, a woman’s breast. This is illustrated by that portion found in Isaiah 28:9. *El Shaddai*, therefore, means the Breast of God, the Nourisher, Strength-giver, the Satisfier.

One of the most cherished names of God held by Bible students everywhere is this one — the Breast of God, the Strength-giver, the All-Sufficient God, the All-Bountiful God, the God Who is Enough! the God Who is Able. “He is *able* also to save them to the uttermost” (Heb. 7:25). Why? Because Jesus Christ our Lord is our *El Shaddai* — “The God Who is Able.” [pg14]

## II. The Existence of God

### *A. False and True Systems of Theology.*

1. *Deism*. This system acknowledges that there is a God, but denies that God sustains the creation. “God is the Maker, but not the Keeper.”

2. *Atheism*. Those who hold to this belief — so called — exclude God altogether.

3. *Skepticism and Infidelity*. Skeptics and infidels are full of doubt and disbelief with regard to God, especially the God of Revelation. 4.

4. *Agnosticism*. This school of thought does not deny God, but denies that God can be *known*.

5. *Pantheism*. Everything is God, and God is everything. Everything you see is God.

God is *in* everything. God and creation are synonymous.

6. *Polytheism*. This is belief in many Gods. There are various gods over us; these in turn have gods over them; and these have gods

over them, and so on.

7. *Tritheism*. This is the doctrine of *three* Gods.

8. *Dualism*. This is the belief in *two* Gods; a God that is Good, and a God that is Bad. They are both equal in power and persuasion.

9. *Theism*. The belief in the existence of a personal God is known as theism. Should one boast in this, his boasting is vain, for one must know *who* God is, *what* His name is, in order to trust Him.

10. *Monotheism*. This is the doctrine of one God. We are monotheists. Jews and Mohammedans are monotheists. If that is true, are they saved? No! “Thou believest that there is *one* God; thou doest well; the devils also believe, and tremble” (Jas. 2:19) Believing in one God is not sufficient, but “if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt he saved” (Rom. 10:9).

*B. Evidence of the Existence of God.*

May the student realize that the Bible never tries to prove there is a God. It assumes that man knows that there is a God, and states, “The *fool* hath said in his heart, There is no God” (Ps. 14:1). [pg15]

There are many evidences of the existence of God, the first being:

1. *From Reason*. (The Intellectual).

a. *The Intuitional Argument*: That which is in man, sometimes called the “firsttruths”; that belief that knows that there is a God without anyone revealing that fact. A child knows there is a God. Who has told him? All races of the world know there is a God, though they are not worshiping the One and Only and True God. There is no such thing as a true atheist. The evidence of the existence of God is in man — born in him.

b. *The Cosmological Argument*: This is the argument from cause and effect. Here is the world — how did it come to be? There is a Cause or Power behind everything. There must be a Maker or Creator. It is easy to think that back of the Creation is God, but it is impossible to think back of God.

c. *The Teleological Argument*: By this we mean design. There is perfect design and order in the universe. The snowflake is a beautiful pattern that man could never duplicate. Why does ice rise to the top of the water and not to the bottom when it freezes? Should this not be so,

then all water would eventually freeze, and the fish would perish. How is it possible that spring, summer, fall and winter all come in order, and have been doing so for millenniums? Why is it that the sun comes no closer to the earth (*melting it*) nor goes further away from it (freezing it)? There *must* be a Designer behind all creation — and that Designer is God!

d. *The Anthropological Argument*: This argument is based upon the moral and intellectual qualities of man. Man is a direct result of the creation of God, as other creatures are, yet these creatures do not possess the moral and intellectual qualities of man. Why? If man could create them, so could animals. But man has the capacity to know, to reason. If man did not get these qualities from some One, where did he get them?

2. *From History*. Truly, history is His story! History verifies the fact that there is a God. History has proved the fact of God against those who have repudiated His law. Thus, Christians should never worry over world conditions. God is on His throne. Nothing can happen, but by His will. Someone has said, “Prophecy is the mould of history.” God speaks, and years later what He spoke is fulfilled to the letter, History only fulfills what God has said would happen. History *proves* there is a God!

3. *From Experience*. This is one of the greatest proofs yet for the existence of God. Men have been transformed by the power of God. There is no explanation other than God! Prayers which have been answered attest to the existence of God.

4. *From Scripture*.

a. *Biblical Assumption*. The Bible is the only Book that is God-inspired. The Bible is the standard for all right conduct in the world. If the Bible is not the Word of God, then we have no God; we can never know God.

b. *Christological Revelation*. In Jesus Christ, God came down to man to tell us what God is like. If Jesus is not God, then there is no God. God can never be known. “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he [pg16] hath declared him” (John 1:18). But Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and He and His life prove the existence of God!

c. *Prophetical Declaration*. God forecast the future. Anyone

who can do this is more than man. Man cannot always tell the past, much less the future. It is said that when Christ was crucified there were twenty-five distinct prophecies fulfilled — prophecies written centuries before.

### III. The Nature of God.

#### A. Definitions of God.

##### 1. Scriptural Definitions.

a. *God is Spirit* — “God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth” (John 4:24).

b. *God is Light* — “This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (I John 1:5).

c. *God is Love* — “He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love” (I John 4:8).

d. *God is a Consuming Fire* — “For our God is a consuming fire” (Heb. 12:29).

##### 2. Theological Definitions.

a. *Westminster Catechism*: — “God is a Spirit, Infinite, Eternal, and Unchangeable in His Being, Wisdom, Power, Holiness, Justice, Goodness and Truth.”

b. *Dr. Strong*: — “God is the Infinite and Perfect Spirit. The Source of all things, the Support of all things, the End of all things.”

c. *Andrew Fuller*; — “God is the First Cause and Last End of all things.”

d. *Ebrards*: — “God is the Eternal Source of all that is temporal.”

#### B. Spirituality of God.

1. *His Essence*. He is a Spiritual Being (“God is a Spirit” — John 4:24), invisible (“Who is the image of the invisible God” — Col. 1:15a). What is a spirit? A spirit is a being without flesh and bones. “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have” (Luke 24:39). A spirit has a body, a spirit-body; but it has no natural body, no material body. God cannot be seen by human eye; God, in His pure essence, has never been seen. “No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath

declared him” (John 1:18).

2. *His Manifestations.* While God, in His true essence, has never been seen, yet He hath shown Himself, revealed His Person to man in different forms. The Scriptures ask, “To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One” (Is. 40:25). Man cannot know God but in the way He has revealed Himself. Are we not glad that God has revealed Himself in His Son? Where Christ is the image of God, the Anti-christ shall be an imitation. [pg17]

There *seems* to be some contradictions in the Word; in some places it says that people saw God: “The LORD spake unto Moses face to face” (Ex. 33:11); “Then went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel...” (Ex. 24:9, 10). In other places the Word says that it is impossible to see God: “He said, Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live” (Ex. 33:20). The truth is, man has never looked upon the face of God in His true essence, but has looked upon His face and spoken mouth to mouth with God when God manifested Himself in some form other than his true essence. “With him will I speak mouth to mouth...” (Num. 12:8a).

We do know this, that the Spirit (Holy Spirit) can manifest Himself in a visible form. “John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him” (John 1:32). It was at the Lord Jesus’ baptism that John saw the form, but not the Spirit; yet the Spirit was manifested.

God has manifested Himself in many forms; among them are the following:

a. *In Creature Forms.* By this we do not mean that the LORD appeared in the form of animals, but rather in the form of human beings. Genesis 3:8 and 12:7 illustrate this fully: “They heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the *presence* of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden” (Gen. 3:8); “The LORD *appeared* unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the LORD, who *appeared* unto him” (Gen. 12:7). See also Genesis 16:7, 10, 13; Exodus 24:9-11; Genesis 18:1-16; Judges 13:22, 23; Genesis 32:24-30.

God also manifested Himself as the Angel of the LORD —



“The angel of the LORD encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them” (Ps. 34:7); “The angel of the LORD said unto her, Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shall call his name Ishmael; because the LORD hath heard thy affliction” (Gen. 16:11). It is agreed among most Bible scholars that the Angel of the LORD is no other than the Lord Jesus Himself.

b. *In Material Forms.* Man could not see God; therefore, God manifested Himself in forms from which He spoke to and led him. One such form was the Burning Bush: “When the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I” (Ex. 3:4); Another form was the Pillar of a Cloud and a Pillar of Fire: “The LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night” (Ex. 13:21). [pg18]

c. *In The Person of Christ Jesus.* Again we state that we are rejoicing that God does not choose today to reveal Himself other than in His Son, Jesus Christ! God does not choose to manifest Himself in a vapor, but rather in *human* form: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth” (John 1:1, 14). See also I Timothy 3:16; Hebrews 1:3.

#### *C. Personality of God.*

God is a Person, One possessing Self-consciousness, Self-determination, and Power.

People have many vague ideas of God as a force, a power, an influence. But it is impossible to have fellowship with a force or an influence. The Words of our Lord as He was in the Garden suggest fellowship with God: “Now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy fulfilled in themselves” (John 17:13). See also Exodus 3:14; I Corinthians 2:11.

Never confuse personality with visibility. Substance has nothing to do with personality. The personality of God can be seen:

1. *In Names.* “God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you” (Ex. 3:14). The words “I AM THAT I AM” suggest

personality.

2. *In Contrasts*. By this we mean that the Scriptures contrast the only wise God with the gods of the pagans: “Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God” (I Thess. 1:9). See also Jeremiah 10:16; Acts 14:15.

3. *In Attributes*. That which is characteristic of God is called an attribute. That which He *does*, denotes personality, such as:

a. *God Grieves*. Only a person can grieve: “It repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it *grieved* him at his heart” (Gen. 6:6).

b. *God Repents*. In the above Scripture (Gen. 6:6) we note that God repents. I Samuel 15:29 says: “The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent.” Here one portion of the Scriptures states that God repents, another declares that He does not repent. What is the answer? When man repents, he repents of some moral deed; when God repents, He repents of some judicial act. God’s attitude toward sin never changes. Take the case of Jonah and Nineveh. Nineveh repented; it changed its mind; it changed its character. God, however, did not change His mind; He did not change His attitude toward sin. But inasmuch as Nineveh had repented, there was no need of judgment against sin. Its sin had been confessed and forgiven.

c. *God Loves*. “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16). “As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent” (Rev. 3:19). Only a personality can love.

d. *God Hates*. “These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are an abomination unto him” (Prov. 6:16). [pg19]

e. *God Hears*. “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know” (Ps. 94:9, 10)?

4. *In Acts*.

a. *God Creates*. “In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth” (Gen. 1:1). See also Isaiah 45:18.

b. *God Provides*. “These wait all upon thee; that thou mayest

give them their meat in due season. That thou givest them they gather: thou openest thine hand, they are filled with good. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust. Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth” (Ps. 104:27-30). The material needs of this entire world are met and supplied by God.

c. *God Promotes*. Some people seemingly are pushed ahead of others. The world has a name for this — luck. But the correct answer is the LORD! Kings receive their power from Him; pastors receive their charges from Him; husbands receive their wives from Him. All promotions are from the Lord. “*Promotion* cometh neither from the east nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another” (Ps. 75:6, 7).

d. *God Cares*. God has a heart; only a person has a heart. God has concern: “Humble yourselves . . . casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you” (I Peter 5:6, 7).

#### *D. The Trinity of God.*

1. *Trinity in Personality*. By this, of course, we mean that God is Three in One. There are some errors concerning the Trinity; some have been proposed ignorantly, and others deliberately.

We know that the Bible is the Word of God, if for no other reason than that we have the Trinity in it. If man had written the Bible, he would have left the Trinity out of it; for the Trinity is too hard to understand — the mind of man cannot comprehend it. The only thing that the Child of God can do is to accept it by faith and stand upon what God says about it. Just because we cannot seem to understand all about it is no sign that it is not true.

There is one error which proposes that there are three Individuals in the Godhead. But remember, God is not a Triad.

Another error is that the Trinity is just one Person, manifesting Himself in three. That is, there are three essences in one Person, Jesus Christ. The Father and the Holy Spirit are only manifestations.

Still another, and damnable, denies the Trinity altogether, and consequently makes the Son and Holy Spirit creatures of God, those who came into existence after God. In other words, they who hold to this erroneous theory declare that there was a time when the Son was not; that there was a time when the Son of God never existed. They

use this sort of reasoning: “A son cannot be as old as his father — a father always has to exist before his [pg20] son in order to beget him; God is the Father of the Son of God; therefore, the Father had to exist before the Son in order to beget Him.” To this we reply: “If a person should declare that he is a father, and has been one for ten years, then we know that he has had a child for ten years. A man cannot be a father without having a child. Yes, a man who has been a father for ten years has had a child for ten years. Even so in the Godhead — if God is the *Eternal* Father, then He must have had an *Eternal* Son!”

The doctrine of the Trinity is a doctrine of pure revelation from God. And remember, we worship not three Gods, but One — God: the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

It is practically impossible to give examples of the Trinity. Some have offered the threeleaved clover as an example; others have suggested water: in its natural state, liquid; when heated, vapor; when frozen, solid. Still, this is not clear. For God is Three in One!

Therefore, we propose that the best illustration is man himself: body, soul and spirit. He is not three persons, but a three-in-one person. And there are three things which pertain to each separately: food to the body, music to the soul, and worship to the spirit — yet all three of these things appeal to the one man.

Rays from the sun may be used as a further type. When the sunshine breaks upon the earth it is composed of three elements: heat rays, which can be felt but not seen; light rays, which can be seen, but not felt; chemical rays, which cannot be seen, nor felt, but do have effects. All together make sunshine. We cannot understand light — three rays and yet one light. Without one of these elements there would be no light; without one part of man, man would cease to be; and without one Person of the Godhead, God would not be God!

a. *Old Testament Names*

(1) *Plural Nouns* “In the beginning [*Elohim*] created the heaven and earth” (Gen. 1:1). *Elohim* is the plural noun, meaning three or more. This, of course, suggests the Trinity in creation. See also Genesis 3:5; Exodus 20:3; Deuteronomy 13:2, 3. Many times *Elohim* is translated (in English) in the singular and the plural.

(2) *Plural Pronouns*. “The LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of *us*, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth

his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever...” (Gen. 3:22). See also Genesis 1:26; Isaiah 6:8. This is God speaking to God — thus the Trinity.

(3) *Scriptural Statements*. The Scriptures state that God anointed God, and how could this be if God be not a Trinity? “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows” (Ps. 45:6,7). See also Hebrews 1:8-12; Psalm 110:1.

(4) *Scriptural Designations*. That is, in Genesis 1:1 God declares that He created the heavens and the earth, and in verse 2, the Holy Spirit, the Third Person of the Trinity, is singled out: “The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” (See also Job 24:13). [pg21] And elements of personality are accounted for by reference to the Holy Spirit: “There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD (Is. 11:1, 2).

The Son, the Second Person of the Trinity is singled out also: “I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. . . . Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way...” (Ps. 2:7, 12a). The Angel of the LORD of the Old Testament is no other than Jesus Christ Himself, and in the following portion of Scriptures He is declared as being separate from God the Father and Holy Spirit: “The angel of the LORD found her by a fountain of water . . . in the way to Shur” (Gen. 16:7).

The following Scriptures plainly reveal the Trinity of the Godhead: Genesis 18:1,2,33; Isaiah 48:16; 63:8-10.

(5) *Triple Expressions*. Whenever the Scriptures express praise or benediction of the Godhead, a triple exclamation is declared which points to the fact that as God is the Three-In-One God these expressions must also be three: “The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace” (Num. 6:24-26). “And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him;

and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, *Holy, holy, holy*, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come” (Rev. 4:8).

b. *New Testament Disclosures.*

(1) *Baptism of Christ.* The baptism of Christ is one of the best illustrations which prove the Trinity: “Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Matt. 3:16, 17). Here there is presented the Father in heaven, the Son in the water, and the Holy Spirit descending as a dove.

(2) *Baptismal Formula.* The Church of God in Christ Jesus has always used that formula laid down by its Founder Himself, Jesus Christ: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost...” (Matt. 28:19, 20). Note that the Scriptures do not say, “in the names of”; but, “in the name of.” One in Three; one *name*, but three Persons: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

(3) *Apostolic Benediction.* The Church has used this benediction (which was first used by the Apostle Paul by inspiration of the Holy Spirit) for the last nineteen hundred years: “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen” (II Cor. 13:14). [pg22]

(4) *Other Scripture.* The following verse plainly reveals the fact of the Trinity: “The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:26).

2. *Unity of Being: Undivided and Invisible.* There is *one* God; He is the one and only God: “Thou art great, O LORD God: for there is none like thee, neither is there any God beside thee, according to all that we have heard with our ears” (II Sam. 7:22); “Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I the LORD, the first, and with the last; I am he” (Is. 41:4). See also Isaiah 43:10, 11; 44:6; Deuteronomy 6:4.

God — Elohim — is a compound unity; that is, the noun, God

(which is plural), is used always with a singular verb: “In the beginning God [plural] created [singular] the heaven and the earth” (Gen. 1:1); “The LORD [singular] God [plural] of gods, the LORD [singular] God [plural] of gods, he knoweth, and Israel he shall know; if it be in rebellion, or if in transgression against the LORD [*singular*], (save us not this day,)...” (Josh. 22:22). See also Genesis 1:5, 8, 13; 33:20.

3. *A Scriptural Summary.*

a. *Three Are Recognized as God.*

(1) *The Father is Recognized as God.* “To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 1:7). See also John 6:27; I Peter 1:2.

(2) *The Son is Recognized as God.* “Unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom” (Heb. 1:8); “We should live soberly, righteously, and godly . . . looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ” (Titus 2:12, 13).

(3) *The Holy Spirit is Recognized as God.* “Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God” (Acts 5:3, 4).

b. *Three Are Described as Distinct Persons.*

(1) *Father and Son Are Persons Distinct From Each Other.*

(a) *Christ Distinguishes the Father From Himself.* “As the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man” (John 5:26, 27). See also John 5:32.

(b) *Father and Son are Distinguished as the Begetter and the Begotten.* See John 3:16.

(c) *Father and Son are Distinguished as the Sender and the Sent.* “When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law” (Gal. 4:4). See also John 10:36. [pg23]

(2) *Father and Son Are Persons Distinguished from the Holy Spirit.*

(a) *The Son Distinguishes the Holy Spirit From Himself and the Father.* “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you” (John 14:16, 17).

(b) *The Spirit Proceeds From the Father.* “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26).

(c) *The Spirit Is Sent by the Father and the Son.* “The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto von” (John 14:26); “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26).

*c. These Three Persons Are Equal.*

(1) The Father is not God as such, for God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost (Holy Spirit).

(2) The Son is not God as such, for God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost (Holy Spirit).

(3) The Holy Spirit is not God as such, for God is Father, Son and Holy Ghost (Holy Spirit).

*E. The Self-existence of God.*

Existence of God is within Himself. We are dependent upon Him; He is not dependent upon anything. Something caused us to be; nothing caused Him to be; He always was; God does not exist because He brought Himself into existence. God exists because it is his nature to be.

Our lives come from an external source; there was a time when we began. “I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me” (John 5:36). We cannot say this.



*F. The Infinity of God.*

Divine nature has no limit or bound. “Great is our Lord, and of great power: his understanding is infinite” (Ps. 147:5); “Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea” (Job 11:7-9); “Will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded? (I Kings 8:27); “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!” (Rom. 11:33). See also Isaiah 66:1; Psalm 113:5, 6. [pg24]

The world is a bud from His bower of beauty —

The sun is a spark from the light of His wisdom —

The sky is a bubble on the sea of His power.

#### **IV. The Attributes of God.**

The attributes of God are the essential qualities of a perfect Being — the property of God.

*A. The Omnipotence of God.*

This means that God is all-powerful, all-mighty: “I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth” (Rev. 19:6); “Jesus beheld them, and said unto them, With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible” (Matt. 19:26); “Is anything too hard for the LORD?” (Gen. 18:14a).

There is only *one* thing which can limit God, and that is His own holy will. Some foolish person may propose II Timothy 2:13: “If we believe not, yet he abideth faithful: he cannot deny himself.” This person says, “Here is something God cannot do.” But this is not a question of what God *can* do, but what God *will* do.

1. *God Has Power Over Nature.* “By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. He gathereth the waters of the sea together as an heap: he layeth up the depth in storehouses. Let all the earth fear the LORD: let

all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him. For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast” (Ps. 33:6-9); “Thus saith the LORD of hosts; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land” (Hag. 2:6). See also Genesis 1:1-3; Nahum 1:3-6. Man has to have tools to make things — God only has to speak, and it is done.

2. *God Has Power Over Men.* “There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another? Go to now, ye that say, To day or to morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away. For what ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this, or that” (Jas. 4:12-15). See also Exodus 4:11.

3. *God Has Power Over Angels.* “All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the *army of heaven*, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?” (Dan. 4:35). [pg25]

4. *God Has Power Over Satan.* In Job 1:12; 2:6 we notice that Satan is subjected to God; “The LORD said unto Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the LORD. . . . And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, he is in thine hand; but save his life.” And we know of the end of Satan from the following Scriptures: “The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly...” (Rom. 16:20a); “He laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years...And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever” (Rev. 20:2, 10). See also Luke 22:31, 32.

5. *God Has Power Over Death.* Paul prays that the Ephesians may know “what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come” (Eph. 1:19-21).

Ultimately, death shall be destroyed: “Death and hell [hades] were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death” (Rev. 20:14).

*B. The Omniscience of God.*

Omniscience means “all knowing.” God is the “All-Knowing God” — He knows everything! “For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things” (I John 3:20).

1. *Includes All Nature.* God, the Creator, knows everything concerning His creatures.

a. *Of His Inanimate Creatures.* “He telleth the number of the stars; he calleth them all by their names” (Ps. 147:4); “Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the LORD, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding” (Is. 40:28).

b. *Of His Brute Creatures.* “Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father” (Matt. 10:29).

c. *Of His Human Creatures.* God has full knowledge of man: “Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him” (Matt. 6:8). He knows man’s need; he has knowledge of the need of man. He knows the very *thoughts* of man: “Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, thou understandest my thought afar off” (Ps. 139:2). “The LORD knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vanity” (Ps. 94:11). See also I Chronicles 28:9 and Hebrews 4:13. God knows the *heart* of man: “Hear thou in heaven thy dwelling place, and forgive, and do, and give to every man according to his ways, whose heart thou knowest; (for thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men;)” (I Kings 8:39). See also Psalm 44:21 and Acts 1:24. God knows the *experiences* we have gone through: “The LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows” (Ex. 3:7). How absurd for man to try to deceive God! [pg26]

2. *Covers All Time.* “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world” (Acts 15:18). And this covers the *past*, the *present* and the *future*. The past can God see, for He has given to us those things which have happened millenniums ago (Book of Genesis); the Present is an open book to Him: “Neither is there any

creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do” (Heb. 4:13); and the future is known as the past and present is known. He knows the end from the beginning: “Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you” (I Peter 1:20). I Kings 13:2 is also a marvelous illustration of God knowing the future: a baby was named three hundred years before it was born, its name given, from what family it was to come and the things it was to do in later life: “And he cried against the altar in the word of the LORD, and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the LORD: Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men’s bones shall be burnt upon thee.” See also Isaiah 44:28; Jeremiah 1:5; Galatians 1:15, 16; Exodus 3:19; Daniel 2:8.

With God knowing the future, we must put ourselves in His hands.

3. *Includes All Possibilities.* Only God knows what would have happened if something had happened which did not happen. “Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day” (Matt. 11:23). See also I Samuel 23:12; Isaiah 48:18.

*C. The Omni-sapience of God.*

By this we mean the “All-Wisdom of God”; that is, God has all wisdom. There is a vast difference in wisdom and knowledge. Knowledge is what one knows; wisdom is the perfect display of that knowledge. Wisdom includes discernment and judgment.

1. *Choice of The Highest End.* All things are chosen which will bring about the highest end for God’s glory.

2. *Best Way of Securing That End.* Here wisdom asserts itself, not only choosing that which will bring about the highest end, but devising the best ways of securing that end. “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out” (Rom. 11:33). See also Romans 16:27; I Corinthians 2:7; Ephesians 1:8; 3:10; I Timothy 1:17.

*D. The Omnipresence of God.*

There are many vague ideas concerning the omnipresence of God. “Omnipresent” simply means everywhere present. God is everywhere present. God is everywhere, but He is not *in* everything. The belief that He is in everything is Pantheism. If God were in everything, then all man would have to do would be to bow down to a stone, a tree, a desk, a table, or any object, and he would be worshipping God. God is not *in* everything, but He is <sup>[pg27]</sup> everywhere! He is everywhere present. The best illustration of this is of a teacher before his class. The teacher is omnipresent to every student in that classroom; but he is not omnipresent to those on the outside, nor to those in the basement, nor even to those who are in the next room. Why? Because the walls, floors and space are barriers between him and those in other parts of the building. But God transcends *all* barriers — space, materials, all things.

We believe, however, that there is a certain place where He manifests Himself, where He is located — and from that locality He is present to everything of the universe. “Hearken thou to the supplication of thy servant, and of thy people Israel, when they shall pray toward this place: and hear thou *in heaven* thy dwelling place: and when thou hearest, forgive” (I Kings 8:30). See also Jeremiah 23:24; Ephesians 1:20; Revelation 21:2.

While God’s dwelling place is in heaven, yet we do know that He has manifested Himself in other places: on *earth*, as when He dwelt in the burning bush (Ex. 3:4): “When the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I”; and in the *flesh*, in the incarnation of Jesus Christ: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (Phil. 2:5-8).

The Holy Spirit is everywhere. He is *in* believers: “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be *in* you” (John 14:16, 17).

He is *with* the unbelievers: “Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment” (John 16:7, 8).

God is with us no matter where we are; He is omnipresent; He is everywhere present!

*E. The Eternity of God.*

This is one thing which has never been grasped by the human mind: God is without beginning and without ending. He is the Eternal Now. He is the only One who *is*. There is no past, and there is no future in eternity. God is eternal; therefore, there is no past nor future with God. “I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed. But thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end” (Ps. 102:24-27). See also Psalm 90:4. [pg28]

Some one may ask, “What is the difference between Genesis 1:1 and John 1:1?” Genesis 1:1 says: “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” John 1:1 says: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” Are both “beginnings” the same? If so, then the Word, Jesus Christ, had a beginning! Both passages start at the same point — the beginning; Genesis 1:1 begins with the beginning and looks *forward* into eternity; while John 1:1 begins with the beginning and looks *backward* into eternity. Therefore, the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, had no beginning.

*F. The Immutability of God.*

In other words, this means the “unchangeableness of God.” His Being, attitude and acts are without change; “I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed” (Mal. 3:6); “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning” (Jas. 1:17); “God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath” (Heb. 6:17).

For a discussion of the repentance of God see Chapter I, III, C, 3, b,.

*G. The Love of God.*

1. *Its Citation.* “He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. . . . And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him” (I John 4:8-16).

This is the *one* definition of God. There are many adjectives defining God, but a noun needs a noun. The love of God comes from revelation. It does not come by one’s own knowledge. It cannot be seen in nature. Only from God’s Word comes that knowledge that God is love. There are those who deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, but who still say that God is love. If the Scriptures are not the Word of God, how do we know that God is love? You can search the world over and never find a “God is love” among the heathen. They have their gods and idols, but a God that is “God is love” is unknown to them. The Bible *is* the Word of God — it, and it only, tells us that “God is love.”

2. *Its Objects.* If God is love, then that love must be directed to someone. And it is, for we learn from the Scriptures that the objects of His love are:

a. *His Son.* God loves His Son more than man could ever love his own offspring. “Lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Matt. 3:17). See also Matthew 17:5. God’s love is a perfect love and transcends all bounds: “Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world” (John 17:24).

b. *Believers.* All who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ are the objects of God’s divine love. He manifests that love day by day. “The Father himself loveth **you**, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God” (John 16:27). “I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that [pg29] thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me” (John 17:23).

c. *Israel.* Be careful how you speak of the “lowly” Jew. He is the object of God’s love, the same as we Christians: “The LORD hath

appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee” (Jer. 31:3).

d. *Sinners*. God never changes concerning His attitude toward sin. God hates sin, but *loves* the sinner! “God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved; )” (Eph. 2:4, 5). “When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (Rom. 5:6-8).

### 3. *Its Manifestations*.

a. *In the Gift of His Son for Sinful Man*. “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him” (I John 4:9). See also John 3:16; Romans 5:6-8.

Man cannot look upon Calvary and say, “God doesn’t love me.” One dear man told of the time when his own son was in the pangs of death. The hardest thing he ever had to do was to say, “Thy will be done. If thou wantest my son, thou canst have him.” Oh, to give up an only son! But mankind gives up its sons to *God*, who takes care of them better than man ever could. But God gave His Only Son to sin — to pay for sin, to pay for the sins of sinners! Yes, we may see our children in the throes of death, but God saw His Son suffer as no man ever did. The dearest child on earth is only a stranger compared with the love of God toward His Son. God points toward Calvary and says, “See my Son! See Him mocked, smitten and bruised?” God saw Him. God saw sinners as they crucified His Son. God could have wiped them off the face of the earth, but He did not. The nails that pierced His Son pierced the heart of the Father. We can *never* understand it. “For God so loved the world, that He *gave*...” The Father gave him up to the hands of justice, to pay for our sins.

Many a murderer has had to pay with his life for his crime. Jesus was delivered up to pay for our crimes of sin.

b. *In Giving Life and Position In Christ*. To believers only is given that sacred position — in Christ; there is where we are — saved,



and uncondemned. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is” (I John 3:2): “Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) and hath raised us up together, and made us sit *together* in heavenly places *in Christ Jesus*” (Eph. 2:5,6).

c. *In Granting That We Should Be Called the Children of God.* “Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God; and such we are. For this cause the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not” (I John 3:1, R.V.<sup>12</sup>). [pg30]

d. *In Chastening of His Loved Ones.* “Whom the Lord *loveth* he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons. Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby” (Heb. 12: 6-11). Remember, the chastening of the Lord is for *our* benefit — for *our* profit. We need chastisement; it is a must in the life of the Christian; and we receive it from our Father in Heaven.

e. *In Remembering His Children in All Circumstances of Life.* The question is asked and answered in the Word concerning the care of parents. Is there a love greater than mother love? Listen to what God says: “Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb?” Is it possible that a mother

---

12 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

could ever leave her child? The answer is, “Yea, they may forget.” In our own lifetime we have witnessed the desertion of children by their parents. It is a shame that the United States and the separate States have to have laws which compel parents to take care of their children. However, this is the nature of the flesh; this is the Adamic nature, the sinful nature, that parents desert their offspring. You may know someone who has. You, yourself, may have been deserted by some one. But listen to the rest of God’s Word: “Yet will I not forget thee” (Is. 49:15). There is One who will never desert *His* children!

f. *In Rejoicing Over the Return of the Prodigal Son.* This great story is found in Luke 15:11-24. It is the story of a *Son*, not a sinner. A sinner is not a son. Only a son is a son, and you cannot un-son a son. A son is born a son forever. But here was a son who sank so low that the testimony he might have had was lost. Remember, he was still a son, and as much so while feeding swine as he was in his Father’s house. Relationship was still there, but fellowship was broken. You can lose fellowship, but you cannot lose sonship. He made up his mind what he would say to his father upon his return, but he did not get the chance. He did say, “I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son”; but before he could add, “Make me as one of thy hired servants,” the Father, holding his son in his arms, cried to the servants, “Bring forth the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet: and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it; and let us eat, and be merry: for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found” (Luke 15:21-24).

Let the prodigal know that if he has been once born from above he is still God’s child. Only let him resolve to “arise and go” to his Father. The Father stands with open arms ready to plant His kiss upon the penitent lips of His wayward child. “Arise and go!”

#### 4. *The Forms of God’s Love.*

##### a. *In the Goodness of God.*

(1) *As Manifested in Creation.* “God saw . . . that it was good.” This is characteristic of the first chapter of Genesis. God is good, and all things that He creates and makes are for the good of man.

(2) *As Manifested In His Care of Brute Creation.* “The eyes of all wait upon thee; [pg31] and thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living

thing” (Ps. 145:15, 16).

(3) *As Manifested In the Variety of Pleasure for His Creatures.* Why all the beauty of nature, if not to be enjoyed by the eye of man?

(4) *As Manifested in the Gift of His Son.* This proves the goodness of God — that God is good.

(5) *As Manifested In Allowing Sinners to Repent.* “Despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?” (Rom. 2:4).

b. *In the Loving-kindness of God.* “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not *with him* also freely give us all things?” (Rom. 8:32). Since God has given us the Greatest Gift — His Son — we can be assured that we shall be given “the wrappings” with it. The Son is the Gift, and the wrappings are “things” of His supply which make our souls happy.

c. *In the Long-suffering of God.* “The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance” (II Peter 3:9). “The LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, The LORD, the LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth” (Ex. 34:6). See also Numbers 14:18.

How many of us praise the Lord that the Saviour gave us “time” in trusting Him for our salvation? Oh, the long-suffering of God which is manifested toward us, in that we were able to hear the Gospel twice, when there are millions who have never heard it once!

d. *In the Patience of God.* “Now the God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus” (Rom. 15:5). Here we note that the patience of God is a divine title, for He is the God of patience! This is clearly manifested in:

(1) *His Dealings With Sinners: Those Before the Flood.* “Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water” (I Peter 3:20). The Lord demonstrated His patience for at least a hundred years. As long as the ark was a preparing, the Gospel was preached — the people warned.

His patience was exhausted, finally, and the flood carried the unbelievers away. It will be the same with the coming of the Son of Man at His revelation, at the end of the Tribulation. All those who are found not to be in the Ark, Jesus Christ, shall be destroyed.

(2) *His Dealings With Israel*. “And yet for all that [Israel’s sin], when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the LORD their God. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God: I am the LORD” (Lev. 26:44, 45).

Israel today is Godless, and by this we do not mean that Israel is worse than any other nation, but simply that it is without God. Jehovah has sent prophets unto her, but she has stoned them. He sent even His Son, and Him they crucified. They have been driven unto the uttermost parts of the earth because of it. Yet, for all of this, God has shown His [pg32] patience, and that patience shall be rewarded, for that nation shall be born anew in a day, and all Israel (those alive at the time of the Revelation of Jesus Christ) shall be saved!

(3) *His Dealings With the World Today*. Why does not God strike today? Why are men allowed to blaspheme the God of heaven and His Son Jesus Christ? The answer is found in the patience of God.

#### *H. The Mercy of God.*

1. *As To Its Citation*. “(For the LORD thy God is a merciful God;) he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he sware unto them” (Deut. 4:31). “The LORD is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. . . . But the mercy of the LORD is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children’s children” (Ps. 103:8, 17). “God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us . . . hath quickened us together with Christ” (Eph. 2: 4-5). See also Psalms 130:7; 145:8; 136:1.

2. *As To Its Explanation*. There is very little difference in the meaning of mercy and grace. *Mercy*, generally speaking, is used in the Old Testament, and *grace* in the New Testament. Old Testament *mercy* and *loving-kindness* go together. Someone has said that mercy is negative, and loving-kindness is positive. Mercy is shown to the

disobedient, and loving-kindness is showered upon the obedient — both together mean grace.

3. *As To Its Manifestation.*

a. *In Pardoning the Sinner.* “Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief” (I Tim. 1:13).

b. *In Removing the Guilt and Penalty.* “He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us” (Ps. 103:10-12).

c. *In Delivering the Periled.* “Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: oh save me for thy mercies’ sake” (Ps. 6:4).

d. *In Saving Its Object.* Luke 10:33-37 records the parable of the Good Samaritan. After He has told the parable Jesus asks, “Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?” And the answer comes: “He that shewed mercy on him.” There can be no doubt but that Jesus Christ is typified by the good Samaritan, and it is He who saves, through His mercy, the objects of His concern.

I. *The Grace of God.*

1. *As To Its Citation.* “According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life” (Titus 3:5-7). “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (Eph. 1:7). “The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered a while, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you” (I Peter 5:10). See also I Corinthians 6:1. [pg33]

2. *As To Its Explanation.* Grace is said to be undefinable. Grace always flows down. We might be able to love our equal, or one above our equal, or sometimes one below our equal, but look at the vast difference between God and us; there can be no comparison. The grace of God toward us is unmerited favor.

3. *As to Its Manifestation.*

a. *In That Grace Justifies*. Rather, grace *declares* the saint to be righteous: “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 3:23, 24).

b. *In That Grace Imputes Righteousness*. This means, that by the act of God’s grace, the righteousness of God is put to the account of the believing sinner, “Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness” (Rom. 4: 4, 5).

c. *In That Grace Imparts a New Nature*. “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For *we are his workmanship*, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them” (Eph. 2:8-10).

d. *In That Grace Saves*. Why should God save us? The only answer is *grace!* “By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God” (Eph. 2:8).

e. *In That Grace Instructs*. “The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world” (Titus 2: 11, 12).

#### *J. The Faithfulness of God.*

Unfaithfulness is the greatest sin of today. This is true in every walk of life, whether in business, church, or state. But we have a God who is *faithful* at all times, under every circumstance. The Word bears out the faithfulness of God by the following:

1. *Citation*. Many Scriptures point out the faithfulness of God: “Know therefore that the LORD thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations” (Deut. 7:9); “God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord” (I Cor. 1:9); “There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it” (I Cor. 10:13).

See also Deuteronomy 32:4 (R.V.<sup>13</sup>); I Thessalonians 5:24; II Thessalonians 3:3; I John 1:9.

2. *Explanation.* The meaning of “faithfulness” is stay, lean, prop, support. God is our *support*; He it is upon whom we can lean; when we are faltering, He is our *Prop* — at *all* times! [pg34]

3. *Manifestation.* How does God prove faithful?

a. *In Keeping His Promise.* “Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)... For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry” (Heb. 10: 23, 36, 37). The promise of the virgin-born son in Isaiah 7:9 is fulfilled in Luke 1:26-38; 2:7; the promise of God to Abraham in Genesis 15:13, that his seed would go to Egypt and stay there for four hundred years, is fulfilled in Exodus 12:41. See also these other Scriptures: Deuteronomy 7:9; I Kings 8:23, 24, 56.

b. *In Preserving his People.* Take Lamentations 3:22, 23 with Jeremiah 51:5 and you can see that once a people becomes God’s people, they are His forever. That is because God is faithful: “It is of the LORD’S mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness” (Lam. 3:22, 23); “Israel hath not been forsaken, nor Judah of his God, of the LORD of hosts; though their land was filled with sin against the Holy One of Israel” (Jer. 51:5). Other Scripture bears out the faithfulness of God in preserving His people: “Let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to him in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator” (I Peter 4:19). See also Psalm 89:20-26; II Timothy 2:13 (R.V.<sup>14</sup>).

c. *In Chastening His Children.* God is faithful in carrying out the “spankings” He has promised to His wayward children: “I know, O LORD, that thy judgments are right, and that thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me” (Ps. 119:75). Correction is needed when we disobey our

13 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

14 Ibid.

Lord, and verily we can always count on the *faithfulness* of God to render the expression in this respect. “Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth” (Heb. 12:6).

d. *In Forgiving Our Sins*. “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (I John 1:9).

e. *In Answering Our Prayers*. How do we know that our prayers will be answered? God commands us to pray to Him without ceasing. How do we know that it will do any good? We know that God answers our prayers, because the faithfulness of God guarantees that His ears will always be opened to the cries of His children: “Hear my prayer, O LORD, give ear to my supplications: in thy faithfulness answer me, and in thy righteousness” (Ps. 143:1).

#### 4. *Applications*.

a. *It will preserve us from worry.*

b. *It will check our murmuring.*

c. *It will increase confidence in God.*

#### K. *The Holiness of God*.

While we mention the holiness of God as the last of God’s attributes, let us never forget that it is not the least at all. Consider first:

1. *Natural holiness*. This is called the *fundamental* attribute, and is one attribute by which God wants His people to remember Him. Some Bible scholars declare that this is <sup>[[pg35]</sup> the most important of all of God’s attributes. We know why they make such a statement. It is because holiness is named most often in the Scriptures. God is called holy more times in the Scriptures, and His holiness is mentioned more, than His might. Holiness is indeed the “attribute of attributes.” When we think not of God’s holiness, we think light of sin. We are living in the day of compromise, when people hold “light views.” It is hard to get people to consider their lost condition and the peril of hell ahead. They think lightly of salvation, because they have a light view of God’s holiness: “Who is like unto thee, O LORD, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?” (Ex. 15:11); “I am the LORD your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy: neither shall defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. For I am the LORD that bringeth you up out of the land of



Egypt, to be your God: ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy” (Lev. 11: 44, 45); “Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory” (Is. 6:2, 3); “Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones” (Is. 57:15); “I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are” (John 17:11); “Grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30). See also Leviticus 19:1, 2; Joshua 24:19; Psalms 22:1-3; 99:5,9; I Peter 1:15, 16.

2. *Aspects of holiness.* By this we mean the mien of holiness that of which holiness is composed.

a. *Purity.*

(1) *Its Citation.* “This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all” (I John 1:5).

(2) *Its Explanation.* In Him is light. In Him is no darkness ever. Light is always pure. There is no such thing as dirty light, nor can anyone make dirty light. God is Light — *pure*, free from defilement. There are two phases of purity: *negative*, free from all that defiles; *positive*, pure. God in His holiness is pure: free from all that defiles, and pure in essence.

b. *Righteousness.* This is another element of holiness.

(1) *Its Citation.* “He is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he” (Deut. 32:4). “Righteous art thou, O LORD, when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy judgments: Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?” (Jer. 12:1); “O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou has sent me” (John 17:25).

(2) *Its Explanation.* The formula for righteousness is found in

Ezekiel 18:5, 9: “If a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right...” that is, do things right, in a right way, “he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord God.” God is always right. He possesses character that makes Him do everything right. Righteousness always requires that which is right in character. God never asks anything that is not right. God never [pg36] commands that which will make us do wrong.

c. *Justice.*

(1) *Its Citation.* “The just LORD is in the midst thereof; he will not do iniquity: every morning doth he bring his judgment to light, he faileth not; but the unjust knoweth no shame” (Zeph. 3:5). See also Deuteronomy 32:4.

(2) *Its Explanation.* The Greek and Hebrew words for justice mean the same. Righteousness is the legislative demand of God — the demand for holiness. *Justice* is judicial holiness — that judicial act of God which demands the penalty for those who have not measured up to the righteous commands of God. Justice, judicial holiness, governs those who are judged, and that brings about the execution of those who carry not out God’s laws. Justice is the Executor of those who wrong God’s holy commands. Man’s justice is sometimes wrong, but God’s justice is always right — thus holiness!

d. *Truth of God.*

(1) *Its Citation.* “Lead me in thy truth, and teach me: for thou art the God of my salvation; on thee do I wait all the day. . . . All the paths of the LORD are mercy and truth unto such as keep his covenant and his testimonies” (Ps. 25:5, 10); “God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?” (Num. 23:19); “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began” (Titus 1:2). See also the following Scriptures: Deuteronomy 32:4; Psalm 31:5; 86:15.

(2) *Its Explanation.* That which God has revealed to man in His Word is Eternal Truth. God never contradicts Himself. One portion of His Word never contradicts another. Are we not glad that the Word of God has not agreed with all the dead theories of the past? Certainly! Be not dismayed should the Bible not agree with any modern day theory concerning creation, man, etc. Man does not *know* apart from

the Word of God. Anything apart from the revelation of God is mere supposition.

3. *Manifestation of God's holiness.*

a. *By His Works.* Everything that God has created and made is perfect, holy. God did not create sin. God did not create a sinful nature which is in the unsaved man. God created man, who, has sinned. Man, by sinning, has passed on to man that perverted nature, that Adamic nature, or as we have called it, that "sinful" nature. Yes, God created man who was capable of sinning. If God had created man so that man could not have sinned, then He would have made a machine rather than a being with a free will. And if God had created man so that man could not sin and yet was not a machine, man would not only have been like God, but he would have been God Himself. God does not make God. Man is inferior to God. God cannot sin; that is His nature. Man would be God if he could not have sinned.

b. *By His Laws.* All the laws are right — they are truth. There is not a single untruth in the whole of God's laws. Thus God's laws manifest God's holiness.

c. *By His Hatred of Sin.* Do you know one reason why fellow Christians are tolerant toward the sins of another, or toward the sins of the unbelievers? It is because they do not hate sin as God hates it. Often we say that God hates sin, but He doesn't hate the sinner. That is not true. God *does* hate the sinner; "The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou <sup>[pg37]</sup> hatest all workers of iniquity" (Ps. 5:5). This may be a revelation to some of us. God hates the sinner because of his sin, and not because of himself. God hates the sinner, but He loves him, too, because He knows that man is capable of holiness, although ruined by sin. Why does God punish the sinner? Because of the sinner's sins! God thus hates sin, no matter where it may be found, whether in the life of an unregenerated sinner, or in the life of His own believer! God's attitude and conduct toward sin reveal the holiness of God.

d. *By His Love of Righteousness.* God loves righteousness as much as He hates sin: "Hear thou in heaven, and do, and judge thy servants, condemning the wicked, to bring his way upon his head; and justifying the righteous, to give him according to his righteousness" (I Kings 8:32); "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;

therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows... For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister” (Heb. 1:9; 6:10).

e. *By His Justification of the Believing Sinner.* If man had his “rights,” he would be in hell; but it is the mercy and grace of God which offers him the plan of salvation, which if he receives declares the believing sinner to be righteous: “God hath set [Christ Jesus] forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:25, 26).

f. *By His Care of His Saints,* “The LORD executeth righteousness and judgment for all that are oppressed” (Ps. 103:6). “Many a time have they afflicted me from my youth, may Israel now say: many a time have they afflicted me from my youth: yet they have not prevailed against me. The plowers plowed upon my back: they made long their furrows. The LORD is righteous: he hath cut asunder the cords of the wicked” (Ps. 129:1- 4). See also the following Scriptures: Psalm 98:1-3; 145:15-19; II Timothy 1:6-9.

g. *By His Cross.* “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Ps. 22:1). We can catch a glimpse of the Cross by reading the quoted verse and the remaining verses of Psalm 22. This Psalm is, of course, prophetic, spoken or written some nine hundred years before Christ actually died upon the Cross of Calvary. And Christ’s death is a perfect manifestation of God’s holiness. Some, no doubt, will ask how this could be. We know that God hates sin; therefore, when His Son was made “sin for us, who knew no sin,” yea, when even God’s Son became sin, God’s attitude toward sin did not vary. God hated sin as much as ever, even when He made His Son sin. His Son did not change His view at all. Jesus, therefore, became hated of the Father because of sin. Jesus never became a sinner, but He became sin. And as God hated sin (“It pleased the LORD to bruise him” — Is. 53: 10a), God forsook His Son, for God will always forsake sin. God’s holiness did not change.

## V. The Fatherhood of God.

God is called the Father because of the association with Him. Popularity of the term “Father” is due to Christianity. There is no such thing as God being a Father in heathenism — this can be found only in Christianity. Today there are many fancies concerning the Fatherhood of God. The teaching of the Fatherhood of God and the [pg38] Brotherhood of Man is nothing but Universalism: that which teaches that no one will ever be sent to hell. The Universalists reason that God will never send any of His children to hell — and that is true: He will not send any of His *children* to hell — but not all men are the children of God. The Scripture which the Universalists use to preach that God is the Father of all mankind is Ephesians 4:6: “One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” But this means all Christians, all believers, *not* the unbelievers nor the unregenerated.

### *A. Old Testament Teaching.*

“Doubtless thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our father, our redeemer; thy name is from everlasting... Now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand.” (Is. 63:16; 64:8).

God is mentioned in the Old Testament as a Father, but not the Father of the individual. Rather He is considered to be the Father of the nation Israel. You cannot find in the Old Testament where God is spoken of as a Father of a born-again sinner.

### *B. New Testament Teaching.*

The Lord Jesus is the One who introduced God as the Father of the individual. He is the first to recognize that God is the Father of each separate Christian. The following Scriptures bear this out: “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth” (John 1:14); “Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God” (John 5:17, 18); “My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand. I and my *Father* are one. Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus answered them, Many good works

have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God” (John 10:29-33); “They took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me” (John 11:41).

1. *In That God is the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ.* The expression, as we use it, “the Fatherhood of God,” does not mean that God lived for a long time and then begat His Son. God, remember, is the eternal Father — and to be an eternal Father, He must have an eternal Son. The term “son” in Scripture does not always mean a son by generation; it may also mean a son by *relationship*. Take the Old Testament Scriptures: “Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel” (Is. 7:14); and: “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The [pg39] Prince of Peace” (Is. 9:6). Notice the *child* and the *son*. The child is *born*; the Son is not born, but *given*. Yes, that Babe in Bethlehem was born, but that Life was the Son who has been forever. The Babe had a beginning; the Son had no beginning. He has existed always, from eternity, *with* the Father. Thus, Christ is the Son, not by generation (by birth), but by relation. He is related to the Father and the Holy Spirit; all together are related to each other, and thus compose the Godhead, God could never be God without all members of the Godhead being present from eternity throughout eternity.

In order for God to become flesh, He had to be born as any other man; thus, He manifested Himself in His Son, who was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit: “The angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35); “When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law” (Gal. 4:4).

a. *And the Father Recognizes Jesus as His Own Son.* “Lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am

well pleased” (Matt. 3:17); There came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him” (Luke 9:35).

b. *And the Son Recognizes God as His Own Father.* “All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him” (Matt. 11:27); “I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me” (Luke 22:29); “These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee” (John 17:1).

c. *And Men Recognize Jesus as God’s Own Son.* “Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matt. 16:16); “I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God ...Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel” (John 1:34, 49).

d. *And Demons Recognize Jesus as God’s Own Son.* “Behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?” (Matt. 8:29).

2. *In That God is the Father of Believers On the Lord Jesus Christ.* “There is . . . one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all” (Eph. 4:6).

We cannot emphasize too strongly the fact that God is not the Father of all mankind. He is only the Father of born-again children of God. All men are the creatures of God, but not all are children of God. Man is a creature of God by creation; he *becomes* a child by *re-creation*: “Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord . . . whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the *divine nature*, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust” (II Peter 1:2, 4).

There can be no sonship apart from the spiritual re-birth. A child has, always, the nature of his father. Man, who is born of Adam, has Adam’s nature, which is corrupt, which is perverted, which is sinful. And the *father* of Adam’s sinful nature is Satan. Thus, the nature of our father (Adam) is the same nature as Adam’s father’s (Satan); therefore, our [pg40] nature is the same as Satan’s. All unregenerated

sinners have Satan as their father: “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it” (John 8:44). Summing it all up, if Satan is the father of the unsaved by the natural birth, we must have a supernatural birth in order for God to be our Father!

God does not have any fellowship with anything which is of Adam, for Adam is all that is of a sinful condition and nature. God only has to do with His Son. The world is divided into two divisions; in fact, there are only two men whom God recognizes: Adam and Christ; thus, sinners are divided as to their identity with these two men. The unsaved are identified with Adam; the saved are identified with Christ. All men are identified by the natural birth in Adam; born-again men are identified by the supernatural birth in Christ.

The unsaved man can only call God “God.” The unsaved man cannot call God “Father.” Only the child of God can call God “Father.” When the Lord Jesus was hanging on the tree, He called out, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” Notice that Christ did not cry, “My Father, my Father.” but “My God, my God.” Why? Why did He not call God “Father”? Because He was taking the sinner’s place there in death, dying — the Just for the unjust. And as He was taking the sinner’s place (a sinner can not call God “Father,” but only “God”), He could only call God “God.”

Where are we? In Adam or in Christ? “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:22). [pg41]

[This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.<sup>15</sup> The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

---

15 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69



## Chapter 5 Critique of Other Systematic Theology Works

### Critique of Chafer's Chapter 10-13 Theology Proper (129-180)

Dr. Chafer's eight volumes of Systematic Theology were required reading for my theology studies at LBTS ([www.LBU.edu](http://www.LBU.edu)) This critique of his first volume is not meant to attack or insult Dr. Chafer's intelligence or his integrity. Overall his theology documentation was found lacking and this critique is straight forward and hard hitting.

A common failure of our documented systematic theologies is their propensity to systematically explore orthodox and/or traditional doctrines which have no scriptural bases whatsoever. Naturalistic Theism encompasses exactly such a feckless exercise.<sup>16</sup>

For one whole chapter of twenty five pages Dr. Chafer waxes very philosophical and very, very verbose in trying to decipher what mankind could know about the existence of God, without the presence of God's revelation to man. This theologian's immediate response; "Who cares?" Our more pressing reaction should be "What does God's written Word tell us of man's intrinsic knowledge about God, and man's standing before Him?" A discussion of ontological arguments logically assembled by philosophers of yesteryear has no place whatsoever in a systematic theology. Arguing for or against the existence of reality, categorizing universal characteristics of existence and explaining "I think therefore I am," is a sophomoric exercise for a philosophy student, or cultist's ground for Mary Baker Glover Eddy's Christian-Science reading room, but it is not the sacred ground for the theologian with a Holy Bible in his lap.

Likewise twenty two wordy paragraphs defining a teleological *aposterior* argument which proves the existence of God is nothing

---

16 This section is extracted from a "TH802 report ADVANCED SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY II TH802 WRITTEN REPORT" Presented to the Faculty of Louisiana Baptist University In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Doctorate of Philosophy in Theological Studies, 2013

more than philosophical fodder with no founded place in a systematic theology. Supposing a power which produces intelligence and rational thought itself might somehow lack intelligence and rational thought is such a profound tom-foolery that it should not even be named *theological*, let alone find seven whole pages in a systematic theology book. In his own conclusion Dr. Chafer admits that such “abstract speculations” are completely unnecessary.<sup>17</sup>

Dr. Chafer does include two necessary arguments about man's intrinsic knowledge of God; the cosmological argument and the anthropological argument. But even in these his development is wholly philosophical and completely lacking for the theologian, even categorically incompetent for a systematic theologian. A competent cosmological argument and a competent anthropological argument must start where the Word of God starts, and not where the vain logical philosophies of mere men starts. The theologian must, as heretofore stated by all parties, begin with an infallible, inerrant source and from there unravel what has been revealed about Naturalistic Theism. Such a volume must first cast off all of Hodge, Strong, Thiessen and Chafer's Ontological-Teleological arguments as vain philosophy. There are two and only two pertinent books that fill their pages with philosophy; Job and Ecclesiastes. Neither of them contain ontological or teleological considerations. Why? Both of these philosophy dissertations begin and revolve around what Scripture reveals as man's intrinsic knowledge about God. Ergo a systematic theology presenting Naturalistic Theism must begin with nothing more and should venture through none of the rationalistic mud of unregenerate philosophers. Chafer's whole chapter needs to be reorganized and rewritten. Just such a venture began in this report, and is presently in draft before you.

### **Critique of Chafer's Chapter 14 The Attributes of God (187-224)**

Chapter 14 of Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's Systematic Theology disqualifies him as a candidate for writing a theology book, and it thoroughly and completely disqualifies him for writing a systematic

---

<sup>17</sup> Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 161.

theology. In this chapter, titled “The Attributes of God”, a crescendo of improper, unsystematic organization crosses a line of incompetence where his scattered ramblings cannot be rationally comprehended. In this chapter, needing concise conclusions about our God and Father. Passive communication methods cross a threshold in Chafer's ability to comprehend his subject, his verb and the possible existence of indirect objects. In this Chapter, where the heart of theology resides, one cannot find sound Biblical Doctrine, Biblical research methods, or Biblical hermeneutics. These observations make Chafer's six volume set uncomfortable in an independent Baptist theologians library.<sup>18</sup>

There are three glaring failures in Chafer's systematic theology; his failure to organize a presentation of doctrine, his failure to communicate anything in an active voice and a concise English sentence, and his failure to comprehend and capture a purely Biblical theology. These necessitate the review of more competent systematic works, and makes obvious the dire need of a purely Biblical systematic theology work captured in something less than his wordy volumes.

Three more competent systematic works capture a profound insight to the attributes of God and surely capture a more thoroughly organized systematic theology. First, Dr. Chafer's lack genders a new respect of Augustus H. Strong. A strong attraction is in Strong's Baptist heritage; Baptist historically being people of the Book, i.e. people with the Holy Bible as a final authority and that being a sole authority of all faith and practice, ergo, people who defy creeds, traditions, and human founders, to rest solely on this one authority. Augustus Strong exhibits genius in organizing and communicating Bible doctrine and systematic theology. His prominent systematic errors being his acceptance of evolution as his creator, and his acceptance of the Presbyterian and Reformed-Theology and their unchangeable “decrees” of God. His organization captures well the attributes of God, however, he falls apart trying to force fit ideas about decrees in Part IV entitled “The nature, decrees, and works of God.”<sup>19</sup>

---

18 Extracted from TH802 report, 2013. [This passionate dismissal of Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's systematic theology is not meant to dismiss his genius and integrity. As the founder and president of Dallas Theological Seminary, and the author of eight volumes of systematic theology, his high regard should not be significantly diminished by this critique, but his *Systematic Theology* should be.]

19 Strong's Volume is organized in four parts; 1) Prolegomena, 2) The Existence of

All systematic theologies in print seem to hold to John Calvin's fatalistic rant about decrees.

Chafer's whole section titled Bibliology, needed to be re-written to incorporate a Biblical view of inspiration; his whole chapter of "Naturalistic Theism," needed to be re-written to capture any Biblical view at all; and now, his chapter on the attributes, personality and works of God is found to be in such unorganized, excessively passive and verbose conglomeration that it needs to be re-written. Such a re-write, following Augustus Strong's superb example, began in connection with this report.

Henry Clarence Thiessen is the other Baptist author of a Systematic Theology. His organization and writing is far superior to Chafer's. His one volume called "Introductory Lectures In Systematic Theology" incorporates a very concise and careful wording of doctrine, where Chafer exhibits six volumes of verbose imprecise wording of the same. Both seem to equally capture evangelical error, with an un-Biblical doctrine of inspiration, naturalistic theology, and of the decrees of God, but Thiessen is greatly preferred to the excessively passive and verbose mannerisms of Dr. Chafer.

Dr. Thiessen divided his Theism from his Theology, as did Strong, and he organized the latter as: 1) The Nature of God- Essence and Attributes, 2) The Nature of God- The Unity and Trinity, 3) The Decrees of God, 4) The Works of God in Sovereignty. Such a work mimics the organization structure and content of Strong and makes a worthy outline for a re-write of Chafer's vain attempt.

Charles Hodge,(1797-1878) in a perfectly thorough systematic theology, by a perfectly thorough, albeit Presbyterian, theologian, organized his Theology Proper as:

Charles Hodge organized his Theology Proper in 436 pages thus:

- 1) Origin of the idea of God,191-203 (13pgs 3%);
- 2) Theism,204-240 (37 pgs 8%);
- 3) Anti-Theistic theories, 241-334 (94pgs 22%);
- 4) knowledge of God, 335-365 (31pgs 7%);
- 5) The Nature of God and His Attributes, 366-441 (76pgs 17%);
- 6) the Trinity, 442-482 (41pgs 9%);

---

God, 3) The Scriptures A Revelation From God, 4) The Nature, Decrees and Works of God.

- 7) The Divinity of Christ, 483-521 (39pgs 9%);
- 8) The Holy Spirit, 522-534 (13pgs 3%);
- 9) The Decrees of God, 535-549 (15pgs 3%);
- 10) Creation, 550-574 (25pgs 6%);
- 11) Providence, 575-616 (42pgs 10%);
- and
- 12) Miracles, 617-636 (20pgs 5%).

For the area of Theology Proper it would be hard to improve on Hodge's Systematic approach. Strong seems to be the first to separate Theism from Theology and that separation is artificial and unnecessary. Where each theologian should have expounded the Bible's dispensationalism, under the works of God, alas none have. A special disappointment is heaped on Chafer, who started with a burning desire to word dispensationalism but had no depth to include it under the works of God. Instead all these theologians spent exorbitant time defending the Westminster confession and its fatalistic heresy that God decrees everything that happens, and knew who would marry who before the foundation of the earth!<sup>20</sup> Further they suppose that God knows every soul that shall be saved and decreed it before the foundation of the earth!<sup>21</sup> Even further they suppose that God knows every soul headed to hell and predestined them to go there before the foundation of the earth!<sup>22</sup>

Hodge the Presbyterian, worshiper of John Calvin, made his Systematic Theology systematically Westminster, and loyal to Roman diabolical philosophies. Strong, bolstered the deity of Christ in his, but retained the Westminster confession without correction, and would not

---

20 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 1. God from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely, and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass ...

21 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death. IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated, and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

22 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

depart from vain philosophy. Thiessen departed from inspiration of Scripture, but not from the Westminster Confession or philosophical viewpoints. And Chafer added unmitigated wordiness to Thiessen, bolstered the denial of plenary verbal inspiration, infallibility and inerrancy, while bowing the more loyally to the Westminster Confession as he spinelessly regurgitated the philosophical perspectives; perspectives incorporated by Roman Catholics and carried on by Protestants who did not protest enough. It is high time that someone with a systems background and a solid grasp on an infallible, inerrant sole authority, defy the Westminster Confession of 1646, defy the philosopher and define a Biblical Systematic Theology. Alas Chafer is not that man.

### **Critique of Chafer's Chapter 15 Divine Decrees (pg. 225-259)**

A supposition about Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's competence in writing a systematic theology is worded previously but a comment on his thirty five pages defending the Westminster Confession's divine decrees is in order here. He starts by asserting that anyone who would disagree with the Westminster's interpretation is “dishonoring and misleading.”<sup>23</sup> He contends that since both the Westminster Confession of 1646 and the Bible assert the *decree*, the *purpose*, the *determinate counsel*, the *foreknowledge*, the *fore ordination*, and the *election* by which God is said to act, therefore the Westminster Confession of 1646 is the truth. Incidentally, it reports as truth that God decrees everything that happens and knew who would marry who before the foundation of the earth!<sup>24</sup> Further they suppose that God knows every soul that shall be saved and decreed it before the foundation of the earth!<sup>25</sup> And even further that God knows every soul headed to hell and predestined them to go there before the foundation of the earth!<sup>26</sup>

---

23 Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 225.

24 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 1, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

25 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, III, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

26 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, Previously quoted

Dr. Chafer then rambles on and on for thirty three pages before he allows a Rev. Alex Brown to write his misguided conclusion.<sup>27</sup> Dr. Chafer is provided a perfect convenience for writing out his dispensational theology in a section about the works of God, instead of writing about the actual works of God he expands and justifies the Roman Catholic myth, worded by John Calvin, codified in the Westminster Confession of 1646, perpetuated by Presbyterians, certified by Reformed Theologians, and presently creeping in to non-Protestant (i.e. Baptists) theology, the myth of divine decrees. Someone needs to accentuate the old relevant story and declare in no uncertain terms, “The Emperor has NO clothes.”<sup>28</sup>

I hold in my hands a Bible that declares, Prayer changes things, and they hold in their systematic theologies that, All is foreknown, nothing can change. One is wrong. I hold in my hands a Bible that says, “It repented God that He had made man”, that God repented of what he was going to do to Nineveh, and that God and I can change the eternal destiny of my neighbor, and they write a systematic theology that says “nay, nay.” I hold in my lap a book that says Sarah gave Hagar to Abram and mucked up a situation with obtuse consequences; they say God planned it that way from the foundation of the world. I hold a book that says Abraham intervened for Lot and caused his salvation, they say God would have done it that way anyhow. My Bible says Moses intervened to prevent God from destroying the Sons of Israel, they say God was just pulling Moses' leg with false threats. My Bible says Joash only had three victories because he only struck his arrows three times, their decrees say God didn't rearrange his plan he just deceived old Elisha and Joash. My book says God changed his mind, God changed his Word, and God changed his message just to give Hezekiah thirteen more years of life; they say he was just messing with Elisha and Hezekiah's head. It is high time somebody stood up to these dishonoring deceivers and plainly declared that the Westminster Confession is WRONG! One is responsible for their own actions, decisions, and rejections, and God

---

from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

27 Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 257-259.

28 Reference to short story *Emperor's New Clothes*, 1837, by Hans Christian Anderson.

does pay attention to the whosoever of the Bible. Again, Dr. Chafer proved not to be the man that would stand up to deceivers.

### **Critique of Chafer's Chapter 16 The Names of Deity (260-271)**

Chafer worded an excellent chapter on The Names of Deity. There is a distinct break from his very wordy, excessively philosophical style previously displayed. He emphasized in this chapter that the Scriptures were his main source. This had not been mentioned or practiced previous. It made all the difference in the world. The concise wording seems to be accomplished by citing other works heavily, but it was a joy to read a concise well worded chapter. Evidently he wrote his own conclusion, that is the only portion that regressed to his disturbing style.

### **Critique of Chafer's Chapter 17-19 Trinitarianism (272-317)**

Chafer's Trinitarianism was reviewed. It was disturbing that Chafer worded this thirty nine word sentence, "The fact that men of equal sincerity disagree relative to the possibility of reason serving in the field of this doctrine is evidence that unaided human minds fail in their attempts to search the deep things of God." That sentence highlights his insufficiency to word a concise definitive section on the trinitarian doctrine. Again Strong is far more capable as a theologian in this area. Chafer outlines his section as follows:

- Chapter 17 Introduction to Trinitarianism
- Chapter 18 Proof of the Trinitarian Doctrine
- Chapter 19 God the Father
- Chapter 20-26 God the Son
  - I. His Preexistencetic Union
  - II. His Names
  - III. His Deity
  - IV. His Incarnation
  - V. His Humanity
  - VI. The Kenosis
  - VII. The Hyposta
- Chapter 27 God the Holy Spirit



While Strong has this detailed and clarified presentation of the doctrine:

Chapter II. Doctrine of the Trinity, 304-352

I. In Scripture there are Three who are recognized as God, 305-322

1. Proofs from the New Testament, 305-317

A. The Father is recognized as God, 305

B. Jesus Christ is recognized as God, 305-315

C. The Holy Spirit is recognized as God, 315-317

2. Intimations of the Old Testament, 317-322

Godhead,  
A. Passages which seem to teach Plurality of some sort in the  
317-819

B. Passages relating to the Angel of Jehovah, . . . 319-320

C. Descriptions of the Divine Wisdom and Word, 320-321

D. Descriptions of the Messiah, 321-322

II. These Three are so described in Scripture, that we are compelled to conceive them as distinct Persons, 322-326

1. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from each other, 322

2. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from the Spirit, 322-323

3. The Holy Spirit is a Person, 323 326

III. This Tri-personality of the Divine Nature is not merely economic and temporal, but is immanent and eternal, 326-330

1. Scripture Proof that these distinctions of Personality are eternal, 326

2. Errors refuted by the Scripture Passages, . . . 327-330

A. The Sabellian, 327-328

B. The Arian, 328-330

VI While there are three Persons, there is but one Essence, 330-334

V. These three Persons are Equal, 334-343

1. These Titles belong to the Persons, 334-336

2. Qualified Sense of these Titles, 335-340

3. Generation and Procession consistent with Equality, 340-343

VI. The Doctrine of the Trinity inscrutable, yet not self contradictory, but the Key to all other Doctrines, 344-352

1. The Mode of this Triune Existence is inscrutable, 344-345 p

2. The Doctrine of the Trinity is not self-contradictory, 345-347

3. The Doctrine of the Trinity has important relations to other Doctrines,  
347-352

Dr. Chafer's extremely wordy, improperly organized section on the trinity is dwarfed by existing systematic theology works. It is to be unstaged by "A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." Praise the Lord.

## Chapter 6 Theology Proper Conclusion

Theology proper is the thorough study of God. It has been designated *proper* to delineate it as a study of the Godhead rather than the larger study of God, the revealed works that he has done, is doing, and shall do, i.e. the whole study of *Theism* that we are systematically engaged in. In theology proper one is engaged in a study of everything one needs to know about God the Father himself, and everything one therein needs to know, has been revealed in God's completed revelation to man, the Holy Bible. Realizing that God is infinite, and man is finite is to realize that knowing God will always be finite and limited, and thus limited here to what man "needs to know."

*Romans 11:33 O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!*

*Deuteronomy 29:29 The secret things belong unto the LORD our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.*

Such a study first considers the sixty six books, written by forty men, over a period of 1,592 years, to be the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God, and to be the sole source of all theology, particularly here for theology proper. Thus, what man naturally knows about God is not discovered by examination of the philosopher's *ontological* or *teleological* argument, nor by man's *anthropological* or *cosmological* reasoning, but by examining what God's word says that man naturally knows about God. It declares that God himself has placed inside of man a natural knowledge of God and his wrath against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, that our Lord Jesus Christ is a light that lightheth every man that cometh into the world, and that "I the LORD search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings" (Jeremiah 17:10). These three revelations mark all of the

*naturalistic theology* one needs to systematically delve into.

Likewise what God knew, what God planned, and what God programmed before the foundation of the world is not discovered by examining a logical, philosophical creed declaring what he must have known, or detailing the decrees of God compiled by some genius theologian of the past. It is discovered by looking into the perfect law of liberty. Therein one sees a Sovereign God who has given some measure of sovereignty to man; therein one sees a God who repents of some of his own decrees thus responding to that delegated sovereignty in man, and therein one sees, “*For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts*” (Isaiah 55:8-9).

In these two venues alone one can see the importance of using the Bible as a sole authority for our theology, and one can see the failures of previous theology works that did not. Know God. Study God. Study not on the basis of visions, or feelings, or logical reasoning, or ideas of men, or even ideas of genius theologians of bygone days, but on the basis of what he has revealed about himself in the sixty-six books called the Holy Bible. That study alone causes that he must increase, and I must decrease. This chapter of that study has only outlined some of the important things that one can know about God from that revelation, and it constitutes the opening of a door, that you may know God. Important in this doorway are the names of God, the existence of God, the nature of God, the attributes of God, and the Fatherhood of God, and each of these was found well documented in Dr. Cambron's “Bible Doctrines” book. Again keep in mind:

*The secret things belong unto the LORD our God:  
but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to  
our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this  
law.*

Deuteronomy 29:29

## Bibliography for Theology

### The Holy Bible

Bancroft, Emery H., *Elemental Theology*, 1932, Baptist Bible Seminary, 1945, 1960, Zondervan 1977, [In 1932 Emery H. Bancroft became the first Dean of Baptist Bible Seminary, Johnson City, NY and published his text for his course *Elemental Theology*. In 1968 the Seminary relocated to Clark Summit PA. In 1970 this author attended Practical Bible Training School on the Johnson City campus and studied Bancroft's text. In 1999 – 2000 this author attended Baptist Bible Seminary to take Greek (NT502 and NT503) via a 3 hour commute from Hammondsport NY to Clark Summit PA, and was reintroduced to Bancroft's exceptional work.]

Cambron, Mark G. *Bible Doctrines*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1954, [Independent Baptist, Professor and Dean, Tennessee Temple Bible School-College-Seminary, 1948-1959, serving with Dr. Lee Roberson (1909-2007) the founder of Tennessee Temple University in 1946], [*Bible Doctrines, Beliefs That Matter* is available at <http://thecambroninstitute.org/library/Bible%20Doctrines.pdf> and <https://heritagebbc.com/bible-doctrines-class-complete/> ].

Carroll, James Milton, *The Trail of Blood*, 1932, open source, public domain, from <https://archive.org/details/TheTrailOfBlood>.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.[Lewis Sperry Chafer was an American theologian. He founded and served as the first president of Dallas Theological Seminary, and was an influential founding member of modern Christian Dispensationalism. Born: February 27, 1871, Rock Creek, Died: August 22, 1952, Seattle, Education: Oberlin College, Wheaton College. For

my Doctorate of Philosophy in Theological Studies through LBTS, I was tasked to analyze all six volumes of his Systematic Theology]

*Satan*, 1909, Free ebooks - Project Gutenberg, 2004,  
<http://www.gutenberg.org> accessed 06/01/2013

Christian, John T., *A History of the Baptists*, Vol 1&2, The Baptist Bible Institute, New Orleans, Louisiana, first published in 1922, public domain, soft copy  
[http://www.pbministries.org/History/John T. Christian/vol1/or](http://www.pbministries.org/History/John%20T.%20Christian/vol1/or)  
or  
<http://www.reformedreader.org/history/christian/ahob1/ahobp.htm>.

Dollar, George W., *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, Bob Jones University Press, 1973.

Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI, 1985.

Finney, Charles G., *Power from On High*, Christian Literature Crusade, public domain, from  
<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/finney/power.html>

Gausson, L., *Theopneustia – The plenary Inspiration of The Holy Scriptures deduced from Internal Evidence, and the Testimonies of Nature, History and Science*, David Scott's translation, Chicago, The Bible Institute Colportage ASS'N., 1840.

Geisler, Norman L, *Systematic Theology in One Volume*, Bethany House, 2002, 3, 4, 5, 11 [Geisler, also a neoevangelical, sharply contrasts with Lewis Sperry Chafer in that Geisler 1) admits what he is, neoevangelical, 2) admits what he is attempting, a compilation of evangelical theologies, 3) shows superb organization and structure of thought, 4)

contains depth, and 5) is a masterful communicator. This author cannot endorse all that Geisler believes to be true, but can endorse that he seems to capture all that has been believed by conservative evangelicals.]

Hodge, Charles, *Systematic Theology: Volume I-IV*, Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, Hardback- Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, <http://www.ccel.org>, public domain. [The Internet Archive [www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01hodg](http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01hodg)], [Charles Hodge, 1797-1878, Presbyterian Minister, Princeton Theologian].

Larkin, Clarence. *The Spirit World*, Published by the Clarence Larkin Estate, 1921, Cosimo, 2005

Miley, John, *Systematic Theology* Vol. 1 & 2, The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, New York: Eaton and Mains, 1894, The Internet Archive <http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01mile>, [John Miley (1813-1895, Methodist Theologian)].

Rice, Edward G., *The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*, Public Domain, <http://www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf>, <http://www.lulu.com/shop/pastor-edward-rice/the-357-magnum-errors-of-modernists-critical-texts/paperback/product-5586759.html>

Ryrie, Charles C., *Basic Theology*. Victor Books, Wheaton, Illinois, 1981.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Three volumes, 1877, reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977.

------. *History of the Christian Church*. Third edition, revised in eight volumes, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans

Publishing Company, 1910.

Schofield, C. I., *Prophecy Made Plain*, Photolithoprinted by Grand Rapids Book Manufacturers, Grand Rapids, MI, 1967.

Shedd, William G. T., *Dogmatic Theology*, Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, Charles Scribner & Sons, 1888. [The Internet Archive [www.archive.org/details/dogmatictheology01sheduoft](http://www.archive.org/details/dogmatictheology01sheduoft)], [William G.T. Shedd, 1820-1894, Old School Presbyterian & Reformed Theologian].

----- Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, A Defense of the Westminster Standards. 1893, reprint, Edinburgh, UK: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1986.

----- Commentary on Romans. 1879, reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980.

Strong, Augustus H., *Systematic Theology: Three Volumes in 1*, Philadelphia, Valley Forge PA, The Judson Press, 1907, 35<sup>th</sup> printing 1993. [Augustus H. Strong, 1836-1921, American Baptist Pastor & Theologian].

Thiessen, Henry Clarence, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949. [Henry Clarence Thiessen, ? -1947, President of Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, later renamed John MacArthur's The Master's College].

*Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Revised by Vernon D. Doerksen, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 2006.

Waite, D.A.. *Defending the King James Bible*. The Bible For Today Press, 1992 & 2002.

Yoho, Walter Allan, *YAHWEH The Greatness of God*, Volume 1 thru 3, FBCPublications.com, 2010. [Dr. Yoho teaches theology at Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary 717 Whitehurst Landing Rd. Virginia Beach VA 23464 under Pastor. James Baker. We met after our military-hop to Norfolk VA on our return from Mazara Del Vallo, Italy in May 2016. I have been enthralled with his three volumes of theology since that meeting.]



## Volume 4 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

### Chapter 1 – Christology Introduction

There is no better introduction to the doctrine of Christ than is found in God's first sentence to the Hebrews.

*God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.*

Hebrews 1:1-4<sup>29</sup>

The doctrine of Christ is foundational to everything one is to know in theology. It is “first principle” it is “milk” and it is what brings us to “strong meat.”

*Of whom we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing. For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the **first principles of the oracles of God**; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. Therefore leaving **the***

---

29 The Holy Bible

*principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection...*

Hebrews 5:11-14, 6:1a

[Emphasis added by author]

The most central theme of a thorough systematic theology is the doctrine of Christ. In segregating systems of the key '*ologies*'<sup>30</sup> of the whole revelation of God for a thorough analysis, it is Christology which interfaces with every other system. It is indeed central. In order of our topic coverage, it may rank in third place, behind Bibliology, and Theology Proper, but it is prima-facie the principle and central doctrine of God's whole revelation. Bibliology sets the foundation for all Bible doctrine, and Theology Proper presides as a grand overview of all Bible theology, but Christology is the central key to all theology and all doctrine. Whatever is to be gleaned from a discourse on Pneumatology, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and certainly all Anthropology, Hamartiology, Soteriology, studying the doctrine of man, sin, and salvation, must find its root in a discourse on the redeemer of mankind, the Christ. Ecclesiology and Eschatology, the doctrine of His Church and the doctrine of last things, yea, even ones Angelology, the study of His angels, springs with rapture from the study of the person of the Christ. It is, therefore, needful to dwell here, on the person of the Christ, and make it a true "*ology*."

A systematic theology must first have as its foundation a true and rich Bible doctrine. From that foundation a discourse must systematically analyze such doctrine, keeping it pure from its detractors, and evaluating its fit into the larger arena of theology. Detractors from truth are myriad from outside but fall under three

---

30 *ology* is from the Greek meaning a word, a discourse, a doctrine, a teaching, a matter under discussion, a thing spoken of or talked about, also the mental faculty of thinking, meditating, or reasoning about. Others have limited this suffix by equating it to the English word science, which is "The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of phenomena." Some have better equated it to the English word "study," to consider in detail and subject to an analysis in order to discover essential features or meaning, to give careful consideration to. There really is no English equivalent that can capture the depth of "*ology*," which derives from the Greek word "*logos*." It is literally to go on, and on, and on about a topic with pen, or speech, or thought.

major considerations when guarding against internal sabotage. The first is Roman Catholic religion which has always directly opposed Bible truth; second the Protestant Reformers, who are supposed to have come back to Bible truth, but, subtly, they carry the Roman error as concealed weapons; and third the post-modernist ecumenical Bible correctors who make a pretense of using textual criticism and modern language to "fix" what they suppose God was unable to preserve. These three are primary enemies to Bible doctrine, Rome - directly, reformed - more subliminally, and ecumenical Bible correctors - very shrewdly. Exposing their pernicious ways is not generally the focus of a Bible doctrines book, and in a world where Bible doctrine is under constant attack, a careful type of systematic theology needs to be developed. Herein a solid Biblical doctrine must form the basis and starting point for a purified systematic theology.

## Chapter 2 Christology in Bible Doctrine.

Bible Doctrine differs from systematic theology only in its level of thoroughness. Consequently, a sound Bible Doctrine book makes for a good foundation for a Biblical systematic theology. A good systematic theology does not separate itself from practical theology nor Biblical theology, nor exegetical theology, and ergo it cannot separate from a good Bible based Bible doctrine exposé. There is no truer, or more thorough, published, Baptist, and Biblical doctrine than that of Dr. Mark G. Cambron.<sup>31</sup> His teachings on Bible Doctrine at Tennessee Temple Bible School thoroughly lay the foundation for this systematic theology. His book, *Bible Doctrines*<sup>32</sup> is, with the permission of the Cambron Institute,<sup>33</sup> given in block quotes throughout this effort. The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for most of this Systematic Theology.<sup>34</sup>

Believing in the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and believing that every single word is directly chosen by God, it is necessary to preserve and defend the doctrine extracted from Scripture and presented by Dr. Cambron. In this Christology volume, in block quotes of his book, his extensive analysis of Christology in Bible

---

31 Dr. Mark G. Cambron, B.A., M.A., Th.B., Th.M., Th.D., D.D., L.L.D., Litt.D., was one of the foremost theologians of our times. Born in Fayetteville, Tennessee on July 31, 1911. He was born-again in 1919. It was during a Billy Sunday campaign in Chattanooga that he trusted in the Lord Jesus Christ as his personal Savior. He served for many years at Tennessee Temple College (1948-59) with Dr. Lee Roberson and served as Dean of the College. From <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org> accessed 10/16/2013

32 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

33 The Cambron Institute, 35890 Maplegrove Road, Willoughby, Oh 44094

34 It is noted here and amply reproved in the Bibliology section of this work, that it is fallacy for Dr. Cambron's Bible Doctrines book to recommend using the R.V., instead of the Holy Bible, 41 times for 54 Bible verses. Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the "Bible Critics," the "Bible Correctors," the "Textual Critics," and the "Copyright Mongers" of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

doctrine is given in its entirety. Below is a block quote of his chapter II opening and his section on “Names and Titles of Christ” [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 60-69, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 44-53]

## Cambron's Ch II Christology (The Doctrine of Christ)

Chapter II Christology - The Doctrine of Christ [pg42]

CHRISTOLOGY (The Doctrine of Christ)

### OUTLINE FOR CHAPTER II

I. Names and Titles of Christ.	III. The Two Natures of Christ.
A. Jesus.	A. The Humanity of Christ.
B. Christ.	B. The Deity of Christ.
C. Messiah.	C. The Blending of the Two Natures Into One Person.
D. Lord.	D. The Errors Concerning the Two Natures.
E. Jesus Christ.	IV. The Death of Christ.
F. Christ Jesus.	A. The Fact of the Death.
G. The Lord Jesus Christ.	B. The Form of the Death.
H. I Am.	C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Death.
I. The Son of God.	D. The Scriptural Names of the Death.
J. The Son of Man.	E. The Objectives of the Death.
K. The Son of Abraham.	F. The Extent of the Death.
L. The Son of David.	G. The Results of the Death.
M. The Son of the Highest.	V. The Resurrection of Christ.
N. Second Man.	A. The Importance of the Resurrection.
O. Last Adam.	B. The Meaning of the Resurrection.
P. The Word.	C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Resurrection.
Q. Emmanuel.	D. The Proofs of the Resurrection.
R. Saviour.	E. The Result of the Resurrection.
S. Rabbi.	VI. The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ.
T. Rabboni.	A. The Meaning of the Ascension and

	Enthronement.
U. Master.	B. The Message of the Ascension and Enthronement.
II. The Incarnation of Christ.	C. The Nature of the Ascension and Enthronement.
A. The Fact of the Incarnation.	D. The Necessity of the Ascension and Enthronement.
B. The Manner of the Incarnation.	E. The Purpose of the Ascension and Enthronement.
C. The Objections to the Incarnation.	F. The Results of the Ascension and Enthronement.
D. The Objects of the Incarnation.	
E. The Perpetuity of the Incarnation.	
F. The Proofs of the Incarnation.	

[pg44]

## Chapter II Christology

Christology, fundamentally, is the doctrine of Christ. Blessed is he who knows Him as Lord and Saviour.

Sometimes we are warned that we can preach too much of Christ, in that we may not emphasize enough the doctrines of God and of the Holy Spirit. Let us say here, that one cannot preach too much of Jesus Christ. Furthermore, there is no such thing as jealousy in the Godhead. From Scripture we can see that God would have us emphasize Christ more than we do: “And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the *preeminence*” (Col. 1:18).

### I. Names and Titles of Christ.

We believe in the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scripture. That is, we believe that every single word in the originals is the direct word chosen by God with which to convey His will to us. Believing thusly, we attach much importance to the titles and names of the Lord Jesus Christ. The most well-known name of our Saviour is:

*A. Jesus.*

The name *Jesus* is found in the Four Gospels 612 times, and it is found in the balance of the New Testament 71 times. The name *Christ* alone is found in the Four Gospels only 56 times, while in the remainder of the New Testament the name *Christ* is found 256 times.

*Jesus* is found *before* His death, burial and resurrection, while *Christ* is found *after*.

*Jesus* is the personal name of the Lord. It is His earthly name, the name under which He was born, lived, and died. It is the name of His humiliation; of suffering; of sorrow. It is the name of the One who humbled Himself. The name *Jesus*, at the time of our Lord, was not uncommon, there were many who were named *Jesus*. *Jesus* is the Greek form for the Hebrew word *Joshua*, and both mean “Jehovah our Saviour.” This name, *Jesus*, was the one which was nailed over Him on the Cross.

Again we emphasize the fact that the name *Jesus* is prominent in the Gospels, while the name *Christ* is mentioned more in the Epistles. The name *Jesus* was more prominent *before* salvation was made and completed, while the name *Christ* is prominent *after* the work of salvation was finished. A Christian is not a person who believes in *Jesus* — the whole world believes there’s a *Jesus* — but a Christian is one who believes in the LORD [pg46] *Jesus Christ*. He is Lord! With this knowledge, that a person is saved by declaring *Jesus* as Lord (Rom. 10:9, R.V.<sup>35</sup>), and believing that God hath raised Him from the dead (and we know by I Corinthians 15:1-3 that the Gospel is the death, burial and resurrection of the Lord *Jesus Christ* as the sinner’s Substitute), we state that there is very little “gospel” in the Four Gospels. The Four Gospels give very little of the doctrine of salvation for sinners; only in the last few chapters of each Gospel is the death, burial and resurrection of *Christ* recorded. Hence, the name *Jesus* is predominant.

The Epistles are the writings which bring out so clearly the

---

35 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ. The Epistles are full of the doctrine of salvation; hence the emphasis upon the name *Christ* and *Lord!* Before Calvary it is *Jesus* which is emphasized; after Calvary it is *Christ* which is emphasized: “Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same *Jesus*, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ” (Acts 2:36); “Being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of *Jesus* every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that *Jesus Christ* is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil. 2:8-11).

This is interesting to point out: when He was upon this earth (before He was crucified), He was never called *Jesus* to His face. It was always Lord, Master, or Rabbi by His followers: “Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am” (John 13:13); “Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” (Luke 6:46).

The reason why the name *Jesus* is mentioned most in the Gospels (612 times) is that the Gospels emphasize His humility; the reason why the name *Christ* is mentioned most in the Acts and Epistles is that these writings emphasize His exaltation! There is a reason why the name *Jesus* is mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews eight times: the Holy Spirit would have us know that this Person was a *man*. The institution of the Lord’s Supper is a perfect illustration of the emphasis on the name *Jesus* in the Gospels, and on the title *Christ* in the Epistles: “As they were eating, *Jesus* took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body” (Matt. 26:26); “I have received of the *Lord* that which also I delivered unto you, That the *Lord Jesus* the same night in which he was betrayed took bread” (I Cor. 11:23).

Men of the world, the demons of Satan, all addressed Him as *Jesus*, but never as Lord. Christian Science, Universalism and Unitarianism believe in a *Jesus*, but they claim that He cannot save, for they state that there is no sin to be saved from. Every false system of religion has the Lord *Jesus Christ* as the Object of its attack. Every



false system reasons away sin; and in doing so, the need of a Saviour is ruled out. It says that Jesus died a needless death; and in doing that, He did not know what He was doing; in doing that, He must not have been the Son of God, for God knows all things. Do you not see that every attack upon the Son of God, Jesus our Lord, whether it be in regard to His blood, His resurrection, His substitutionary sacrifice or His second coming, is nothing but a subtle assault upon the *deity* of Christ. [pg47]

We do not get our name from Jesus, but from Christ: we are *Christians*. Yes, we know that this name *Christian* was first given to the believers by those who hated God and His Christ; nevertheless, we are proud to take His dear name and to bear His reproach.

Never, remember, did unbelievers call the Saviour Lord, they called Him Jesus; and never did believers call Him Jesus, with one exception (and the exception makes the rule): “He said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning *Jesus* of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done” (Luke 24:19-21). These were the words of the disappointed disciples — “we trusted that it had been he” — all their hopes were shattered when Jesus was crucified. They did not know the Scriptures, nor had they remembered the Lord’s words that He would rise again from the dead, and thus they spoke of Him as a Lost Cause; and they, here, called Him *Jesus*. If Christ had not risen from the dead, their hopes, and not only theirs, but ours as well, would have been destroyed; He would have been just plain *Jesus*. “But now is *Christ* risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept” (I Cor. 15:20). He is Christ and Lord! Not mere man, but the God-man.

To believers He is Lord. We should never use adjectives with Him. He is not the Blessed Jesus, the Sweet Jesus, although He is all that; He is the Lord Jesus Christ! When we pray, we should pray in Christ’s name, not in Jesus’ name.

*B. Christ.*

We have dealt at length with the name *Christ* as it is used, but let us add these details:

The name *Christ* means the Anointed One. This is the *official* title of the Son of God. Whenever we hear the word “anointed,” remember how, and under what circumstances, men were anointed. We know that men were anointed as kings, and prophets, and priests: “Samuel also said unto Saul, The LORD sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the LORD” (I Sam. 15:1); “Jehu the Son of Nimshi shalt thou anoint to be *king* over Israel: and Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah shalt thou anoint to be *prophet* in thy room” (I Kings 19:16); “The LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Take Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments, and the *anointing oil*, and a bullock for the sin offering, and two rams, and a basket of unleavened bread. . . . And he poured of the *anointing oil* upon Aaron’s head, and anointed him, to sanctify him” (Lev. 8:1, 2, 12).

1. *Christ Has Been Anointed Prophet.* “Moses truly said unto the fathers, A *prophet* shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethen, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that *prophet*, shall be destroyed from among the people” (Acts 3:22, 23). [pg48]

2. *Christ Has Been Anointed Priest.* “Seeing then that we have a great *high priest*, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an *high priest* which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:14, 15).

3. *Christ Has Been Anointed King.* “Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the *throne* of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his *kingdom* there shall be no end” (Luke 1:31-33).

In the Gospels *Christ* is pictured as *King* of Israel: in the Epistles *Christ* is pictured as *Head* of the Church.

### C. *Messiah*.

“He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the *Messias* [Messiah], which is, being interpreted, the Christ” (John 1:41); “The woman saith unto him, I know that *Messias* cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things” (John 4:25).

*Messiah* is the Hebrew word with the same meaning as *Christ*, which is the “Anointed One.” The Old Testament is full of the *Messiah* prediction, while the New Testament is full of *Christ* fulfillment; the Old Testament is written in the Hebrew language, while the New Testament is written in the Greek language.

### D. *Lord*.

This is Christ’s title of deity, that of authority. All three names of God, as found in the Old Testament, are compounded into that one name, *Lord*. In the study of the names of God, we saw that the word “God” in the Authorized Version comes from the Hebrew word *Elohim*, which is the office of God; and that the word “LORD” or “GOD,” comes from the Hebrew word *Jehovah*, which is the personal name of God; and that the word “lord,” or “Lord” (small letters), comes from the Hebrew word *Adonai*, meaning Master.

In the New Testament the word “Lord” comes from the Greek word *kurios*, which is translated in the Authorized Version as Lord, God, Master, and Sir. This rendering is equivalent to the Old Testament *Adonai* — Master. And Christ, the Lord, is our Master: “And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him” (Eph. 6:9); “Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven” (Col. 4:1).

As stated above, the title “Lord” also includes another name for God, and that is LORD or Jehovah, and we know this by the way it is used in the New Testament. The New Testament quotes from the Old Testament Scriptures, using the word “Lord,” while the Old Testament word is “LORD,” or “Jehovah”: “Jesus said unto him, It is written again, [pg49] Thou shalt not tempt the Lord [Old Testament: Jehovah]

thy God” (Matt. 4:7). In this verse it is also seen that *Elohim* (God) is ascribed to the Lord, who is the Lord Jesus Christ.

In salvation we must acknowledge that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, God, and Master: “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as *Lord* [Jehovah, God, Master — all three], and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (Rom. 10:9, A.R.V.<sup>36</sup>).

If we have declared Him as Lord (Jehovah, God, Master), then we recognize Him as the One who owns us, the One who determines our walk and life, the One who only has the right to us and everything we possess. We have a great responsibility to Him; His will is to be the will of our lives: “Be ye not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord [Jesus Christ: Jehovah, God, Master] is” (Eph. 5:17). Even in marriage one should abide by the will of the Lord Jesus Christ: “The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord” (I Cor. 7:39). These words take on a deeper meaning as you realize that a Christian should not only marry another Christian, but that he should do so only if it is according to the will of the Lord. And *after* marriage the will of the Lord should be desired: “Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord” (Col. 3:18).

No man can call Jesus *Lord*, except by the Holy Spirit, for the flesh (sin, carnal nature) does not recognize Christ as Lord: “I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost” (I Cor. 12:3).

### *E. Jesus Christ.*

This is another title of the Lord, which is the combination of His personal name (Jesus) with His official title (Christ). The emphasis is on the first word — Jesus, what He *was* to what He *is*. That is, Jesus, who once humbled Himself, is now exalted.

---

36 Ibid.

*F. Christ Jesus.*

The emphasis is on the first word here also — Christ, which means He who was exalted, was once humbled; “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (Phil. 2:5-8).

*G. The Lord Jesus Christ.*

This is the Lord’s fullest title: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, [pg50] who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (Eph. 1:3).

*H. I Am.*

This is an Old Testament title brought forth into the New Testament. Jehovah appeared unto Moses in the burning bush and commanded that he should tell Pharaoh to let the children of Israel go from the land of bondage. “Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I AM* hath sent me unto you” (Ex. 3:13, 14).

The Lord Jesus called Himself the great I AM when He was in Gethsemane. As the crowd came with lanterns, torches and weapons, the Lord went forth to meet them, asking, “Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am...” (John 18:4, 5). But, you may add, the Scriptures say, “I am he,” not merely, “I am.” To this we reply, Look at the word “he”; it is in italics, and all italicized words have been supplied by the translators and can therefore be left out.<sup>37</sup> The Lord Jesus actually said, “I am.” When the

---

37 Dr. Cambron here oversimplifies an accepted explanation that is generally not true. It is not true that KJB italic words may be left out. They were carefully added by fifty-seven expert linguists in order to faithfully capture the exacting

Lord announced that He was the great I am, what did they do? “As soon then as he had said unto them, I am, they went backward, and fell to the ground” (John 18:6). Still another portion of the Word bears out the fact that Christ Jesus was the great I Am. “Jesus saith unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58). “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9).

### *I. The Son of God.*

This is the Lord’s title of personal glory and deity. “The angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). “The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God” (John 19:7). See also John 5:18.

The Lord Jesus is *the* Son of God. A Christian is *a* Son of God. The Lord Jesus is *the* Son of God by relation and nature; the Christian is *a* Son of God by regeneration and adoption. The Lord Jesus has been *the Son* of God from all time and eternity; the Christian becomes *a child* of God when he trusts in Christ, the Lord.

### *J. The Son of Man.*

This seems to be the favorite title of the Lord, the one by which He called Himself time and again: “Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head” (Luke 9:58).

This is the Millennial title of Christ. Wherever it is recorded, it is used in connection with <sup>[pg51]</sup> the coming kingdom reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. Even in the Old Testament the same thing holds true. Some may take issue with this, stating that Ezekiel takes upon himself that same title, the son of man. However, we refer the reader to the passages where it is used; there the coming Millennial Kingdom is in view. For example, in Ezekiel 37 is the prophecy of the Valley of Dry

---

Greek and Hebrew variances that do not readily flow into our cumbersome English language. The information these italic words add are not to be just discarded without thinking.

Bones, the whole house of Israel, which shall come to life again when the Lord prophecies unto them to return to the Land of Palestine; that will be the Millennium.

This is the Lord's title and not man's. You are *a* son of man, but He is *the* Son of man.

The title, the Son of man, is found eighty-eight times in the New Testament: once in Acts; once in Hebrews; twice in Revelation; and eighty-four times in the Gospels; not once in the Epistles. The Epistles concern the Church, not the coming kingdom of the Millennium. Christ is *King* of the Kingdom, but *Head* of the Church. And as the Church is not the Kingdom, therefore, the Millennial Title (the Son of man) of Christ is not found in the Epistles to the Churches.

#### *K. The Son of Abraham.*

The Gospel of Matthew is described as “the book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham” (Matt. 1:1). “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ” (Gal. 3:16).

The Messiah (Christ) was to be a Jew. Christ was a Jew, for He was a Son of Abraham, and thus the Messiah!

#### *L. The Son of David.*

This is the *royal title* of the Lord Jesus: “When he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me” (Mark 10:47).

#### *M. The Son of the Highest.*

The title of pre-eminence: “He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David” (Luke 1:32).

#### *N. Second Man.*

“Second Man” indicates that there was one man before Him — only one — and that man was Adam: “The first man is of the earth, earthy: the *second man* is the Lord from heaven” (I Cor. 15:47).

*O. Last Adam.*

“Last Adam” indicates that there is no man to follow Him. There are only two men in the [pg52] records of God: Adam and Christ. Thus, the world is divided under these two headships: Adam and Christ. All are of Adam by the natural birth; only those are of Christ who have experienced the new birth.

“It is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last *Adam* was made a quickening spirit” (I Cor. 15:45).

*P. The Word.*

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God” (John 1:1, 2).

As spoken words reveal the invisible thoughts of man, so the visible (living) Word reveals to us the invisible God.

*Q. Emmanuel.*

“Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us” (Matt. 1:23). As the Scripture tells us, it means “God with us.” Remember, the Lord Jesus is Emmanuel — God with us; He will never leave nor forsake us (Heb. 13:5, 6).

*R. Saviour.*

“Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord” (Luke 2:11). Not a helper, but a Saviour!

*S. Rabbi.*

This comes from the Hebrew word meaning teacher. “Then Jesus turned, and saw them following, and saith unto them, What seek ye? They said unto him, Rabbi (which is to say, being interpreted, Master,) where dwellest thou?” (John 1:38).

*T. Rabboni.*

This is the same as the word “rabbi,” meaning Teacher, but



comes from the Chaldean. “Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master” (John 20:16).

*U. Master.*

“When the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?” (Matt. 9:11). The meaning here is “Instructor.” The idea of Owner is not here implied, as in the word “Lord” (Adonai). The world today recognizes that Jesus is a great Master (Instructor), but will not own Him as Lord. The Lord Jesus is not merely our Instructor: He is our God, our Jehovah, our Lord! [pg53] [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.<sup>38</sup> The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

---

38 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

## Chapter 3 – Christ The “I AM” and Modernist Deletions

### The “I AM” references of Christ

Even after Dr. Cambron's extensive explanation of Christ's use of the name "I Am", this author thinks some additional insight is appropriate. God uses 196 "I AM THE" references in the Holy Bible. Twenty Four times "I AM THE" is in Genesis and Exodus, as follows:

Ge 15:7 And he said unto him, **I am the LORD** that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.

Ge 17:1 And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, **I am the Almighty God**; walk before me, and be thou perfect.

Ge 26:24 And the LORD appeared unto him the same night, and said, I am the God of Abraham thy father: fear not, for **I am with thee**, and will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake.

Ge 28:13 And, behold, the LORD stood above it, and said, **I am the LORD God of Abraham** thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed;

Ge 31:13 **I am the God of Bethel**, where thou anointedst the pillar, and where thou vowedst a vow unto me: now arise, get thee out from this land, and return unto the land of thy kindred.

Ex 3:6 Moreover he said, **I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob**. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.

Ex 3:14 And God said unto Moses, **I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.**

Note the Hebrew in this instance: "I AM THAT I AM" = אֲדֹנָי (haw-yaw shur haw-yaw )

Ex 6:2 And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, **I am the LORD:**

Again Note the Hebrew "I am the LORD:" = אֲנִי יְהוָה (ne-vaw yeh-ho-vaw')

Ex 6:6 Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, **I am the LORD**, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments:

Ex 6:7 And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall **know that I am the LORD your God**, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.

Ex 6:8 And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it you for an heritage: **I am the LORD.**

Ex 6:29 That the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, **I am the LORD:** speak thou unto Pharaoh king of Egypt all that I say unto thee.

Ex 7:5 And the Egyptians shall know that **I am the LORD**, when I stretch forth mine hand upon Egypt, and bring out the children of Israel from among them.

Ex 7:17 Thus saith the LORD, In this thou shalt **know that I am the LORD:** behold, I will smite with the rod that is in mine hand upon the waters which are in the river, and they shall be turned to blood.

Ex 8:22 And I will sever in that day the land of Goshen, in which my people dwell, that no swarms of flies shall be there; **to the end thou mayest know that I am the LORD in the midst of the earth.**

Ex 10:2 And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may **know how that I am the LORD.**

Ex 12:12 For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man

and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: **I am the LORD.**

Ex 14:4 And I will harden Pharaoh's heart, that he shall follow after them; and I will be honoured upon Pharaoh, and upon all his host; that the Egyptians may **know that I am the LORD.** And they did so.

Ex 14:18 And the Egyptians shall **know that I am the LORD,** when I have gotten me honour upon Pharaoh, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen.

Ex 15:26 And said, If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the LORD thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: **for I am the LORD that healeth thee.**

Ex 16:12 I have heard the murmurings of the children of Israel: speak unto them, saying, At even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread; and ye shall **know that I am the LORD your God.**

Ex 20:2 **I am the LORD thy God,** which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

Ex 29:46 And they shall **know that I am the LORD their God,** that brought them forth out of the land of Egypt, that I may dwell among them: **I am the LORD their God.**

Ex 31:13 Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that **I am the LORD that doth sanctify you.**

It needs pointed out here that in the Hebrew tongue there is a very similar ring to "I AM" and the personal name of God "Jehovah" (generally shown with all caps as "LORD" in the King James Bible). Even without knowing Hebrew this similarity can be seen in the Hebrew lettering for the two expressions: "I AM" = אהיה (*haw-yaw*)

and "the LORD:" = יהוה (*yeh-ho-vaw*) Remember the latter of these, the personal name of God, was so hallowed that it was not spoken out loud in conversation; extreme care being taken to not use the name of the LORD in vain.

In reading scriptures aloud in Hebrew class this author, struggling with each word's pronunciation, was corrected gently a couple of times, but then rebuked sharply, when I carefully pronounced "*yeh-ho-vaw*"; instead of substituting the word "Lord" (*Adonay ad-o-noy*) in its stead. Hebrews do not say the name of God aloud, except in private prayer when talking to him. Whenever a newcomer to our online-class read aloud, and pronounced "LORD" instead of substituting "Lord" all ears perked-up, all students winced, and we waited for our Hebrew instructor to correct the new student. In the Hebrew tongue when someone said "I AM" out loud, all ears perked-up, supposing perhaps that someone was using the LORD's name in vain. This has been in Hebrew culture since 1492 BC, when God wrote down the 3<sup>rd</sup> commandment and gave it to Moses. When Jesus used the "I am" phrase repeatedly Pharisees were very angry. We completely miss this connection in English, and we also give the name "LORD" all too little reverence. Many Christians do not even know the difference between LORD and Lord in their Bible.

Forty five (45) times "I AM THE" is used in Leviticus. Seven (7) times "I AM THE" is used in Numbers and Deuteronomy, that is seventy-seven (77) times "I AM THE" is used in The Pentateuch alone.

It is used eight (8) times in the history books, only two (2) times in poetry; Ps 81:10 *"I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt: open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it."* and So 2:1 *"I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys."* It is used fifteen (15) times in Isaiah, only three (3) times in Jeremiah and a whopping sixty seven (67) times in Ezekiel. Another five (5) times in Minor Prophets Hos, Joel, Joel, Zac, Mal.

It is important to see that the "I AM" title for God is important in the Bible. The twenty-three New Testament usages demand a more complete examination.

Thrice Matthew records the "I Am the" title:

Mt 22:32 **I am the** God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

Mt 27:43 He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, **I am the** Son of God.

Mr 12:26 And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, **I am the** God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?

Fourteen (14) times "I AM THE" is used in the Gospel According to John. These are deserving of careful examination, but first note that it is used once in Acts 7:32 and twice in Revelation. The Revelation of Jesus Christ's usage of the "I Am the" title is striking:

Re 1:17 And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; **I am the first and the last:**

Re 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. **I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.**

God is the first and the last, and Christ is the first and the last. That is significant. Note the verses:

Re 1:17 And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; **I am the first and the last:** (Contrasted with: Isa 41:4 below)

Re 1:8 **I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending,** saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Re 1:11 Saying, **I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last:** and, What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto

- Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.
- Re 2:8 And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write; These things saith **the first and the last**, which was dead, and is alive;
- Re 21:6 And he said unto me, It is done. **I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end**. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely.
- Re 22:13 **I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last**.
- Isa 41:4 Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? **I the LORD, the first, and with the last; I am he**.
- Isa 44:6 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; **I am the first, and I am the last**; and beside me there is no God.
- Isa 48:12 Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; **I am the first, I also am the last**.

Two things come to bear on the identity of the Christ in this context. First he uses the “I AM” title of God so readily, and secondly he is indeed “the first and the last.” These unequivocally make him part and parcel of the triune Godhead.

The fourteen (14) times that the "I AM THE" title is used in the Gospel According to John are worthy of particular note:

- Joh 6:35 And Jesus said unto them, **I am the bread of life**: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.
- Joh 6:41 The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, **I am the bread which came down from heaven**.
- Joh 6:51 **I am the living bread** which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.
- Joh 8:12 Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, **I am the light of the world**: he that followeth me shall not walk in

darkness, but shall have the light of life.

Joh 9:5 As long as I am in the world, **I am the light of the world.**

Joh 10:7 Then said Jesus unto them again, **Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep.**

Joh 10:9 **I am the door: by me if any man enter in,** he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.

Joh 10:11 **I am the good shepherd:** the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.

Joh 10:14 **I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep,** and am known of mine.

Joh 10:36 Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, **I am the Son of God?**

Joh 11:25 Jesus said unto her, **I am the resurrection, and the life:** he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live:

Joh 14:6 Jesus saith unto him, **I am the way, the truth, and the life:** no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

Joh 15:1 **I am the true vine,** and my Father is the husbandman.

Joh 15:5 **I am the vine,** ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing.

In the Gospel of John, the Son of God makes use of seven (7) "I AM" likenesses. In that seven is the number of completeness, and these likenesses portray perspective on the Son of God they are extended some additional consideration. Examine the list below:

1) I am the bread of life: 6:35

I am the bread which came down from heaven 6:41

I am the living bread 6:51

2) I am the light of the world 8:12



- I am the light of the world. As long as I am in the world 9:5
- 3) I am the door of the sheep. 10:7  
I am the door: by me if any man enter in 10:9
- 4) I am the good shepherd: 10:11  
I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep 10:14
- 5) I am the resurrection, and the life 11:25
- 6) I am the way, the truth, and the life: 14:6
- 7) I am the true vine 15:1  
I am the vine, ye are the branches: 15:5

These seven exemplify his profoundest claim, “I am the Son of God” John 10:36 cf. Matthew 27:43. Christ's use of the “I AM” title of God may seem subtle to some, but it is a striking truth of his person to those who have ears to hear and eyes to see.

### **The Modernist bibles vs Names of Christ**

Little more needs to be said to explain these names for Christ, however, it is important for a systematic theology to disclose some alterations to this list. The ecumenical Bible correctors brazenly attack this list of the names of Christ. Three hundred and fifty seven (357) gross errors that are incorporated into all modernist English Bibles, can be found in this authors book "The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts"<sup>39</sup> These errors are finding root in all modern English Bible translations. They are also present in every other language that these Bible correctors touch. In this wholesale attack on the Words of God, they leave off 127 of the names of Christ we just considered! They completely omitted them from their modernist bibles.

The Westcott and Hort critical Greek text relies extensively on the Alexandrian manuscripts, Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph). All modernist, protestant, ecumenical bibles from all of the Bible societies, rely exclusively on the Westcott and Hort critical Greek text, which was incorporated in the Nestles Greek Text<sup>40</sup>. In concert, these

39 Edward Rice, *The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*, Public Domain, [www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf](http://www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf), [www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch](http://www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch)

40 Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, Allen Wikgren, *The Nestle-Aland Greek New*

modernist, calling themselves textual critics, and feigning to repair God's botched up preservation of Scripture, have stripped the name "Jesus" out of the Holy Bible 47 times.<sup>41</sup> They have stripped the name "Christ" out of the Holy Bible 37 times.<sup>42</sup> They have stripped the name "Lord" out of the Holy Bible 40 times.<sup>43</sup> Twice they had the audacity to strip out the whole compound name, "Lord Jesus Christ"! (Col 1:2 & 1Thes 1:1). Once they eliminated the name "Son of man" from their "corrected bibles" (Matt 25:13).

The attack on God's Words by ecumenical textual critics is brought to a most striking focus in the examination of these 127 listed atrocities. If, in examination of your non-English Bible, you find one of these gross departures from the received text, you can be certain that ecumenical textual critics, modernists for certain, have had their hand in its translation process. These lists may be edited into most Bible search engines and a comparison can be made between your Bible and the Greek Received Text or the King James Bible Text. Since it causes such an awakening to the ecumenical textual critics tactics, the verse lists of the errantly eliminated names are repeated below.

The name "Jesus" has been stripped from the Holy Bible in modernist versions in these 47 verses: Matt 4:12, 4:18, 4:23, 8:29,

---

*Testament*, Fourth Revised Edition, copyright United Bible Societies, U.S.A., 1966, 1968, 1975, 1983, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, D-Stuttgart 1993, 1994, 1998

41 The name "Jesus" has been stripped from the Holy Bible in modernist versions in these 47 verses: Matt 4:12, 4:18, 4:23, 8:29, 12:25, 13:36, 13:51, 14:14, 14:22, 14:25, 14:27, 15:16, 16:20, 17:20, Mark 5:19, 6:34, 7:27, 8:1, 8:17, 11:14, 11:15, 12:41, 14:22a, Luke 7:22, 9:43, 9:60, 10:21, 10:41, 42, 13:2, 24:36a, 24:36b, John 3:2, 5:17, 6:14, 13:3, Acts 3:26, 9:29, 19:10, Rom 15:8, 16:18, 1Cor 5:5, 16:22, 2Cor 5:18, Gal 6:15, Col 1:28, 2Tim 4:22, 1Pet 5:14

42 The name "Christ" has been stripped from the Holy Bible in modernist versions in these 37 verses: Matt 23:8, Luke 4:41, John 4:42, 6:69, Acts 15:11, 16:31, 19:4, 20:21, Rom 1:16, 14:10, 16:20, 1Cor 5:4, 9:1, 9:18, 16:22, 16:23, 2Cor 11:31, Gal 3:17, 4:7, 6:15, Phil 4:13, 1Thes 2:19, 3:11, 3:13, 2Thes 1:8, 1:12, 1Tim 2:7, 2Tim 2:19, 4:22, Heb 3:1, 1John 1:7, 4:3, 2John 1:9b, Rev 1:9a, 1:9b, 12:17, 22:21

43 The name "Lord" has been stripped from the Holy Bible in modernist versions in these 40 verses: Matt 28:6, Mark 11:10, Luke 7:31, 9:57, 9:59, 13:25, 22:31, 23:42, Acts 7:37, 22:16, 1Cor 11:29, 15:47, 2Cor 4:10, Gal 6:17, 1Tim 1:1, 5:21, 2Tim 4:1, Titus 1:4, Heb 10:30, Rev 16:5a

12:25, 13:36, 13:51, 14:14, 14:22, 14:25, 14:27, 15:16, 16:20, 17:20, Mark 5:19, 6:34, 7:27, 8:1, 8:17, 11:14, 11:15, 12:41, 14:22a, Luke 7:22, 9:43, 9:60, 10:21, 10:41,42, 13:2, 24:36a, 24:36b, John 3:2, 5:17, 6:14, 13:3, Acts 3:26, 9:29, 19:10, Rom 15:8, 16:18, 1Cor 5:5, 16:22, 2Cor 5:18, Gal 6:15, Col 1:28, 2Tim 4:22, 1Pet 5:14.

The name "Christ" has been stripped from the Holy Bible in modernist versions in these 37 verses: Matt 23:8, Luke 4:41, John 4:42, 6:69, Acts 15:11, 16:31, 19:4, 20:21, Rom 1:16, 14:10, 16:20, 1Cor 5:4, 9:1, 9:18, 16:22, 16:23, 2Cor 11:31, Gal 3:17, 4:7, 6:15, Phil 4:13, 1Thes 2:19, 3:11, 3:13, 2Thes 1:8, 1:12, 1Tim 2:7, 2Tim 2:19, 4:22, Heb 3:1, 1John 1:7, 4:3, 2John 1:9b, Rev 1:9a, 1:9b, 12:17, 22:21

The name "Lord" has been stripped from the Holy Bible in modernist versions in these 20 verses: Matt 28:6, Mark 11:10, Luke 7:31, 9:57, 9:59, 13:25, 22:31, 23:42, Acts 7:37, 22:16, 1Cor 11:29, 15:47, 2Cor 4:10, Gal 6:17, 1Tim 1:1, 5:21, 2Tim 4:1, Titus 1:4, Heb 10:30, Rev 16:5a

Twice they had the audacity to stripped the whole compound name, "Lord Jesus Christ", out of the Holy Bible: Col 1:2, 1Thes 1:1.

Once they eliminated the name "Son of man" from their "corrected bibles": Matt 25:13.

An explanation of the reasoning of the ecumenical textual critic and a through documentation of all 357 gross errors is available in this authors 2006 book.<sup>44</sup>

The attacks against the names of Christ are subtle in the Roman Catholic religion and in the Reformers Protestant religion, but they are brazen in the Ecumenical Bible correctors efforts to deter from a sound Christology.

---

44 Edward Rice, *The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*, Public Domain, [www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf](http://www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf), [www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch](http://www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch)

## Chapter 4 – The Incarnation of Christ

*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.... And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.*

John 1:1-3,14

The *incarnation* is herein stated by God, “*The Word was God ... and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth.*” Few comprehend the power of such a truth. Every true believer needs it moved to the forefront of their studies if they will be “*a workman that needeth not be ashamed.*”

On the Incarnation of Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of his section on “The Incarnation of Christ.” [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 69-81, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 54- 61.]

### **Cambron's Christology Section II. The Incarnation of Christ.**

This is a cardinal truth of Christianity. It is the fundamental foundation upon which our faith rests. Without the incarnation, Christianity could not stand. There is no way of getting rid of the incarnation without getting rid of Christianity. Mere man did not reveal this to us but God Himself did, through the revelation of His Word: “I would that ye knew what great conflict [fear or care] I have for you, and for them at Laodicea . . . that their hearts, might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge” (Col. 2:1-3).

The word “incarnation” comes from the Latin word meaning enfleshment; thus, when we speak of the incarnation of Christ Jesus,

the Son of God, we mean the “enfleshment” of God — God manifest in the flesh.

*A. The Fact of the Incarnation.*

Two of the Gospels, Matthew and Luke, record the full account of it. Both accounts are different, but both agree in the true facts. Matthew, which portrays Christ as the King throughout the whole Book, describes His birth as: “He who is born King of the Jews,” tracing His line through Solomon to David. Luke, which reveals Christ as the perfect Man, emphasizes the humanity (human nature) of Jesus, showing that His lineage went back through Mary, to Nathan (another son of David), then to David, and on to Abraham, and finally to the first man, Adam.

1. *As To the Virginity of Mary.* Both Matthew and Luke state she was a virgin. “Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 1:18). “In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin’s name was Mary. . . . Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?” (Luke 1:26, 27, 34).

2. *As To Her Discovered Motherhood Before Her Marriage to Joseph.* “Joseph also went up from Galilee . . . to be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with child” (Luke 2:5). See also Matthew 1:18-20.

3. *As To the Divine Paternity.* If Joseph was not Jesus Christ’s father, then who was? *God*, of course: “Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. . . . And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:31, 32, 34). See also Matthew 1:18-20.[pg54]

*B. The Manner of the Incarnation.*

The reason why so many do not believe in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ is that they think His birth was the birth of a mere baby, and not the birth of God, the Son. Remember, this is the incarnation — the enfleshment of God, God manifest in the flesh!

1. *As Testified By Matthew.*

a. *In the Genealogy of Christ.* Tracing the Lord's descent from Abraham in chapter one, verses one through seventeen, we notice that the word "begat" is mentioned thirtynine times, but is omitted after the name Joseph, the husband of the Virgin, Mary. Joseph did *not* beget Jesus Christ: "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (Matt. 1:16).

Then, one may ask, why is this genealogy mentioned in the first place? The reason is this: the future King of Israel *had* to come through this line (David, Solomon, etc.); and, in order to prove that Jesus was the rightful heir to the throne of David, it had to be shown that He came from this line. When Joseph married the Virgin Mary, her virgin-born Son became the *legal* heir of Joseph and first in line for the throne.

Was Christ an actual son of David? Certainly He was, but not through Joseph to Solomon and David. He was a son of David by His mother; she, herself, was a princess in Israel, tracing her lineage through Nathan (another son of David) on to David. By blood Christ Jesus was a son of David through Mary; legally He was a son of David through Joseph.

b. *In the Attitude of Joseph.* For this let us turn to Matthew 1:18-25: "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold,

a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.”

Now if this does not speak of the virgin birth, how would you state it? In his own mind, Joseph was convinced of the impurity of Mary, his espoused wife. He reasoned that if he had not known her some other man must have. Living under the law, a just man, he thought of two things to do: divorce her; or have her exposed and stoned to death. He never once conceived of the idea of taking her and making her his wife; indeed, not until the angel appeared unto him and commanded him to do so; and this he did.

Men today, even some preachers, think it is smart to deny that Jesus was of a virgin birth. [pg55] They say that Joseph was the father, but Joseph said he was not.

c. *In the Worship of the Wise Men.* “There came wise men... saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. . . . And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshiped him” (Matt. 2: 2, 11).

These wise men were indeed wise men. They worshiped the Baby, and not the mother Mary. These men were men of God, taught and led by God; they would not have worshiped the Baby if Joseph had been the father.

d. *In the Expressions of “the Young Child and His Mother.”* Four times is this statement made (Matt. 2:11, 13, 14, 20); never does it say, “your wife and your child.” In connection with this we note another statement: “When they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt; and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: and was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.” (Matt. 2:13-15). *My Son.* Not Joseph’s, but God’s!

2. *As Testified by Luke.*

a. *In the Enunciation to Zacharias.* “The angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord” (Luke 1:13-17).

Herein Zacharias was told that he was to have a son who would be the forerunner of the Christ, the Son of God.

b. *In the Enunciation to Mary.* “The angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS” (Luke 1:30, 31).

Mary became a woman with child out of wedlock, which was evil unto God; but Mary found favor in God’s sight. Thus, if Mary had become with child by man, and God still blessed her while in that condition, then God would be a God of evil. But we know He found favor with her, and she with Him, for she was with child, but by the Holy Ghost.

c. *In the Praise of Elizabeth.* “She [Elizabeth] spake out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And blessed is she that believed: for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord” (Luke 1:42-45). [pg56]

Was this the praise to Mary? No!

d. *In the Song of Mary.* “Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my *Saviour*...” (Luke 1:46-55). This was not a song of a woman that had conceived and was to bear in shame; it was a song filled with joy and praise to God, who had selected her to bring forth the Messiah.



e. *In the Prophecy of Zacharias.* “Thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest: for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways” (Luke 1:76). This is only a portion of the prophecy of the father of John the Baptist concerning the work of John, then just born. He declares that the One whom John shall go before is the Son of God, and not the son of a man.

f. *In the Experience of Shepherds.* “There were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you; Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men” (Luke 2:8-14).

When Christ was born, Heaven shouted a message of praise. Would all this have happened over a bastard child? Of course not! But Jesus was what the Word says He is — Christ the Lord! — the virgin son of Mary.

### *C. The Objections to the Incarnation.*

Many of the enemies of God are within the body of professed believers — those who claim to be Christians, but deny the virgin birth of Christ. Someone may ask: “When a person is to be saved, does he have to believe in the virgin birth of Christ to be saved? Is this one doctrine which one must believe and understand to be saved?” Let us answer by asking this: “Do you believe that it is possible for a saved person not to believe in the virgin birth of Christ?” Of course not! All saved, born-again saints of God will believe that our Saviour was virgin born. The only thing that a lost person has to do to be saved is to repent of his sins and trust Christ as his Saviour, believing that He died for his sins and that He rose again from the dead. Saved people will believe in the virgin birth of our Lord.

Those who say they are Christians, and deny the virgin birth, are

mere “professors” and not “possessors.” These enemies within, and those without the professing Church, object to the virgin birth by the following arguments:

1. *The Scholarship of the Day is Against It.* This statement is not true, but it would not matter much if it were, for we know that “the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Rom. 8:7). The unconverted heart [pg57] knows not God nor of the things of God; and, of course, it would not believe in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ. Unregenerated scholars may not accept this divine truth, but there are great minds of this world sitting upon the chairs of learning in our leading colleges and universities — saved men - who believe and testify to the virgin birth of Jesus. Really, a person is not indeed educated until he believes God and His Word: “The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge” (Pro. 1:7).

2. *The New Testament is Silent Concerning It.* Certainly Matthew is not silent concerning it; surely Luke is not silent concerning it. God has provided *two witnesses*, for “in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established” (II Cor. 13:1). God fulfills the Law, thus establishing the truth concerning the virgin birth of our Redeemer. What if there were only *one* witness? It still would be true, for it is God who speaketh.

a. *But There is the Testimony of Mark.* By this we present indirect evidence which proves the virgin birth of Christ. There is nothing said against the virgin birth. Mark does not record the birth of the Lord; does he mean to state that Christ never existed? Of course not. The Gospel of Mark presents Jesus as the Perfect Servant; and when considering a servant, no one cares to know his genealogy; thus the birth of Christ is omitted. The first verse of Mark’s Gospel states: “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.” Any Hebrew knows that this means that Jesus Christ was on an equal with God, and we know that the record tells us of things Jesus Christ did which no other man could ever do.

b. *But There is the Testimony of John.* “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and

truth” (John 1:1, 14). Indeed this is not the record of a mere man, but the Son of Man, the Son of God, God Himself!

c. *But There is the Testimony of Paul.* While stating that these arguments are of Mark, John, Paul, and others, let us bear in mind that, while these men penned these words, the words are the words of God, and they express His mind upon the virgin birth of His Son.

Paul was separated “unto the gospel of God . . . concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. . . . what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 1:3, 4; 8:3). “Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich” (II Cor. 8:9). See also Philippians 2:5-7; Galatians 4:4; I John 4:2; Colossians 2:8.

3. *The Early Church Didn't Believe It.* This is another false argument against the virgin birth which can be refuted easily. The early creeds of the Church plainly declared the virgin birth.

a. *The Apostles' Creed.* This dates back to the second century. The word “creed” comes from the Latin, *credo*, which means, “I believe.” These creeds came first orally, [pg58] then written.

b. *The Nicene Creed.* This goes back to the fourth century. When Arius stated that Jesus was a created being, and not the Son from all eternity, a council was called to settle the fact that Christ, though born of the virgin, has existed co-eternally with the Father. The Council at Constantinople (381) was called. This council also refers to the fact of the virgin birth of Christ.

c. *The Te Deum Laudamus.* This was an ancient hymn preserved by the Church, which proved that the Early Church believed in the virgin birth of Christ.

4. *It Is Against the Laws of Nature.* To this argument against the virgin birth, we reply, “It most certainly *is* against the laws of nature.” For this was not the birth of a mere baby, but the birth of the Son of God in the flesh. Did you ever take time to consider that this might have been the only way by which God could have come in the flesh — by the virgin birth?

There are three ways by which God made human beings not according to the laws of nature: (1) When He made Adam without the aid of a man and woman; (2) when He made Eve without the aid of a woman; (3) when He made Christ without the aid of a man.

5. *It Is Too Much Like Mythology.* It is true that many idolatrous religions have taught that their gods were the offsprings of women, but not wholly of virginity; rather, that these women had carnal relations with other gods which produced the people's gods. Can there be any comparison between the birth of Jesus Christ and the reported stories of those myths? Of course not! The virgin births of the men of mythology are not virgin, but the result of carnal intercourse.

6. *In Calling Himself the Son of Man Christ Denied the Virgin Birth.* Remember, the Lord Jesus Christ never said, "I am a Son of a man"; but, "I am *the* Son of Man."

7. *The Need of a Purification Proved That This Was a Natural Birth.* Under the law of Israel all women were unclean. The purpose of this law was hygienic, to save the woman's health, protecting her from the pleasure of her husband while she was still in a weakened condition, caused by childbirth.

#### *D. The Objects of the Incarnation.*

What were the purposes of the virgin birth?

1. *To Reveal the Invisible God.* "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John 1:18). Jesus Christ is the Exposition of God, the Revealer of God. If you want to know what God is like, look upon Jesus.

2. *To Fulfill Prophecy.*

a. *The Seed as an Example.* "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel" (Gen. 3:15). A woman does not have seed; seed belongs to the man. But this Scripture mentions the "seed of the woman." This is contrary to nature and refers, of course, to the [pg59] virgin birth — fulfilled when Mary gave birth to Jesus Christ.

b. *The Virgin as an Example.* "The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his

name Immanuel.” (Is. 7:14). This Scripture means exactly what we mean.

3. *To Fulfill the Davidic Covenant.* “There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots. . . . And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious” (Is. 11:1, 10). “Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS” (Jer. 23:5, 6). “Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption” (Acts 2:29-31). See also I Samuel 7:4-17; Luke 1:32, 33.

4. *To Sacrifice For Our Sins.* “Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin” (I John 3:5). “It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. . . . Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10:4, 5, 8-10). “Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures” (I Cor. 15:1-4).

a. *A Sacrifice of Beast Never Took Away Sin.* It is God who instituted animal sacrifice. Yet all the blood for centuries shed upon Jewish altars never took one sin away. Why, then, was it commanded? It was commanded in order to provide a “covering” for sins until the blood of Christ would come and “wash” them away. No, animal sacrifices could never take away sin, for the sacrifice must come up to the level of man, for whom it is sacrificed.

b. *The Sacrifice Must Be Sinless.* We agree that a “man must be sacrificed for a man”; animals do not come up to the level of man. Yet one sinful man cannot be offered up as a sacrifice for another sinful man, for if the first sinful man must die, he must die for his *own* sin.

c. *The Sacrifice Must Be an Infinite Sacrifice.* Not only must the sacrifice come up to the level of man, for whom it is offered, but it must come up to the level of *God*, whom it [pg60] must satisfy! Jesus, our Lord, fulfilled all! “His own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed” (I Peter 2:24).

5. *To Provide the Redeemed With a High Priest.* “In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. . . . Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus” (Heb. 2:17; 3:1).

Today we have One, even Jesus Christ, who stands for us before God. We have an accuser (Rev. 12:10), who accuses us daily before God, but we also have an advocate with the Father, who maketh intercession for us.

6. *To Show Believers How To Live.* “He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked” (I John 2:6). “For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps” (I Peter 2:21).

7. *To Become the Head of a New Creation.* “He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful” (Rev. 21:5). See also II Corinthians 5:17; I Corinthians 15: 4, 47.

*E. The Perpetuity of the Incarnation.*

By this we mean the “everlasting of the incarnation.” God will always be manifested in the flesh in the person of His Son Jesus Christ.

1. *Is Essential To the Integrity of Our Lord’s Manhood.* Our Lord, now in glory, has His manhood. He is man *today*.

2. *Is Essential To Our Lord’s High Priesthood.* “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted” (Heb. 2: 14-18). “And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people’s: for this he did once, when he <sup>[pg61]</sup> offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore” (Heb. 7:23-28). “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. 9:24). “Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God” (Heb. 12:2).

3. *Is Essential To Our Lord’s Return and Millennium Reign.* “While they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of

Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? *This same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven” (Acts 1:10, 11). “I have said, Mercy shall be built up for ever; thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens. I have made a covenant with my chosen. I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations” (Ps. 89:2-4). “In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old” (Amos 9:11). See also Isaiah 9:6, 7; 55:3, 4.

#### *F. The Proofs of the Incarnation.*

The proofs of the incarnation are centered in Christ Himself!

1. *Such As His Sinless Life.* “We have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (Heb. 4:15). “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (II Cor. 5:21). Only God, in human flesh, could live the sinless life.

2. *Such As His Resurrection.* “Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept” (I Cor. 15:20). Would He have been raised from the dead had He not been the incarnate Son of God? Of course not.<sup>45</sup> [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.<sup>46</sup> The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

### **The Wolves Without Attack**

Those that would deny the incarnation are wolves, but they have set aside their sheep's clothing. "*Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*" (1John

45 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 69-81, [www.thecambroninstitute.org](http://www.thecambroninstitute.org) 54-62.

46 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69



2:22-23). Such deniers are often labeled as a "*cult*", "a religion or religious sect generally considered to be extremist or false, with its followers often living in an unconventional manner under the guidance of an authoritarian, charismatic leader."<sup>47</sup> Such a title is aptly applied to both Joseph Smith (1805 – 1844), the founder of the Mormon religion, and Charles Taze Russell (1852 – 1916), the founder of the JW religion. Each had a beginning in "Christianity" and came to a place where they set aside their sheep's clothing and denied the incarnation. The Apostle John says of these "*They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.*" (2:19) Ellen G. White (1827 – 1915), the founder of the Seventh Day Adventist, is characterized a cult because of her false teachings about the means of salvation and the advents of Christ, but she, in doctrine, never denied the incarnation. She, and the SDA, do, however, deny the power and efficacy of the incarnation of Christ. They are aptly called a cult.

Other religions which deny the incarnation are not categorized as cults because they never donned the sheep's clothing. False religions, which make no pretense of believing the Holy Bible, are labeled as false religions, not as Christian cults. Indian Hinduism and its three reformations, Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism; Oriental Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism, Persian Zoroastrianism, and Islam<sup>48</sup>, all these deny the incarnation of Christ, but they deny the label "Christian" as well. Christianity is not a religion, it is a relationship, a relationship based on the incarnation of Christ. The real attack on the doctrine of the incarnation comes from within.

### **The Wolves Within Attack**

The far more subtle and dangerous wolf is the one still wearing the sheep's clothing. The American Baptist Churches (USA) and its larger enterprise the Baptist World Alliance (BWA), an ecumenical alliance founded in 1905, does not deny the Virgin Birth of Christ, nor

47 The American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd Edition, 1994, Softkey International Inc., s.v. "Cult".

48 Edward G. Rice, *The Non-Christian Religions*, E.G.Rice Publications, 2012, [www.lulu.com](http://www.lulu.com), [www.gsbaptistchurch.com/seminary/lbts/non\\_christian\\_religions\\_man.pdf](http://www.gsbaptistchurch.com/seminary/lbts/non_christian_religions_man.pdf)

the incarnation, they just refuse to acknowledge that it is a doctrine. Their intent is to "Let the Spirit unite us, and not let doctrine divide us." For the American Baptist Association, ecumenical inclusiveness is more important than doctrine. Ergo they have said "The virgin birth is only recorded in two of the four gospels, so it is only 50-50 whether one believes it or not."<sup>49</sup> These are false teachers that remain among us, and although they do not deny the incarnation of Christ, they will not preach the incarnation of Christ. Christ warns us "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves" (Matt 7:15). The incarnation of Christ is a cardinal Christian doctrine. Fundamentalists of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century considered it a fundamental of the faith.

It needs to be said again that the Holy Bible is to be the sole authority for our Christology. What the philosopher says, and what the Roman historical perspectives say are dangerous and always detract from a pure Bible source. The danger is illustrated via Stephen J. Wellum, PhD, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, professor of Christian theology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, who published his 2016 book, "God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ." In his flyleaf he says that he "lays out a systematic summary of Christology from philosophical, biblical, and historical perspectives."<sup>50</sup> Fred G. Zaspel, Author and Pastor of a Reformed Baptist Church endorses Wellum's treatment saying it is marked by "a close acquaintance with the centuries of discussion surrounding it," and Michael Horton, Professor of Systematic Theology at Westminster Seminary California, concurs that "Wellum engages a wide range of issues and conversation partners. Consolidating the gains of evangelical Christological reflection... as well as philosophical, systematic, and historical theology."<sup>51</sup> Although he adds some insights about the two natures of Christ, Wellum must be treated as a hostile witness here, because he does not hold the inerrant Word as his sole authority or even the final authority: he includes

---

49 This has been rehearsed by multiple American Baptist Association pastors and leaders in the hearing of this author for 50 years of his walk with the incarnate Christ.

50 Crossway Book Sales <https://www.crossway.org/books/god-the-son-incarnate-case/> (accessed 12/15/2016)

51 Ibid.

phrases such as “Scripture and church tradition teach that the incarnation is not a temporary act but a permanent one,” and again “to reconcile with Scripture and the historical confessions,” and just as troubling he makes statements such as “Christianity would never have been born....” With these shortcomings Wellum's description of Christ's veilings is not given further citation here, but his writings on the two natures in Christ is considered in more detail in a later chapter.

Protestant and Reformed theology books do not value the Holy Bible as the sole source of their doctrine. With no philosophy, and no Roman history lessons, Christology, the Doctrine of Christ, must be based on three things, The Holy Bible, The Holy Scripture, and The Word of God, or the Bible, the Bible and the Bible.

## Chapter 5 – The Two Natures of Christ – Cambron's III.

On the two natures of Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr. Cambron's section on "The Two Natures of Christ." [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 81-93, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 62-71]

### III The Two Natures of Christ.

There can be no Christianity without Christ. Orthodoxy of any person, or any church, can be settled upon this question: What think ye of Christ?

We wonder why the modernists of today try to lay Christ low. There are those who try to prove that He never existed. In one great university, a certain professor went to lengths to prove that Christ was only a figment of the mind. After many lectures, he completed his tirade, and then asked for comments. One student humbly asked, "If Christ never existed, why are you attacking Him?" [pg62]

Why do not the enemies leave Him alone if He never existed? Why have anything to do with Him if He never rose from the dead? But He does exist; He has been resurrected; He ever lives!

Who is He? has been the question for two thousand years. We have the testimonies and confessions of men who saw Him: *John the Baptist* — "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29); "I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John 1:34); *Andrew* — "We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ" (John 1:41); *Philip* — "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph" (John 1:45); *Peter* — "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16).

Among the people there was division caused by this question, Who is He? "Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth, this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was? So there was a division among

the people because of him” (John 7:40-43). See also John 9:17, 18; 10: 9-20; Luke 5: 21.

Men questioned the deity of Christ, but the demons never did. They acknowledged Him as being their Creator and coming Judge: “Behold, they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?” (Matt. 8:29).

At the trial of the Lord Jesus, this same question predominated: “Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest” (Matt. 27:11). See also Matthew 26:63; Luke 22: 67, 70.

And as He hung upon the Cross, the question still agitated the minds of his enemies: “They that passed by reviled him...saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross” (Matt. 27:40).

As we have the testimonies and confessions of those who saw Him, we ourselves who trust Him, and love Him, have the Witness (Holy Spirit) within that He is the Christ, the Son of the living God: “For he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you” (John 14:17a); “No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost” (I Cor. 12:3b).

### *A. The Humanity of Christ.*

In other days it was the humanity of Christ which was under attack, and not His deity. No matter what age we may live in, Satan is the common enemy, and it is he who keeps going the continued attack upon our Lord.

1. *He was Perfectly Human.* By this we mean that our Lord, though He has been from all time and eternity, yet when He became flesh, He possessed a perfect human body, [pg63] soul and spirit. Man, we know, has a body, soul and spirit: “The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Thess. 5:23).

a. *His Human Physical Body.* Yes, the Lord Jesus, in His humanity, possessed a *body*: “For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial” (Matt. 26:12; see also Hebrews

10:5); a *soul*: “Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour” (John 12:27; see also Matthew 26:38); and a *spirit*: “Immediately when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts” (Mark 2:8; see also Luke 23:46; Luke 10:21).

b. *His Human Appearance*. The woman at the well recognized Jesus as a human being: “How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans” (John 4:9). And after Christ’s resurrection He still maintained His human appearance; for Mary, supposing Jesus to be the gardener, recognized Him as a human being: “She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away” (John 20:15b).

c. *His Human Parent*. Though God was His Father, yet the Lord Jesus did have a human mother, thus proving that He was human: “When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law” (Gal. 4:4); Paul was separated unto the gospel “concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh” (Rom. 1:3); “The third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there” (John 2:1). See also Matthew 2:11; 13:55; John 1:14.

d. *His Human Development*. Being perfectly human, the Lord was born, and He grew as other boys and girls: “The child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him. . . . And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man” (Luke 2:40, 52).

e. *His Human Limitation*. Being God, the Son of God became man, and when He did, He limited Himself to the realm of the human. Thus, He possessed human limitations, which were sinless infirmities. As we thus speak, let us not confuse infirmity with sin. He had human infirmities, but no sin. He *hungered* (“When he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred” — Matt. 4:2); He *thirsted* (“After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst” — John 19:28); He became *weary* (“Now Jacob’s well was there. Jesus

therefore, being *wearied* with his journey, sat thus on the well: and it was about the sixth hour” — John 4:6); He *slept* (“Behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep”— Matt. 8:24). See Matthew 26:36-40, for these verses describe in full the testing of Christ in the garden such as only a human being can endure.

f. *His Human Name*. His human name was a name common to all of that time: “And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins” (Matt. 1:21). See also Luke 2:21.

g. *His Human Suffering and Death*. His suffering and death was common to that which is experienced by man. The Scriptures abound in the fact that He possessed a human body and suffered as a human (Matt. 26:26-35; John 19:20; Luke 22:44). [pg64]

If Jesus was not man, He could not have died, for God, in His true essence, cannot die! And He *did* die “Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:12). He rose from the dead! And He is *still* man!

## 2. *He is the Perfect Human.*

a. *As He Transcends All Limitation of Character*. Everything is combined in Him. Look at all the attributes of man, and you will find that some men possess one kind while other men possess other attributes; but in Him we find completeness — all the attributes of men.

We believe that the character of Jesus is free from forgery. It takes a Plato to forge a Plato, and it would have taken a Jesus to have forged a Jesus.

Think of His *power* compared with His *humility*: He drives the money-changers out of the temple at one moment, and then washes the disciples’ feet at another.

(1) *He Has All Perfection*. He never ran for fear. No one ever frightened Him. He was never elated with success; we are. The Devil never baffled Him. He is the Man above all men. You cannot put anyone on the same level with the Lord Jesus. Take the leaders of the world — Caesar, Alexander the Great, yea, even godly men, such as Moody and Billy Sunday — they can never come up to Him. You

cannot put the gods of men upon the same platform with the Lord Jesus. There is only *one* place for our Saviour, and that is the *throne!*

(2) *He Is Without Sin.* He is a perfect human being, the only One the world has ever seen. Turn to II Corinthians 5:21 and read the description of Him: “He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” This verse of Scripture does not mean that Christ never sinned, although He never did, but rather that He was without a sinful nature.

If a man lived all his life without sin, he still would not be perfect. By living without sin, he would only be triumphing over a sinful nature. Christ never had a sinful nature. “that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1: 35c). There has been only *one* Holy Baby ever to be born into this world, and they called Him *Jesus!* No drunkard can help a drunkard. A man does not have to become a thief to help a thief. The Lord Jesus did not take upon Himself a sinful nature in order to help us who do have a sinful nature.

When the Lord Jesus was in the wilderness for forty days, He knew what hunger was. He knows how it is with us when we go hungry. No man ever died at the stake, or went through a time of testing, as He did upon the Cross. He knows what it is to suffer. We have something in us that wants us to sin, but He never wanted to sin — that is what He suffered: the Devil trying to make Him want to sin.

That age-old question may now be raised: “Could the Lord Jesus have sinned had He wanted to?” The question is thrown aside by stating, “He could not have wanted to, being [pg65] the Son of God.” But, someone may add, if He could not have sinned, then why the temptation? If He could not have sinned, then the temptation was a mockery! That is exactly the answer! For He was not tested to see if He would sin, but He was tested to show (to prove) that He *would not* sin.

This is something to consider also: if the Lord Jesus could have sinned here upon earth, then it is still possible for Him to sin in Heaven as He maketh intercession for us. But He could not have sinned upon earth, and He cannot sin in heaven. He is our perfect High Priest.

b. *As He Transcends All Limitations of Time.* He is for all time.



His teachings are not out-of-date. They are up-to-date! The books of our colleges and universities are not over ten years old; they are ever changing. But His words stand sure.

He is the One who has said, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall never pass away.” But there is no record of Him writing a book of His life — yet His words *are* true, for they have *not* passed away!

c. *As He Transcends All Limitations of All Nationalities.* The Jew was exclusive of all people, and the Lord Jesus came from the most exclusive race of people, yet He belongs to all kindreds and tribes! *He belongs to all.* The Chinaman thinks of Him as being Chinese; the Englishman thinks of Him as being English. When we are saved, we claim Him as our own, no matter to what race we belong.

Christ was liar, lunatic, or *Lord!* No modernist ever says He was a liar — He only *thought* He was God. Then He must have been a lunatic. Of course He was not a liar nor a lunatic; He was the Son of God! The God man!

### B. *The Deity of Christ.*

1. *Divine Predictions.* “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool” (Ps. 110:1); “Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” (Mic. 5:2). See also Isaiah 7:14; 9:8; Jeremiah 23:6; and Genesis 3:15.

#### 2. *Divine Names.*

a. *He Is Called God.* “Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God” (John 20:28); “Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen” (Rom. 9:5); “We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life” (I John 5:20). See also Matthew 1:23; John 1:1; compare Psalm 45:6, 7 with Hebrews 1:8.

b. *He is Called the Son of God.* This implies sameness with God. “Devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to

speak: for they knew that he was Christ” (Luke 4:41); “Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live” (John 5:25); “For what the law could not [pg66] do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3). Look up these other Scriptures: Mark 1:1; Matthew 27:40, 43; John 19:7; 10:36; 11:4.

c. *He Is Called Lord.* “The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day” (Matt. 12:8); “Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am” (John 13:13); “And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house” (Acts 16:31); “He hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS” (Rev. 19:16).

d. *He Is Called Other Divine Names.* “When I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last” (Rev. 1:17). See also Revelation 22:13.

3. *Divine Equality.* “Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5); “He that seeth me seeth him that sent me” (John 12:45); “Being in the form of God, [Christ Jesus] thought it not robbery to be equal with God” (Phil. 2: 6a); “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9).

4. *Divine Relationship.* His name is coupled with the Father’s. “I and my Father are one” (John 10:30). “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen” (II Cor. 13:14); “Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work” (II Thess. 2:16, 17).

5. *Divine Worship.* Worship belongs only to God. Christ received true worship. Therefore, Christ is God! “There came wise men . . . saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. . . . And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down and worshipped him: and when they had opened

their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense, and myrrh” (Matt. 2:2, 11). The wise men did not come to worship Mary, but Christ Jesus. In later years he accepted worship: “They that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God” (Matt. 14:33). See also Matthew 9:18; Luke 24:52. If Christ had not been God, then this worship would have been idolatry. It is God’s command that the Son should be worshiped. “And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him” (Heb. 1:6). “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him” (John 5:23). This is true of all ages, that Christians have worshiped Christ as God. Born-again men would not have been satisfied with the worshiping of the mere man. [pg67]

6. *Divine Attributes.*

a. *Omnipotence.* “Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth” (Matt. 28:18). He has power over *death*: “Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believest thou this?” (John 11:25, 26). He has power over *nature*: “By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist” (Col. 1:16, 17). He has power over *demons*: “They were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out” (Luke 4:36).

b. *Omniscience.* “Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God” (John 16:30). “He [Peter] said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep” (John 21:17c). See also Matthew 9:4; 12:25; Luke 6:8; 9:47; 10:22; John 1:48, 49; John 4:16-19; Mark 2:8.

This one question of the doctors of Jerusalem proves the omniscience of the Lord Jesus: “How knoweth this man letters, never having learned?” (John 7:15). This leads us to know that Christ was

never taught by man. He needed no schooling, nor tutors. His disciples sat at His feet — at whose feet did He sit? At no one's! Paul was a student of Gamaliel — who taught Jesus? No one! Christ said, "Learn of me" — when did He ever say, "Teach me"? Never! We are sometimes advised to go to a higher authority, but to what authority did He go? To none other, for He had all authority. When did Jesus ever say, "I don't remember, I will have to look it up?" Never! He was never caught off guard. In Mark 12:13 we have these words: "And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians to catch him in his words." They tried to trap Him in His words, but He was all wise and put His persecutors into confusion.

(1) *How He Taught.*

(a) *With Simplicity.* His illustrations were made on the spot. He drew them from life itself. He had no need of a filing system.

(b) *With Authority.* You never heard the Lord say, "We may as well suppose" (See Matthew 7:29; Mark 1:22).

(2) *What He Taught.*

(a) *Doctrine.* What He taught is not popular today. The modernists substitute ethics for doctrine; they believe in salvation by ethical living.

(b) *Ethics.* Christ certainly did teach ethics, but doctrine was first. Ethics must have doctrine for its foundation.

c. *Omni-sapience*<sup>52</sup>. "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." (Col. 2:3).

d. *Omnipresence.* "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20). "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven" (John 3:13).

e. *Immutability.* "They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but [pg68] thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail" (Heb. 1:11, 12). "This man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood" (Heb. 7:24). "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever" (Heb. 13:8). Jesus may change His position, but His Person never changes.

---

52 Sapience def. "Ability to apply knowledge, experience, understanding or common sense and insight." WordNet Database, 2006, Princeton University.

f. *Everlastingness*. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God” (John 1:1, 2). “Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” (Mic. 5:2). “Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58). “Fear not; I am the first and the last” (Rev. 1:17c).

g. *holiness*. “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth” (I Peter 2:22). “Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin” (I John 3:5). See also Hebrews 7:26.

h. *Love*. Paul prays that the Ephesians may be able “to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God” (Eph. 3:19).

(1) *It is Spontaneous*.

(2) *It is Eternal*.

(3) *It is Infinite*.

(4) *It is Inexhaustible*.

(5) *It is Invincible*. See Ephesians 5:25; Revelation 1:5.

i. *Righteousness and Justice*. “Ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer, to be granted unto you” (Acts 3:14).

7. *Divine Offices*.

a. *Creation*. All creation is by the act of God; Christ created: therefore, Christ is God. “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands” (Heb. 1:10). See John 1:3; Colossians 1:16; Ephesians 3:9; John 1:10.

b. *Preservation*. “Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb. 1:3). “He is before all things, and by him all things consist” — all things hang together (Col. 1: 17).

c. *Pardon*. “He said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven” (Luke 7:48). See also Mark 2:5- 10.

d. *Resurrection*. “This is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have

everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day” (John 6:39, 40).

e. *Transformation*. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is” (I John 3:2). See also Philippians 3:21 (R.V.<sup>53</sup>).

f. *Judgment*. “The Father judgest no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son” (John 5:22). See also Acts 17:31; Matthew 16:27; Matthew 25:31; Romans 2:16; 14:10; II Corinthians 5:10; Revelation 22:12.

g. *Salvation*. “I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall [pg69] any man pluck them out of my hand” (John 10:28). See also John 5:25; 6:47; 10:10; 17:2.

### C. *The Blending of the Two Natures in One Person.*

Man cannot understand it. This is one proof that the Bible is the Word of God, for if man had written the Bible he would have left the two natures of Christ out of it. These are infinite facts, and God does not seek to explain, but makes a simple declaration of fact; Christ possessed a human nature and a divine nature — both are complete. It is not Scriptural to say Christ is God and man; rather, He is the God-Man. A type of His dual nature can be found in the boards of the tabernacle. The boards were of wood and gold — one board, with two materials; not two boards. The wood never became gold, and the gold never became wood. Christ had but one personality, not two. Two natures, with one personality.

We try to make John 1:14 read, “The Word became a man”; but it says, “The Word was made flesh.”

If we make Christ have two personalities, then we make the Godhead a Foursome instead of a Trinity.

### D. *Errors Concerning the Two Natures of Christ.*

#### 1. *Ebionitism*. This error was prevalent during the first century

---

53 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

of the Christian Church. It denied the deity of Christ. It stated that Christ had a relationship with God after His baptism.

2. *Corinthianism*. This was most popular during the days of the Apostle John.

According to this error, Christ possessed no deity until He was baptized.

3. *Docetism*. This error found its way into the Church during the latter part of the second century. It maintained that Christ did not possess a human body. He had a body, He had a celestial body. Thus Docetism denied Christ's humanity. Such error is the "spirit of anti-Christ" (I John 4:1-3).

4. *Arianism*. This error denied the divine nature of Christ. Arianism maintained that there was a time when the Son never existed, that God lived and then begat His Son after Him. Thus it denied Christ's pre-existence.

5. *Apollinarianism*. This error maintained that Christ possessed an incomplete human body. The Apollinarians reasoned: sin is sown in the soul of all men; God had no sin; therefore Christ had no soul; therefore He had an incomplete body.

6. *Nestorianism*. Nestorians took the two natures of Christ and made two persons out of them. That is, God came and dwelt in a perfect man; therefore God was in Christ, instead of Christ being God. [pg70]

7. *Eutychianism*. The Eutychians took the two natures of Christ and ran them together and made one new nature.

8. *Monothelitism*. This error consisted of the belief that Christ had two natures, but only one will.

9. *Unitarianism*. The Unitarians deny the Trinity. Thus they deny the deity of Christ altogether.

10. *Christian Science*. This belief is a denial of the humanity of Christ.

11. *Millennial Dawnism*. This belief denies the personal existence of our Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>54</sup> [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.<sup>55</sup> The book is readily available through

---

54 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 81-93

55 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

<http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

Broadening a solid Bible Doctrines work into a systematic theology involves stepping back and taking in the larger picture and examining more fully the interfaces between each individual doctrine, exposing the areas where the doctrine has met its fiercest opposition, and analyzing what other works of systematic theology have done with the Bible doctrine. In Dr. Cambron's coverage of the two natures of Christ, little more need be said. The interfaces of Christology with the other doctrines, and the comparison of other systematic theology works will be advanced at the close of this section. The errors concerning the two natures of Christ are herein well documented by Dr. Cambron but additional consideration might be given to the question, Are Christ's Human Limitations Permanent?



## Chapter 6 - Christ's Human Limitations and *Kenosis*

Christ incarnate was as much human as if he were not God, and as much God, as if he were not human; that common statement about the two natures of Christ solicits considerable discussion. It is often considered that one or the other nature can be somehow, and somewhat, veiled by the other. This consideration is explored in depth by Steven J. Wellum<sup>56</sup>, author of “God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ,” however as previously mentioned Dr. Wellum does not consider the infallible, inerrant, inspired Holy Bible, his sole authority. We, thus, only use his work as a sounding board to ask some questions and gain some understanding about the inner workings Christ's dual nature. Why? That we may better know Christ, and better know man. And to explore how much “finiteness” Christ may have attained for thirty-three years and may have retained in his resurrected body.

*Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Philippians 2:5b-11

It is incomprehensible that a member of the Godhead, our Lord

---

56 Stephen J. Wellum (PhD, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) is professor of Christian theology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, and editor of the Southern Baptist Journal of Theology. Stephen lives in Louisville, Kentucky, with his wife, Karen, and their five children. He is aptly criticized in this work for not using the Holy Bible as his sole source for his theology.

Jesus Christ, “*made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men*” (Phil 2:7). The infinite God took on some measure of finiteness in order to do this. Does the resurrected Christ then retain some of that finiteness that he had when he became flesh? The Greek word κενωω – *kenoo*, Strongs# <2758>, means “to empty, or make empty, or to make void” and is used four times in the Bible, Rom 4:14, 1Cor 1:17, 9:15, 2Cor 9:3 and, significantly, for us here, Phil 2:7.<sup>57</sup> “*But made <2758> himself of no reputation <2758>, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:...*” (Phil 2:7) Consequently the words *kenoo*, *kenosis*, and *kenotic* often come up in the discussion of what all Christ did set aside to become finite, and now we consider what finiteness he carried back to glory in his glorified body. There are two predominate views of the two natures in Christ.

The classic view (classic Catholic if you will, generally orthodox) is that both natures occupied Jesus and he could selectively choose which nature he would occupy. This is wrought with split-personality problems, and conflicting natures driving conflict and consternation in the person of Christ. The more Biblical view is the *kenotic* view that Christ set aside some of his divine attributes in order to be made in the likeness of men, and that the Father would one day, “*glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was*” (John 17:5).

The *kenotic* view is considered an error in Christology by Methodist John Miley. The 19<sup>th</sup> century Methodist scholar and theologian dismisses the *kenosis* view of Christ's incarnation, a view that fits the Scriptures better than any classic or orthodox view, for

---

57 *Romans 4:14 For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void <2758>, and the promise made of none effect:...1 Corinthians 1:17 For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect <2758>.... 9:15 But I have used none of these things: neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me: for it were better for me to die, than that any man should make <2758> my glorying void <2758>.... 2 Corinthians 9:3 Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain <2758> in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready:... Philippians 2:7 But made <2758> himself of no reputation <2758>, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:*

three reasons 1) it is not the orthodox view, 2) it does not fit with the orthodox view, and 3) it is destructive to the orthodox view. A more complete analysis of his opposition is included in chapter 10 of this work. The serious student of theology might study his opposition to this idea, it predominately deals with the orthodox confusion about the formation of the soul and an artificial (but orthodox) insistence that two separate natures dwelt separately and yet in complete union in Jesus Christ.

Consider first three attributes of God that were logically set aside when he took on the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men. Omnipresence is not possible in a finite body. As much as Christ Jesus got hungry, got thirsty, and got tired in his finite body, he also lost the ability to be in more than one place at one time. Even this truth needs to be carefully considered. I have heard preachers of the gospel of Jesus Christ use a clause of John 3:13, *“the Son of man which is in heaven,”* to try and justify that he retained his omnipresence. It helps our finite understanding to consider that Christ retained “membership” in the Triune Godhead, and was thus one with the Father and one with the Spirit and could freely “tap into” these attributes of the Father and Spirit. But just the same, in the body that he occupied he had to set aside the attribute of omnipresence. This is more than semantics and not a trivial pursuit; it guards against error, and gives a deeper consideration of the miracle of the incarnation wherein the two natures were enfolded into one body, one mind, and one personality. The exercise of exploring how this union works is thus part of the *“sore travail given to the sons of men who would give their heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven”* (Eccl 1:13). For a member of the triune Godhead to be God in the flesh, his attribute of omnipresence had to be set aside.

Second, consider God's attribute of omnipotence. That Jesus did not retain omnipotence is best understood by looking at an infant in a crib. They are wholly dependent on parents. That seed of woman robed in flesh did not flee to Egypt on his own accord, he depended on Joseph to get him there because he, in his young present state, was not omnipotent. He was instead presently dependent. It was part of making himself of no reputation.

Thirdly, consider God's attribute of omniscience. That Jesus was not omniscient will likely raise some eyebrows and possibly foil some longtime understandings, but consider it just the same. It is best understood by again examining the infant in a crib. Then consider, did Jesus then grow into or mature into his omniscience? Did he grow into or mature into his omnipotence? Did he grow into or mature into his omnipresence? The thesis here is that he did not grow back into these attributes of God, he laid them aside to be made in the likeness of man, and he was then reinstated with these attributes when he was glorified, i.e. when the Father would "*glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was*" (John 17:5). We might also herein consider the question, did he retained some measure of his finiteness even in his resurrected and glorified body? But first, let us give full consideration that these attributes were set aside so that God, in our Lord Jesus Christ, could be made flesh and dwell among us.

What Jesus knew, learned, and understood was already touched upon by Dr. Cambron. He was not taught by man but instead he, having no sin nature to interfere with his development, was taught by the Holy Spirit and God had a free rein to teach him all things. Remember Dr. Cambron's emphasis on the fact that Christ did not have our sin nature when he came from the seed of woman, i.e. he did not have a propensity to do evil that is present in the seed of man. An overriding principle to apply here is that Jesus in the flesh, did nothing that is impossible for mere man to do. Nothing. Man cannot be omnipotent and/or omniscient of his own accord, but he can be so "tapped in" to God that these attributes are available to him. Stephen Wellum says, "sometimes Jesus denied himself the exercise of his divine might and energies for the sake of the mission. At other times,... he exercised those energies."<sup>58</sup> But I contend that Jesus, while in the flesh, set these attributes completely aside and operated completely in the confines of finite man. It is more than semantics, such an understanding solidifies the tremendous miracle done in the

---

58 Stephen J. Wellum, "God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ," a Crossway blog post of an excerpt from his book, <https://www.crossway.org/blog/2016/11/are-christs-human-limitations-permanent/> (accessed 11/12/2016)

incarnation, helping us to better understand what he did and what we can do. Wellum's classic approach is fraught with split-personality problems, the *kenotic* approach has but one problem, that Christ, for a season, when the fullness of time was come, temporarily, set aside these attributes of God and was made flesh. The latter constitutes a problem only in our finite understanding, but seems to align completely with Holy Scripture. It also disrupts the theologian's little cliché that “Jesus (in the flesh) was as much God as if he were not man” but we don't mind overthrowing man's clichés for the sake of Bible truths.

Consider how the classic approach has leaked into our thinking because many have not made this differentiation. Some, as mentioned, go out on a limb with a clause of John 3:13, “*the Son of man which is in heaven,*” to try and justify that he retained his omnipresence. Some consider that the things Jesus did were only possible because he was God, and thus omnipotent, they thus give little regard that the things he did were done in the power of the Spirit, and that we might, with faith as a grain of mustard seed, fulfill John 14:12, “*Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.*” And even more have heard it said, “Of course Jesus knew what they were thinking, he was God, he was omniscient” (Matt 12:25, Luke 6:8<sup>59</sup>). We contend here that the things Jesus did in the flesh he did in the flesh, and that we, who believe on him, have ability to do the works of God in the same way (John 14:12).

The greatest struggle to let go of the Roman Catholic model about the two natures of Christ comes in this latter argument; they suppose that Jesus was omniscient and could thus perceive and do things that you or I do not have power to do. Again our thesis here is that Jesus operated in his earthly ministry in the flesh, after setting aside the attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience. Such an understanding magnifies what Jesus did in his earthly

---

59 Mt 12:25 *And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand:...* Lu 6:8 *But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth.*

ministry, allows greater consideration of the works believers can presently do, and fully aligns with Holy Scripture. Look anew at the verses wrongly used to support a omniscient-Jesus viewpoint.

In Matthew 9:4 “*And Jesus **knowing their thoughts** said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?*” and 12:25, “*And Jesus **knew their thoughts**, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation...*” and Mark 2:8, “*And immediately when Jesus **perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves**, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts?*” and again Luke 6:8 “*But **he knew their thoughts**, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst...*” and again 9:47 “*And Jesus, **perceiving the thought of their heart**, took a child, and set him by him,...*”

In each of these verses “knowing thoughts”, and “perceiving thoughts” did not need to be accomplished with omniscience. I know what your thinking, but each of these instances might have been accomplished with the power of the Spirit of the living God fully dwelling in Jesus. We might also have that type of perception if we would abide in Christ and have a complete filling of the Holy Spirit of God.

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 will reveal him...*” we see an admission that Jesus only new things that were delivered to him of his Father. And in John 1:48 and 49, “*Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel...*” it is likely that Nathanael was praying under that fig tree, (even more likely that he was praying for the arrival of the Messiah), and, if Jesus did not see him in person, then the Holy Spirit of God showed the Son of God what Nathanael was doing under that fig tree.

Also consider John 4:16-19 and the woman at the well who perceived that Jesus was a prophet because he told her of her past, these things could have been revealed to Jesus by the Father without Jesus being omniscient. Samuel knew that three men would give Saul

two loaves of bread (1Samuel 10:3-4) and he was not omniscient. Ahijah knew that the wife of King Jeroboam was at his door (1King 14:6) and he was not omniscient. So to Elijah the Tishbite new to meet Ahaziah's messengers before they got to the god of Ekron (2Kings 1:2-3), and Elisha knew what Gehazi had taken from Naaman (2Kings 55:25). If God did it for his prophets he can surely reveal things to his only begotten Son, while he was in flesh and blood, without him being omniscient.

Also consider that when a grieved Peter said of the resurrected Christ “*Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee*” (John 21:17), that he was speaking to the resurrected Christ. But just the same “*Lord, thou knowest all things*” might be said of Jesus because he was one with the Father, and not indicate a full-on presence of omniscience.

Dr. Camron examined John 7:15 “*And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?*” to explore how Jesus learned from the Holy Spirit not from man. And in John 16:30, “*Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God...*” it is easily conceived that he knew all things by the power of the Holy Spirit that so filled him. And it may be true that Jesus never said, “I don’t remember, I will have to look it up?” but all this could have been the case without Jesus holding omniscience. Before being glorified in his resurrected body it is most likely that Jesus Christ did not have omnipresence, omnipotence, or omniscience, he had set them aside to be made a little lower than the angles (Psalm 8:5, Hebrews 2:7, 9).

That Christ Jesus set aside some of the attributes of God in order to be made in the likeness of men does not make him less God, nor does it detract from his divinity. It does help us understand some underlying Scriptures about his incarnation and the union of two natures into one personality. It is more Biblical than supposing the classical Catholic approach with its dual personality problems. Now all that remains is an examination of when these attributes were reaffirmed in Christ.

*Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into*

*a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.. Matthew 28:16-20*

In these verses “All power” and “with you always” seem to speak of the omnipotence and omnipresence of the Christ in his resurrected and glorified body. Colossians 1:17-20 indicate that Christ was indeed placed back into a position of full glory.

*And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. Colossians 1:17-20*

This restoration fits exactly with what Jesus prayed for in John 17:5, “*And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*”

Catholic theologians and their Protestant descendants debate when a soul is formed, where it comes from, and how it gets original sin. They follow the philosopher's model that man is both material and immaterial but reject the Bible teaching that man is a trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit, made in his image of Father, Son, and Spirit. Does one really want to rely on their ideas about how Jesus contained both divine and human traits? I trow not. They reject the *knosis* idea because they debate when and how Jesus could have picked up



attributes that were previously laid aside. Let them debate, a believer need only take up a Holy Bible and believe what is laid out in its pages.

Therein it seems clear that Jesus, born in that barn, heralded by angels, and worshiped by wise men, was made a little lower than the angels, took upon the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Three days after his body went to the tomb, his soul went to hell, and his spirit was commended to his Father, he was resurrected from the dead and restored to the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. Our task is not to debate or rationalize all this, it is to believe, only believe.

In believing all that the Scriptures say about the incarnation of Christ I like to leave two things on the table. It seems very likely with this *knosis* model that Jesus operated in the flesh with no reliance on his own omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience. He operated only in the form of a servant, made in the likeness of men. With the absence of a sin nature he was able to fully tap into these attributes through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit. He was tempted, tried, and crucified and yet he was without sin. He told us with two *Amens* and without apology “*Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.*” As miraculous and impossible as all this seems I believe my inerrant, infallible, inspired Bible.

Secondly, it seems logical to me, an engineer who thrives on logic, and it is very possible in the Scriptures that were just presented, that the Christ, in his resurrected glorified body may have retained some of the finiteness that he took on. It is possible that in his glorified body, a body like the glorified body that he promised to us, that he does not presently have omnipresence. He is presently, in some measure of finiteness, seated on the right hand of the Majesty on high (Heb 1:3, 10:12). It is possible that in his resurrected glorified body, which is the first fruit of a resurrection that we will share, that he does not have his own omnipotence. He has the power that is bestowed upon him by the Father, which is without question, “All Power.”

It is possible that in the body he presently has, a body similar to what resurrected saints will have, that he does not have his own

omniscience. In the flesh Jesus told his disciples, “*Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you*” (John 15:15). In his resurrected body his disciples asked him “*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*” and he replied “*It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power*” (Acts 1:6-7). Notice that Jesus said previously, “*But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, **neither the Son, but the Father.***” It is thus possible, with these verses in tandem, that Christ, in his resurrected glorified body, does not presently know when the Father will send him for his own, and thus he does not presently have his own omniscience.

All this consideration of the amount of finiteness that Christ incarnate assumed and/or retained cannot for a moment detract from his deity and full membership in the trinity. God the Son was always co-equal, co-eternal, co-existent with the Father and could be so while setting aside these attributes. God became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, and the Apostle John wrote, “*and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*” (John 1:14). One needs to carefully consider the miracle of the incarnation of Christ, never allowing our finite understanding to compromise his deity or his humanity. Further it is important to know that the works he did in the flesh are not beyond us, they are not outside the reach of the Spirit filled believer (John 14:12).

## Chapter 7 – The Death of Christ – Cambron's IV.

On the death of Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr Cambron's section on “The Death of Christ.” [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 93-101, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 70-84.]

### IV The Death of Christ.

The Cross is the fundamental truth of the revealed Word of God. By the Cross we do not mean the tree, but the Sacrifice upon that tree.

We see the emblems of Christ and Him crucified in Genesis, and so on through the Old Testament. The only reason for Bethlehem is Calvary. Our salvation depends upon Christ dying upon the Cross.

#### *A. The Fact of the Death.*

##### *1. Old Testament Anticipation.*

###### *a. In Type.*

- (1) Coats of Skin (Gen. 3:21).
- (2) Abel's Lamb (Gen. 4:4).
- (3) Offering of Isaac (Gen. 22).
- (4) Passover Lamb (Ex. 12).
- (5) The Levitical Sacrificial System (Lev. 1:1 — 7:16).
- (6) The Brazen Serpent (Num. 21; John 3:14, 15).
- (7) The Slain Lamb (Is. 53:6, 7; John 1:29).

###### *b. In Prediction.*

- (1) Seed of the Woman (Gen. 3:15).
- (2) The Sin Offering of Psalm 22.
- (3) The Vicarious Sufferings of Isaiah 53.
- (4) The Cut-off Messiah of Daniel 9:26.
- (5) The Smitten Shepherd of Zachariah 13:6, 7.

##### *2. New Testament Revelation.*

*a. In General.* One third of the Book of Matthew, more than one third of Mark, one fourth of Luke, and one half of John deals with the last week of Christ before His crucifixion. [pg71]

###### *b. In Particular.*

(1) *The Heart of Christ Must Be Noted.*

(a) *His Death.* “If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life” (Rom. 5:10). See also Philippians 2:8; Hebrews 2:9, 14; Revelation 5:6-12.

(b) *His Cross.* “We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness” (I Cor. 1:23). See also Galatians 3:1; 6:14; Ephesians 2:16; Colossians 1:20.

(c) *His Blood.* “This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:28). See also Mark 14:24; Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14; I John 1:7; Hebrews 9:12, 25; Revelation 1:5; 5:9.

(2) *The Three Statements Concerning His Death Must Be Studied.*

(a) *Made Sin for Us.* “He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (II Cor. 5:21).

(b) *Died the Just for the Unjust.* “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit” (I Peter 3:18).

(c) *Made a Curse For Us.* “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. 3:13).

*B. The Form of the Death.*

1. *A Natural Death.* His death was a death such as experienced by man. It had to be a natural death, for He was The Man dying for all men.

2. *An Abnormal Death.* God cannot die, but God had to die if He was to become man’s substitute. Therefore He became a creature who could die. However, He contracted no sin while He lived.

Man dies today because of sin; but He had no sin. Apart from our sins, He would never have tasted death.

3. *A Preternatural Death.* Christ’s death was marked out and determined beforehand. Before the fall of Adam, God anticipated it. Before man sinned, God made provision for Calvary, for Christ is the Lamb slain “before the foundation of the world” (I Peter 1:20). Were

the sins that man committed before Calvary taken away by the blood of bulls and goats? No! For all sins, whether committed before or after the Cross, were put on Him at Calvary (Rom. 3:25).

4. *A Supernatural Death.* While we have stated that His death was a natural death, yet it was different from the death of other men. “Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father” (John 10:17, 18). [pg72]

His death was of His own volition. He lay down His life Himself; no one took it from Him. Usually it took two days for a man to die by crucifixion, but He died in six hours. Matthew 27: 46 and 50 state that He cried out with a loud voice. His strength had not left Him. He died in His strength. He *gave* His life; no one took it from Him. He bowed His head in death; He was majestic, even upon the cross.

Thus we see Christ suffering two deaths for us: the first death, the separation of the soul and spirit from the body; the second death, the separation of the individual from God. Christ suffered the second death first, and the first death last. He suffered the second death when He was separated from the Father, for He cried, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” (Matt. 27:46). Christ, the very son of God, was able to suffer in six hours what the sinner will endure throughout eternity.

### *C. Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Death.*

“Christ died for our sins according to the *scriptures*” (I Cor. 15:3b). Anything that is not of the Scripture is false.

1. *The Death of Christ Was a Martyr’s Death.* “In this He died to show us that truth is worth dying for.” How does the child of God meet this argument? Simply by the following: Why didn’t Christ say so? Why didn’t Paul say so? Why didn’t Peter say so? And why didn’t John and Luke say so? If Christ had died a martyr’s death, why didn’t the apostles say, “Believe on Stephen’s death and be saved, for Stephen was a martyr?” If Christ died as a martyr, why didn’t the Father comfort Him at His death as He has done others down through the centuries? But He cried out, “My God, my God, why hast thou

forsaken me?”

2. *The Death of Christ Was Accidental.* By the above statement critics mean that He was the victim of a mob. This we know is not true, for He was conscious of His future death. Seven times in the Gospel of John He speaks of “mine hour,” which was in the future, and which was Calvary. *He need not have died.* Nails did not hold Christ upon the cross, but His will. “Come down from the cross, if thou be the Son of God,” cried the mob; but Christ did not come from heaven to come down from the cross.

3. *The Death of Christ Was a Moral Example.* This theory holds that a drunkard has only to think on Christ and he will improve. To refute this we ask, “Why didn’t it improve the ones who crucified Him?” If Christ’s example is for the improvement of the world, then Christianity is a failure. Why not look upon the cross of Peter, as he was crucified downward? Man needs more than improvement.

4. *The Death of Christ Was an Exhibit of God’s Displeasure with Sin.* In other words some people think that God’s displeasure with sin is pictured on the cross rather than in hell. If the preceding statement is true, why the incarnation? Why not crucify a plain sinner, instead of the best Man who ever lived? [pg73]

5. *The Death of Christ Was to Show Man That God Loves Him.* God does love man, and the Cross does show that God loves him, but the death of Christ was not only to show God’s love.

6. *The Death of Christ Was the Death of a Criminal.* Can it be possible that one could hold to this theory? The answer is “yes.” And we refute this theory by stating that Pilate found no fault in Him. A study of the trial, as found in the Gospels, will disprove this theory.

#### *D. Scriptural Names of Christ’s Death.*

1. *Atonement.* This is an Old Testament idea which means “to cover.” The only place that the word “atonement” can be found in the New Testament is in Romans 5:11, but this is a mistranslation; it should be translated “reconciliation.” However, the word “atonement” is a New Testament idea meaning “at-one-ment” — at one with God through the sacrifice of His Son.

2. *Sacrifice.* “Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is

sacrificed for us” (I Cor. 5:7). See also Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26; 10:12.

3. *Offering*. “By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. . . . for by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Heb. 10:10, 14).

4. *Ransom*. “The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). Also I Peter 1:18, 19; I Timothy 2:5, 6. We have been redeemed (bought back) by the Price, which is the blood of Jesus Christ.

5. *Propitiation*. “He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (I John 2:2). See also I John 4:10; Romans 3:25. In Hebrews 9:5 the word “propitiation” is translated “mercy seat,” which is correct, for in the above Scriptures also the word “propitiation” means “mercy seat.” The law demanded death for sin; therefore, the blood of the sacrifice was placed on the mercy seat (Ex. 25:22; Lev. 16:13, 14), showing that death had taken place. God looked upon the mercy seat and saw blood — life — and was satisfied. Since Calvary, God looks upon our Mercy Seat, which is Christ, and is satisfied. Therefore, the underlying thought of propitiation is “satisfaction.”

6. *Reconciliation*. “To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5:19). See also Colossians 1:20. The word “reconciliation” means to cause, or affect a thorough change. Never in Scripture does it say that God is reconciled. It is man who has to be reconciled; it is man who needs a thorough change. [pg74]

7. *Substitution*. Substitution is not a Scriptural word, but it surely is a Scriptural idea. “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all” (Is. 53:5, 6). See also I Peter 3:18; II Corinthians 5:1.

8. *Testator*. A testament is a will that goes into effect at the death of the testator. Thus, our inheritance is that which we shall receive,

which is made possible by the death of the Lord Jesus. “He is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise, it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth” (Heb. 9:15-17). See also Colossians 1:12-14; Ephesians 1:1-7.

### *E. The Objectives of the Death.*

1. *The Manifestation of Divine Character.* “Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. . . . To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:21, 26).

2. *The Vindication of Divine Law.* The law is unto death. There is no mercy in law, only justice. The law condemns the sinner to death; Christ took the sinner’s place; therefore, Christ paid the law’s demand.

3. *The Foundation of Divine Pardon.* This statement will go unchallenged in the New Testament. There is one essential feature of forgiveness, and that is: the one who forgives must take upon himself all wrong (or loss) that has been committed. For example, if a person is robbed of ten dollars, and the culprit is found, but is forgiven, who then stands the loss? It is he who forgave.

### *F. The Extent of the Death.*

#### 1. *General Statements.*

a. *Its Universality.* His death was for all men — for those who believe, and those who believe not. “We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. 2:9). See also I Timothy 2:6; 4:10; Titus 2:11; I John 2:2; II Peter 3:9.

b. *Its Limitation.* Christ’s work upon the cross was conditional, as the efficiency of it depended upon the repentance and acceptance of Christ by the sinner. “We labor and suffer reproach, because we trust



in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe” (I Tim. 4:10). [pg75]

2. *Particular Statements.*

a. *Christ Died for the Believer.* “Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Titus 2:14). See also Ephesians 5:2; Galatians 2:20; I Timothy 4:10.

b. *Christ Died for the Church.* “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish” (Eph. 5:25- 27).

c. *Christ Died for Sinners.* “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but: quickened by the Spirit” (I Peter 3:18). See also I Timothy 1:15; Romans 5:10.

d. *Christ Died for the World.* “They sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation” (Rev. 5:9, R.V.<sup>60</sup>). See also John 3:16; 1:9; I John 2:2.

G. *The Results of the Death.*

1. *In Relation to the Sinner.*

a. *Provides a Substitute.* “We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death ... that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. 2:9).

b. *Provides a Ransom.* “Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time” (I Tim. 2:6).

c. *Provides a Propitiation.* Because of the death of Christ, God is “mercy seated” — satisfied. “He is the propitiation for our sins: and

---

60 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (I John 2:2).

d. *Provides for Non-imputation of Sin.* “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them: and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5:19).

e. *Provides an Attraction.* “I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me” (John 12:32).

f. *Provides a Salvation.* “The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men” (Titus 2: 11).

g. *Provides a Gracious Invitation.* “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16).

## 2. *In Relation to the Believer.*

a. *Reconciliation.* “All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5:18).

b. *Redemption.* “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (Eph. 1:7). See also Galatians 3:13.

c. *Justification.* “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:1).

[pg76]

d. *Exoneration.* “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1, R.V.<sup>61</sup>).

e. *Possession.* “What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have received of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s” (I Cor. 6:19, 20).

f. *Sanctification.* “We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10:10).

g. *Perfection.* “By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Heb. 10:14).

h. *Admission.* “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and a living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and

---

61 Ibid.

having a high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water” (Heb. 10:19-22).

i. *Identification*. “The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died” (II Cor. 5:14, R.V.<sup>62</sup>).

j. *Liberation*. “Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage” (Heb. 2:14, 15, R.V.<sup>63</sup>).

k. *Donation*. “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” (Rom. 8:32).

### 3. *In Relation to Satan*.

a. *Dethronement*. “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out” (John 12:31).

b. *Nullification*. “Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. 2:14, R.V.<sup>64</sup>).

c. *Defeat*. “Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son” (Col. 1:13). See also Ephesians 6:12.

4. *In Relation to the Material Universe*. “It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven” (Col. 1:19, 20).

Some teach that Philippians 2:9-11 reveals the fact of universal salvation, but this is not so. This passage declares the truth of universal adoration.<sup>65</sup> [pg77] [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible*

---

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

*Doctrines*.<sup>66</sup> The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

---

Publishing House, 93-101

66 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

## Chapter 8 – The Resurrection of Christ – Cambron's V.

On the resurrection of Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr Cambron's section on "The Resurrection of Christ." [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 101-109, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 78-84.]

### V The Resurrection of Christ.

#### *A. The Importance of the Resurrection.*

In the Bible there are several accounts of people having been brought back to life. These people, however, were not resurrected, but restored, for they died again. But our Lord was resurrected, having died once and for all and having been raised from the dead. He now liveth and abideth forever.

His death was necessary, because He was made sin for us.

1. *Its Place in Scripture.* There are thirteen or fourteen references in the New Testament concerning the ordinance of baptism, and even fewer Scriptures referring to the Lord's Supper. However, the fact of His resurrection is mentioned over one hundred times.

2. *Its Part in Apostolic Testimony.* "With great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all" (Acts 4:33). See also Acts 2:32; 17:18; 23:6.

3. *Its Prominence in the Gospel.* If Christ be not risen there is no Gospel. "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I have preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures" (I Cor. 15:1-4).

4. *Its Preeminence in Salvation* (I Cor. 15:12-20).

a. *First Proposition.* "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" (verse 12).

b. *Second Proposition.* “But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen” (verse 13). If we are not to be raised from the dead, then Christ is not risen.

c. *Third Proposition.* “And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain” (verse 14). If Christ is not risen, Christianity is a sham.

d. *Fourth Proposition.* “Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not” (verse 15). If Christ be not raised, every evangelical preacher is a fraud.

e. *Fifth Proposition.* “For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins” (verses 16 and 17). If He be not risen, He is still dead, and therefore cannot redeem us. The penalty paid for any crime is not fully paid until the one for whom it was paid is free. As long as Christ was in the tomb, the penalty for our sins was not paid; but His resurrection shows that the penalty *has* been paid. And, remember, this Scripture was written to those who were not in their sins.

f. *Sixth Proposition.* “Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished” [pg78] (verse 18). In other words, they have all gone like the beasts of the field, if Christ did not rise from the dead.

g. *Seventh Proposition.* “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable” (verse 19). If all of our hope is staked upon the resurrection of Christ, and if He has not risen, then we are of all men most to be pitied. We have done nothing else to secure salvation, and if our Saviour be not risen, we have no Saviour. We had better look into some other religion.

h. *Eighth Proposition.* “But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept” (verse 20). Praise the Lord, *He is risen! He is alive!* We are saved by a living Redeemer. We, of all men, are the only sinners who are saved.

### *B. The Meaning of the Resurrection.*

By the resurrection we mean the *bodily* resurrection, not the spiritual resurrection.

1. *Provision of the Tomb.* Guards were placed there to guarantee against the removal of His body, not His Spirit. “So they went, and

made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch” (Matt. 27:66).

2. *Recognition of the Disciples.* “Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God” (John 20:27, 28).

3. *Testimony of the Apostles.* “This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses” (Acts 2:32).

4. *A Testimony of the Lord Himself.* “He began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again” (Mark 8:31).

5. *The Announcement of Our Transformation.* “Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself” (Phil. 3:20,21).

### *C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Resurrection.*

1. *The Unburied Body Theory.* By this statement unbelievers maintain that the tomb was never filled, that the two thieves, and Christ, were thrust out upon the trash heap. However, this is refuted by the Jew’s own law: “If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt surely bury him the same day; for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee for an inheritance” (Deut. 21:22, 23). [pg79]

2. *The Unemptied Grave Theory.* Those that hold to this say that He is still there. Surely common sense would refute this argument, for if Christ had not arisen, the Devil would have caused His body to have been found sometime during the last two thousand years.

3. *The Removal Theory.* This is that theory which proposes that Joseph moved the body out of the tomb. Of this argument we ask, “If he removed the body, why didn’t he also remove the clothing?” All

will have to admit that if Joseph *did* remove the body, it would have had to be done in secret. If done in secret, why wasn't the stone rolled back against the door? 4. *The Mistaken Woman Theory*. This theory contends that the woman misunderstood what the man in the sepulchre had said. We refute this contention by saying that the Word does not so declare it, and the Word is the only authority and witness we have.

5. *The Deliberate Deception Theory*. This supposition clings to the idea that Christ did not die at all, but rather that He fainted on the cross and was revived by the cool air of the tomb. If this be the case, where did He go? Surely, as He was an object of interest to the entire populace, He would have been recognized and openly accepted or rejected.

6. *The Fraud Theory*. This states that the apostles plainly lied and deceived those that heard them. However, all of the apostles, except John, met a martyr's death. Why? Because of their devotion to Christ and His resurrection. Would they have sacrificed their lives for a lie? Of course not!

7. *The Self-Deception Theory*. In other words, this speculation declares that the apostles had an illusion; that is, they thought that He arose from the dead, and kept on thinking it, until after a while they believed it. We know, from human experience, that delusions soon fade away, and we awaken to reality. The apostles could not have deceived themselves very long.

8. *The Hallucination Theory*. This idea supposes that they thought they had actually seen the resurrected Saviour, when it was merely a hallucination caused by nerves and excitement. Can you imagine Peter becoming delirious, and Thomas hysterical? 9. *The Recollection Theory*. This view sees the hysterical apostles fleeing to Samaria, and while alone in this place, they began to think that Jesus is still with them. That is where we get the idea that He arose from the dead. The Scriptures, nevertheless, declare that they remained in Jerusalem behind closed doors until He revealed Himself to them.

10. *The Misunderstood Theory*. This reasoning admits that the Saviour died, but states that the apostles preached the resurrection of His Spirit, and not His body. However, people took it wrong. The word "resurrection" is never connected with the spirit, but rather with the body, for the spirit never dies. [pg80]



11. *The Spiritual Vision Theory.* This supposition maintains that the apostles actually saw something. What they saw was a lying vision, not the Lord. The Devil had fooled them. But, if there was anything the Devil did not want them to believe, it was the resurrection of Christ, whether, a lying vision or the actual thing. Christ Himself dispels this argument by declaring, after His resurrection, that “a spirit does not have flesh and bones.”

12. *The Twins Theory.* Those who offer this suggestion say that Christ had a twin, and that three days after He had been crucified and buried, His twin showed himself, declaring that he was Christ risen from the dead. We ask, “Where was this twin hidden for thirty-three years?”

#### *D. The Proofs of the Resurrection.*

1. *The Empty Tomb.* The Gospels declare that the people held two views concerning his resurrection. One group, consisting of unbelievers, said that someone stole His body; the other group contended that He was raised by Divine Power. The empty tomb proves the latter. A Roman watch, composed of sixty men with four groups of fifteen each, were stationed to watch the tomb. Each group guarded the tomb for a six-hour period. The watch was ordered to guard the tomb against the theft of the body of Christ. Now the enemy did not wish to steal the body; they wanted it buried. We know that the apostles did not steal it, as they were afraid. Even at His crucifixion they fled. The soldiers were paid by the unbelievers to bear false testimony. Is it not peculiar that the Jewish priests did not prosecute the soldiers, if the body had actually been stolen? Had the disciples stolen the body, would not the priests have hounded them until they admitted such a deed? Why did they not do *something*? Simply because they did not believe the story.

*A new tomb:* there was but one body in it, and there is no question as to who rose from the dead when the tomb became empty. It was carved out of the rock — solid rock behind, above, below, and on the side. There were no other entrances.

2. *The Undisturbed Grave Clothes.* In the Orient the bodies of the dead are wound with grave clothes, from the neck down to the feet, in a manner similar to that used on Egyptian mummies. The head is

wrapped with a napkin. When this wrapping was duly done, the body was stretched out on a ledge. When Peter came in to examine the grave clothes, he saw that they were undisturbed — the body of Christ had shot through the grave clothes without bursting a single thread. Peter discovered that the grave clothes were unmolested; the clothes appeared as though they were still wrapped around the body — but there was no body.

As for the tomb, the door was not opened to let Christ out — He was *already* out! He came out of the tomb just as He had come out of the grave clothes. Yes, He was out of the tomb long before the stone was rolled away. The soldiers had been guarding a sealed, empty tomb for nearly twelve hours. [pg81]

3. *The Appearances of Christ.* In I Corinthians 15:1-11 we have recorded the number of witnesses who actually saw the Lord, the risen Saviour. This number does not include the women. The highest number of witnesses required to establish the truth in America is seven: one for murder; two for treason; three for a will; and seven for an oral will. The number of witnesses recorded in the Word is over five hundred. Certainly, according to the accepted jurisprudence, there is sufficient evidence that He arose from the dead.

4. *The Character of Christ.* No greater proof is needed in contending for His resurrection than His character. To think that such a shameful end would come to Him who was the Perfect One! Surely, God in His justice would not have allowed the only man without sin to remain in the tomb.

5. *The New Testament.* The twenty-seven books composing the New Testament are the *effect*; the *cause* is a risen Christ. Without Christ's resurrection, there would not have been any New Testament. The death of Christ had sorely depressed the disciples. Their faith was shattered. If Christ had not appeared unto them, they would never have written about Him. The story of His life grew out of His resurrection.

6. *The Apostles' Church.* The apostles began preaching at Jerusalem only seven weeks after the crucifixion. Right there in Jerusalem, where Jesus had been crucified and buried, the apostles declared Christ to have risen from the dead. If Christ had not risen, the enemies could have produced the body, for they had crucified Him. The silence of the Jews was as much proof of His resurrection as the

writings of the disciples.

7. *The Transformed Disciples.* The resurrection brought about a transformation of the disciples. Before, they had seen Christ die, and thus their faith was shattered. Two of them said, “We hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel” (Luke 24:21, R.V.<sup>67</sup>) Sad words — no hope. All faith was now dead. They were meeting together behind closed doors, frightened, afraid for their lives, when the Lord appeared. It was hard to convince them of His resurrection, even though He actually appeared before them. But when they were convinced, *nothing* could ever change them.

How about doubting Thomas? He was not present at Christ’s first appearance before the disciples, and, therefore, he doubted. I am glad that Thomas doubted, for now I am relieved of doubt. His unbelief was removed at the second appearance of the Saviour; consequently, all of our doubts concerning the resurrection should be removed.

8. *The Conversion of Saul.* The Church never had a greater enemy than Saul of Tarsus. He was a well-known individual in Judaism, belonging to the sect known as the Pharisees, who believed in the future resurrection of the dead, but certainly not in the resurrection of Jesus. What changed this terrible persecutor of the Church into the mighty preacher of Christ? *The resurrection of Christ!* From the day on the road to Damascus, he never doubted the resurrection. He suffered at the hands of his own countrymen and in the courts of the foreigner because of his belief in Christ’s resurrection. [pg82]

9. *Christian Experience.* Since we have been born again hope has been placed in our hearts: that our sins have been taken away and that our own resurrection is assured. This hope could only be guaranteed by a risen Saviour. We are not saved from our sins by a living mother, nor by a dead Jew, but by a Living Lord.

10. *The Gospel Record.* The Gospels were written or dictated by witnesses, “chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink

---

67 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

with him after he rose from the dead” (Acts 10:41b). In reading the Gospels, we notice the little details, words and phrases, which prove to us how natural and how true to life the accounts are.

*E. The Result of the Resurrection.*

*1. In Relation to Christ Himself.*

a. *It Was the Seal of His Father’s Acceptance.* In other words, Christ’s sacrifice was sufficient and accepted by God. “It is God’s ‘amen’ to His Son’s ‘it is finished.’”

b. *It Was the Mark of His Divine Sonship.* Christ was “declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead” (Rom. 1:4). On being nailed to the cross, He was accursed of God. God would not let His Son remain accursed; therefore God raised him from the dead.

*c. It Was the Demonstration of His Victory.*

(1) *Over the Devil.* If only the Devil could have kept Him in the grave, complete victory would have been Satan’s. However, Christ arose from the dead, guaranteeing salvation for every believing soul. The believer is commanded to put on the whole armour of God in order to withstand the wiles of the Devil. One piece of that armour is the helmet of Salvation.

(2) *Over Death.* “Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:19, 20). See also II Timothy 1:10.

d. *It Was the Illustration of Incorruptibility.* God’s purpose and grace “is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality [incorruptibility] to light through the gospel” (II Tim. 1:10).

*2. In Relation to the Believer.*

a. *Proves His Justification.* “Jesus our Lord . . . was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification” (Rom. 4:24, 25).

b. *Illustrates His Power.* Paul prayed that God might give the Ephesians “the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him . . . that ye may know . . . what is the exceeding greatness of his

power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places” (Eph. 1:17, 18,19, 20).

c. *Provides a High Priest.* “He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:25). See also Romans 8:34; Hebrews 3:1; 7:22.

d. *Begets a Living Hope.* “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the [pg83] resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you” (I Peter 1:3,4).

e. *Guarantees Our Resurrection.* “He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you” (II Cor. 4:14). See also I Corinthians 15:22; I Thessalonians 4:14.

### 3. *In Relation to the World.*

a. *Gives Evidence of His Truth.* All that he spake is substantiated by His resurrection, for God would not have raised a liar from the dead and declare Him to be His Son. His act proved His favor.

b. *Gives Evidence of Universal Resurrection.* “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:22).

c. *Gives Evidence of World Judgment.* “He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead” (Acts 17:31).<sup>68</sup> [This ends a block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.<sup>69</sup> The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroininstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

---

68 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 101-109

69 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

## Chapter 9 – The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ – Cambron's VI.

On the ascension and enthronement of Jesus Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr Cambron's section on “The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ.”[block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 109-113, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 84-87.]

### VI The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ.

His ascension is a historical fact. If His resurrection is denied, then His ascension must also be denied. It is hard for some people to grasp the thought that a glorified, living Body is in glory; but He *is* up there, nevertheless.

#### *A. The Meaning of the Ascension and Enthronement.*

1. *Of the Ascension.* It is that event, after His resurrection, in which He departed visibly from the earth to heaven. “When he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven” (Acts 1:9-11).

2. *Of the Enthronement* (Exaltation). This is that act of God by which he gave to the risen and ascended Lord full power and glory, allowing Him to sit down on the right hand of God’s throne. “This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear” (Acts 2:32, 33). “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne” (Rev. 3:21). Christ is not now sitting on His own throne, but upon His Father’s throne. [pg84]

*B. The Message of the Ascension and Enthronement.*

*1. In Prophecy.*

a. *Testimony of a Psalmist.* “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore” (Ps. 16:10, 11). See also Psalm 68:18; 110:4, 5.

b. *Testimony of the Saviour.* “What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?” (John 6:62). See also John 16:28.

c. *Testimony of Luke.* “It came to pass, when the time was come that he should he received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem” (Luke 9:51).

*2. In History.*

a. *Testimony of Mark.* “So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and set on the right hand of God” (Mark 16:19).

b. *Testimony of Luke.* “It came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven” (Luke 24:51). See also Acts 1:9-11.

c. *Testimony of Stephen.* “He, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God” (Acts 7:55, 56).

d. *Testimony of Peter.* “Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him” (I Peter 3:22). See also Acts 3:15, 20, 21; 5:30, 31.

e. *Testimony of Paul.* “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us” (Rom. 8:34). See also Ephesians 1:20, 21; 4:8-10; Colossians 3:1; I Timothy 3:16.

f. *Testimony of John.* The entire first chapter of the Book of Revelation declares John’s testimony of the ascended and enthroned Christ.

*C. The Nature of the Ascension and Enthronement.*

1. *He Bodily and Visibly Ascended.* Luke wrote “of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen” (Acts 1:1, 2). See also Acts 1:9-11.

2. *He Passed Through the Heavens.* “Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession” (Heb. 4:14).

3. *He Was Made Higher Than the Heavens.* This means that He was made higher than all the created beings in heaven. “Such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens” (Heb. 7:26). [pg85]

4. *He Sat Down on the Right Hand of God.* “Now in the things which we are saying the chief point is this: We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens” (Heb. 8:1, R.V.<sup>70</sup>). See also Ephesians 1:20; Colossians 3:1.

*D. The Necessity of the Ascension and Enthronement.*

1. *For the Demonstration of His Complete Achievement.* “Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins” (Acts 5:31). He said, “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. . . . By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10: 9, 10). In the tabernacle here upon earth there were no chairs, and this fact signified that the showing work was never complete. He entered heaven and sat down on the throne, and thus declared that the work of our redemption was a finished act.

2. *For the Facilitation of Human Worship.* “The hour cometh and now is. when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth” (John 4:23, 24).

---

70 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.



3. *For the Bestowment of the Holy Ghost.* “I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you” (John 16:7).

4. *For the Constitution of His Headship Over the Church.* “[God] hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all and in all” (Eph. 1:22, 23).

#### *E. The Purpose of the Ascension and Enthronement.*

1. *He Entered Heaven as a Forerunner.* “The forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec” (Heb. 6:20). Another word for “forerunner” is “captain,” “prince leader,” one who has others to follow him.” The Lord Jesus precedes us; if death comes while He tarries, we will go on to be with Him.

2. *He Entered Heaven as a Gift-Bestower.* “He saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive. and gave gifts unto men. . . and he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers” (Eph. 4:8, 11).

3. *He Entered Heaven as a Place-Preparer.* “I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also” (John 14:2, 3). [pg86]

#### *F. The Results of the Ascension and Enthronement.*

1. *Gives Us an Intercessor with God.* “Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. 9:24). See also Hebrews 7:25.

2. *Gives Us Access to God.* “Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to

help in time of need” (Heb. 4:14-16).

3. *Gives Us Ableness for Service.* “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father” (John 14:12). “Greater works” does not mean healing or speaking in tongues, but the spreading of the Gospel of salvation. For example, Peter spoke, and three thousand believed; he spoke again, and five thousand others believed.

4. *Gives Us Confidence in God’s Providences.* “We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose” (Rom. 8:28).

5. *Gives Us Our Heavenly Position.* “[God] hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (Eph. 2:6).<sup>71</sup>

[This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.<sup>72</sup> The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

---

71 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 109-113

72 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69

## **Chapter 10 – Critique of other Systematic Theology Christology Works**

There is a difference between a Bible doctrine book and a theology book. The "ology" in theology emphasizes a discourse which meanders down every conceivable avenue of consideration for a topic. While a Bible doctrine must detail every straight and narrow consideration of what God has revealed. A thorough "ology" must do that, plus expand and expound on every thread. It must further introduce and explore some of the major broad paths and wide gates of man's creation. It should thereby open some vistas which may not have been considered by the student of doctrine, being ever vigilant because the wide paths do lead to destruction. Review of other works of systematic theology pursues this mind broadening purpose.

### **Critique of John Miley's 1892 Methodist Christology**

John Miley wrote an extensive Christology section in his *Systematic Theology*.<sup>73</sup> A brief introduction of John Miley, taken from wikipedia is included below:

John Miley (1813–1895) was an American Christian theologian in the Methodist tradition who was one of the major Methodist theological voices of the 19th century. Miley had graduated from Augusta College and, as a Methodist pastor, had held nineteen different pastoral appointments. He served as chair of systematic theology at Drew University in Madison, NJ beginning in 1873, after his brother-in-law, Randolph Sinks Foster, left the seat to become a Bishop. He was the author of *Systematic Theology* (1892, ISBN 0-943575-09-5), a two-volume work which served as a key text for Methodist seminarians for decades. He also authored *The Atonement in Christ* (1879), in which he demonstrated what he believed were

---

<sup>73</sup> John Miley, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1 & 2*, The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, New York: Eaton and Mains, 1894, The Internet Archive [www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01miley](http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01miley).

severe Biblical and theological problems with commonly held theories on the doctrine of the atonement such as the punishment view of Calvinism and the moral example view of Pierre Abélard, developing a strong moral government theology which was thoroughly Wesleyan and Arminian, heavily reliant on the work of Hugo Grotius.<sup>74</sup>

John Miley's systematic theology was reviewed in my studies to keep Hodge and Strong's excessive Presbyterian leanings in check, however, he does have an extensive Christology section. In his development Miley states that in the logical order of doctrines, meaning the intelligent order in which they arise for thought, Anthropology must precede Christology, and Christology must precede Soteriology. He then gives extensive coverage of "Leading Errors In Christology"<sup>75</sup> before he deals with Christology proper.<sup>76</sup> After which he further develops another section on the errors in Christology.<sup>77</sup> Concerning the leading errors, his overlap with Dr. Cambron's coverage is shown in the table below:

Dr. Cambron <i>Bible Doctrine 1954</i> deals with: these leading error in Christology:	John Miley, <i>Systematic Theology 1894</i> , pg 851 Chapter V. Leading Errors In Christology,
<p>1. <i>Ebionitism.</i></p> <p><b>2. Corinthianism.</b></p> <p><b>3. Docetism.</b></p> <p>4. <i>Arianism.</i></p> <p>5. <i>Apollinarianisin.</i></p>	<p>I. Earlier Errors.</p> <p>1. Ebionism</p> <p><b>2. Gnosticism</b></p> <p>3. Arianism</p> <p>4. Apollinai'ianism</p>

74 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\\_Miley](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Miley) accessed 29 Sep 2014. [wikipedia has not been, in general, treated as a reliable reference for professional works, but it is a very assailable reference.]

75 John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, pg 851 Chapter V. Leading Errors In Christology, I. Earlier Errors. 1. Ebionism 2. Gnosticism 3. Arianism 4. Apollinai'ianism 5. Nestorianism 6. Eutychianism : II. Later Errors. 1. The Socinian Christology ; 2. The Lutheran Christology 3. The Kenotic Christology (pg 45-59).

76 John Miley, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1 & 2*, 851,885-947.

77 *Ibid.*, 947-976

<p>Dr. Cambron <i>Bible Doctrine 1954</i> deals with: these leading error in Christology:</p>	<p>John Miley, <i>Systematic Theology 1894</i>, pg 851 Chapter V. Leading Errors In Christology,</p>
<p>6. <i>Nestorianism</i>. [pg70]          7. <i>Eutychianism</i>.  <b>8. Monothelitism.</b>  <b>9. Unitarianism.</b>  <b>10. Christian Science.</b>  <b>11. Millennial Dawnism.</b></p>	<p>5. Nestorianism          6. Eutychianism :   <b>II. Later Errors.</b>  <b>1. The Socinian Christology ;</b>  <b>2. The Lutheran Christology</b>  <b>3. The Kenotic Christology</b> (pg 45-59).</p>

Because John Miley gives an extensive coverage to the errors of Christology, from a late 19<sup>th</sup> century Methodist's viewpoint, his public domain chapter on this topic is given in a block quote below. Make particular note of his coverage of the *kenosis* theory, which I called upon and defended earlier and which he calls an error in Christology:

*Miley's Chap V. Leading Errors In Christology.*

The treatment of Christological errors is specially the work of historical theology; yet some attention to them is proper in a system of doctrines. We may thus set in a clearer light the true doctrine of the person of Christ. However, a brief presentation of the leading errors is all that we require and all that we attempt.

I. Earlier Errors.

While it is convenient to make the general distinction between the earlier and later Christological errors, a chronological order is not important in the treatment of the errors as classed in the two divisions. Here it is better to observe, as far as practicable, a logical order.

1. Ebionism. The Ebionites were probably so named by an opprobrious application to them of a Hebrew word which means poor; but not on account of their low and impoverished views of Christ, as some have held. Ebionism was a strongly Judaized form of Christianity. This is true as a general characterization. However, Ebionism represents several sects, with different Christological tenets. There were two leading sects: the Essene and the Pharisaic. The Essene Ebionites held the Mosaic law to be obligatory on all Jewish Christians, but did not require its

observance by Gentile Christians. Therefore they accepted the apostleship and teaching of St. Paul. The Pharisaic Ebionites held that all Christians must observe the law of Moses, the Gentile no less than the Jewish. Therefore they repudiated the apostleship and teaching of St. Paul. They were his virulent and persistent opposers and persecutors.

Both sects held Christ to be the promised Messiah, but their notion of him was the low, secularized notion of the Jew. But, with agreement on this point, the two sects differed on others. The Essene held the miraculous conception of Christ, while the Pharisaic held him to be the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation. The former of these views is in close identity with the earlier Socinianism; the latter in a like identity with a more modern humanitarianism, which holds Christ to be a man, just as others, whatever moral superiority may be conceded him. With these statements the errors of Ebionism in Christology are manifest. The divinity of Christ and the divine incarnation in him are both denied.'

2. Gnosticism. No doubt the term Gnostic had its ground in the Greek word  $\nu\tau\epsilon\omega\alpha\iota\chi$ . As appropriated by the Gnostics it meant the profession of a high order of knowledge. As knowledge is possible, such a claim is not necessarily groundless; but it may mean, and with the Gnostics did mean, the profession of a peculiar insight into great problems which lie beyond the grasp of other minds. They dealt freely, and with much pretension of knowledge, with the profoundest questions.<sup>78</sup> All may instance the world-ground or absolute being; all secondary or finite existences; the mode of their derivation from the absolute; the origin of evil and the mode of the world's redemption. Mostly, however, their treatment of these great questions was in a purely speculative mode. Hypothesis and deduction were in the freest use. Deduction, however, must be kept within its own sphere, and proceed only from grounds or principles of unquestionable truth.

The Gnostics were heedless of these imperative laws, carried

---

78 A 2018 AD Note: This same airs is found in followers of Peter Ruckman and others who suppose angels bred with humans, created giants and that is why God destroyed the world with flood, it was those angels fault!, then supposes they did it again and made giants in Canaan, then those rascal evil angels did it again and now our world is governed by secret hidden giants covered up by government officials in Washington DC. Other cults advance a flat earth, a geocentric universe, alien beings as our creators and/or a gap theory that might account for the Bible's misrepresentation of the age of rocks. Be careful of those who promote their own special insight into the Bible, and demonize with ignoance those who do not see things their way.

their speculations into spheres where induction is the only appropriate method, and proceeded from the merest hypotheses or assumptions. With such methods in view the vagaries of Gnosticism should cause no surprise.

Gnosticism divided into various schools. This was an inevitable consequence of its purely speculative method. It was also made certain by the diverse influences to which its speculations were subject. The principal sources of Gnosticism may probably be summed up in these three. To Platonism, modified by Judaism, it owed much of its philosophical form and tendencies. To the dualism of the Persian religion it owed one form at least of its speculations on the origin and remedy of evil, and many of the details of its doctrine of emanations. To the Buddhism of India, modified again probably by Platonism, it was indebted for the doctrines of the antagonism between spirit and matter and the unreality of derived existence (the germ of the Gnostic Docetism), and, in part at least, for the theory which regards the universe as a series of successive emanations from the absolute unity."<sup>79</sup> Theories would thus take form just as one source of influence or another predominated, or according to the elements combined in their construction.

It is already apparent that leading tenets of the Gnostic heresy flourished in different philosophies long before the Christian era. As a heresy in Christianity it began its evil work while the apostles yet lived and wrote. There are many references to it in the New Testament, particularly in the writings of St. John. It is every-where reprehended as false in doctrine, evil in practice, and corrupt in influence. These characterizations are not limited to its evils as then manifest, but are prophetic of far greater evils in a future not remote. The truth of these prophecies was fully verified in the early history of the Church.

There were two principles of Gnosticism which led to an utterly false doctrine of the person of Christ. These were the perturbing tenets of emanation and the intrinsically evil nature of matter. God was not a creator of the universe, but the source of emanations. In this mode all things have proceeded from him. But this process is on a descending scale; so that even the first emanation must be inferior to the original ground of all things. Hence, wherever Christ is placed in the scale of emanated existences, even though it were

---

79 Burton: *Heresies of the Apostolic Age*, Bampton Lectures, 1829, lect. iii ; Reuss : *Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, book i, chap, ix ; Neander: *History of the Church*, vol. i, pp. 344-353 ; Schaff : *History of the Christian Church*, vol. li, pp. 431-442, 1886 ; Dorner : *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. 1, pp. 188-217. [pg47]

at the top, he cannot be truly divine. The other tenet that matter is intrinsically evil, and corruption of all spiritual being in contact with it, was common to the different schools of Gnosticism, and led to a denial of the divine incarnation. That is: Gnosticism denied the reality of the human nature of Christ.

What in him seemed a real body was not such in fact, but a mere phantasm or appearance. It was on this ground that the Gnostics were often called Docetse, from *Sokeo*, to seem or appear.<sup>80</sup> If there was no reality in the bodily form of Christ, of course there was no divine incarnation in him. It was in view of this heresy as an evil already at work, and as seen in prophetic vision, soon to become a far greater evil, that St. John opened his gospel with a doctrine of the Logos, which could mean nothing less than his essential divinity, and asserted in a manner so definite the reality of his incarnation.' It was in the same view that he wrote in his epistles: "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist."<sup>81</sup>

It is obvious that such texts are indirect reprobation of certain principles of the Gnostics, which determine for them an utterly false doctrine of the person of Christ. According to these principles he could be neither divine nor an incarnation of divinity in our nature.<sup>82"</sup>

3. Arianism. The term Arianism was derived from Arius, who became the representative of certain doctrinal views regarded as heretical. Arius was a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, early in the fourth century, and a man of influence. He set forth and maintained views at issue with the accepted doctrine of the Trinity; but the real point of the issue concerned the divinity of the Son. When, in an assembly of his clergy, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, maintained the eternity of the Son, Arius openly

---

80 Mansel : *The Gnostic Heresies*, p. 32.

81 'John i, 1-3, 14. ' 1 John iv, 3 ; 3 John 7.

82 Burton : *Heresies of the Apostolic Age*, Bampton Lectures, 1829 ; Mansel : *The Gnostic Heresies* ; Norton : *History of the Gnostics* ; Lightfoot : *Commentary on Colossians*, pp. 73-113 ; Ueberweg : *History of Philosophy*, Â§ 77 ; Eeuss : *Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, book iii, chaps. ix, x ; Neander : *History of the Church*, vol. i, pp. 366-478 ; Domer ; *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. i, pp. 218-252 ; King : *The Gnostics and their Remains*. An appendix to King's book gives very fully the literature of the subject.



opposed him, and maintained that in the very nature of his relation to the Father, the Son could not be eternal. This position could not remain as the whole adverse view. It involved doctrinal consequences which could not be avoided, and which, therefore, were soon accepted and maintained. If the Son was not eternal, then there was a time when he was not. This consequence was accepted and avowed. If the Son was not eternal, then his existence must have originated in an optional will of the Father, and either in the mode of generation or in that of creation. These consequences were also accepted; but respecting the actual mode of the Son's origin the earlier Arianism was vacillating or indefinite. Later, the mode of creation was more in favor. Thus, the Son was held to be of creaturely character. The departure from the orthodox faith was really the same, whichever view of his origin was maintained. A being originating in time, and by an optional act of God, whatever the mode of his operation, could not be truly divine. This consequence was fully accepted.[pg49]

The results of these views respecting the doctrines of the Trinity and the person of Christ are obvious. They are utterly subversive of both. The truth of the Trinity imperatively requires the essential divinity of the Son. He must be consubstantial with the Father, and his personal subsistence must be in the mode of an eternal generation, not by any optional act of the Father. A true doctrine of the person of Christ equally requires the essential divinity of the Son. Hence Arianism subverts the deepest truth of the person of Christ. When the Son is reduced to a temporal existence, to a finite being, to carnation. the plane of a creature, there can be no divine incarnation in Christ, no theanthropic character of Christ. No attribution of greatness to the Son can obviate these consequences. Arianism may declare him, as it did, the head of creation, and far above all other creatures, so far as to be like God; but all this avails nothing because such likeness means, and is intended to mean, that he is not God, and that the divine nature is not in him. No more relief comes with the ascription to the Son of the whole work of creation. Relief might thus come if this work were allowed to mean what it really means for the divinity of the Son ; but there is no relief so long as Arianism denies his divinity and reduces him to the plane of a creature. The contradictory ascription of the work of creation to the Son, after he is reduced to the plane of a creature, leaves Arianism in the utter subversion of the truth respecting the person of Christ.<sup>83</sup>

---

83 Newman, Cardinal : Arians of the Fourth Century ; Gwatkin : The Arian Controversy ; Waterland : Defense of the Divinity of Christ ; A Second Defense of Christ's Divinity, Works, vol. ii ; Cunningham : Historical Theology, vol. i, pp.

4. Apollinarianism. The Apollinarian Christology was so named from Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, and was disseminated in the fourth century. Its distinctive characteristic is that it denies to Christ the possession of a human mind. Necessarily, therefore, the theory grounded itself in a trichotomic anthropology. Man was assumed to consist of three distinct natures, body, soul, and spirit. In the theory body and mind were held in their usual meaning: the former as the physical nature; the latter as the rational and moral nature. The peculiarity of the theory was in the meaning given to the psyche or soul. This was held to be a distinct nature, intermediate between the physical and mental, and the seat of the sensuous or animal life. Provision was thus made for the theory of a partial incarnation. If man consists of three distinct natures it was possible that in the incarnation the Son should assume two of these natures and omit the third. It was assumed, accordingly, that the rational and moral [pg50] nature was omitted, and that the Son united with himself merely the physical and psychic natures of man.

With such limitation of the human nature assumed in the incarnation, or the omission of the mental nature, the mental facts, must account for the rational and moral facts, such as have a human cast, in the life of Christ. The account was attempted on the assumption that the incarnate Logos so fulfilled the functions of a rational mind in Christ as to account for this class of facts in his life.

While trichotomy provides for a partial incarnation, it is the necessary ground of a Christology which makes such limitation fundamental. If man is only dichotomic natures, there is no place for such a Christology. However, the refutation of Apollinarianism is not to be most readily achieved through the refutation of trichotomy. While the Scriptures are seemingly in favor of dichotomy,<sup>84</sup> yet they are not decisive, as appeared in our discussion of that question. Nor can the question be concluded in any scientific or philosophic mode. On the other hand, there is here a fatal weakness of the Apollinarian Christology. In the first place, it is unable to establish the truth of trichotomy, which yet is its necessary ground. In the next place, the established truth of trichotomy could not conclude the Apollinarian Christology; indeed, could not furnish any proof of

---

276-293; Gieseler: Ecclesiastical History, vol. i, pp. 294-322; SchafE : History of the Christian Church, vol. iii, ^Â§ 119-125, 1886; Domer : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. i, vol. ii, pp. 201-241.

84 A 2018 AD Note: In actuality the Scriptures are most in favor of the trichotomy of man, it is the Roman Catholic and orthodox theologians who favor a philosopher's dichotomy of man. This is more fully developed in our section on Anthropology.

it.

The disproof of this Christology lies in the historic life of Christ. The facts of a rational and moral life in the cast of the human are as manifest therein as the facts of a psychic life, as here distinguished from the rational and moral. The presence of a human mind in Christ is the necessary ground and the only rational account of these facts. They cannot be accounted for simply by the presence of the incarnate Logos. To assume this possibility would be to assume the compression of his divine attributes into the limits of the human, after the manner of the modern kenoticism. Then there could no longer be a divine incarnation. The humanization of the Logos in Christ contradicts the deepest truth of the incarnation, which lies in the divine consciousness of the human. If the divine is in any way changed into the human there can no longer be a divine consciousness of the human.

The reality of the divine incarnation is itself the disproof of the Apollinarian Christology. The assumption of a human nature without the rational mind could not be an incarnation in the nature of man. The mind is so much of man that without it there is no true human nature. Nor could the [pg51] self-incarnating Son, with such limitation of the nature assumed, so enter into the consciousness of experiences like our own as to be in all points tempted like as we are, and thus appropriate the deepest law of his sympathy with us. Our deepest trials and our deepest exigencies of experience lie in our rational and moral nature; therefore it was necessary that he should take this nature into personal union with himself. Only in this mode could he share the consciousness of such experiences and so appropriate the law of his profoundest sympathy with us.<sup>85</sup>

5. Nestorianism. The term Nestorianism is derived from the name of Nestorius, and means the doctrine of two persons in Christ. This doctrine was propagated early in the fifth century, and at one time very widely prevailed, particularly in the Eastern Church. Nestorius, whose name is so responsibly connected with the doctrine, was a presbyter of Antioch, and later Patriarch of Constantinople, and a man of eminence and moral worth. However, he was not the author of the Christological view so directly connected with his name. The true authorship was with Theodore of Mopsuestia, but his doctrine found able advocates in his former pupils. Nestorius and Theodoret, the latter, Bishop of Cyrus.

While it was a special aim of the Apollinarian doctrine to make sure of the oneness of the person of Christ, it was equally the aim

---

85 Neander : History of the Church, vol. iii, pp. 428-434; SchafliE: History of the Christian Church, vol. iii, 136.

of the Nestorian doctrine to make sure of the integrity of his two natures, particularly of his human nature. Each made an unnecessary sacrifice of vital truth in order to the attainment of its aim: the former, of the integrity of the human nature of Christ; the latter, of the unity of his personality in the union of the two natures. It is true that the dualism, such as we have named, claimed Christ to hold the personal oneness of Christ, or denied the dualism with which Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, and others charged them. Cyril was their chief opponent. Their doctrine of the union of the Logos with the human nature in Christ fell far short of the requirement of his personal oneness, and left the human in the mode of a distinct and complete human personality.<sup>86</sup> They called it an inhabitation ; and the general nature of the personal inhabitation, as distinct from that by which God dwells in all men, through his omnipresent essence and energy, they indicated by the [pg52] phrase 'by good pleasure' (εἰσὶν αὐτῷ); and this indwelling by good pleasure in Christ they further discriminated from God's indwelling in other good men, by representing it as attaining in him the highest possible degree. This indwelling of the Logos in Christ was also said to be according to foreknowledge, the Logos choosing the man Jesus to be in a peculiar sense his temple, because he knew beforehand what manner of man he should be.

Among other phrases current in the same school were such as these; union by conjunction; union by relation, as in the case of husband and wife; union in worth, honor, authority; union by consent of will; union by community of name, and so forth; for it were endless to enumerate the Nestorian tropes or modes of union.<sup>87</sup> ' No such union of the divine nature with the human assumed in the incarnation is here expressed, or even allowed, as will answer for the personal oneness of Christ. Therefore, while Nestorianism might repudiate the doctrine of two persons in Christ, it could not free itself from the implication of such a doctrine.

The disproof of Nestorianism lies in the proofs of the personal oneness of Christ in the union of the divine and human natures. These proofs were given in the treatment of that question; hence they need not here be repeated. Further, this doctrine, as the Apollinarian, and even more fully, is refuted by the reality of the divine incarnation. The great texts adduced in the treatment of that question mean, and must mean, that the divine Son took the nature

---

86 Plumptre : Christ and Christendom, Appendix H ; Hagenbach : History of Doctrines, § 99 ; Domer : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. i, vol. ii, pp. 351-398.

87 Hefele : History of Church Councils, book x, chap, ii ; Neander : History of the Church, vol. iii, pp. 504-511.

of man into a personal union with himself; so that of the two natures so united there is one Christ, very God-man. The Nestorian Christology must deny the reality of the divine incarnation, and, therefore, must be false to the Christology of the Scriptures.

6. Eutychianism. This error is coupled with the name of Eutyches, a monk without other distinction, unless we reckon to his account a notable lack of culture, an intense love of debate, and an extreme doggedness. He is not reckoned the author of this Christological error, though he may have contributed something toward its extreme form. His intense activity in the propagation of the doctrine seems to be the only reason for its bearing his name. [MILEY, ERRORS IN CHRISTOLOGY pg53]

Eutychianism is monophysitic as it respects the nature of Christ; that is, that as the incarnate Logos Christ possessed but one nature. This view was in direct contradiction to the Chalcedonian symbol, which so formally declared that in him there were two complete, unmixed, and unchanged natures, the human and the divine. Eutychianism admitted the reality of the divine incarnation, and the incipient duality of the natures, but denied that their distinction remained in Christ. Just when, and in what mode, the distinction ceased, and the two natures became one, are questions on which the doctrine was quite indefinite. Respecting the time, it was held that it might have been instant with the incarnation, or at the baptism of Christ, or after his resurrection. Nor was the theory less definite respecting the change in the natures whereby the two became one. Whether the divine was humanized, or the human deified, or the two so mixed and compounded as to constitute a nature neither human nor divine was not determined, though the stronger tendency was toward the view of the deification of the human nature. In this view Christ was wholly divine. The human nature was transmuted into the divine, or absorbed by the divine, as a drop of honey is absorbed by the ocean. Such an illustration was in frequent use for the expression of the change to which the human nature assumed in the incarnation was subject and the monophysitic result determined. Much is thus expressed.

The drop of honey absorbed by the ocean would no longer be a drop of honey; nor would it be distinguishable from the body of the ocean. Hence the frequent use of such an illustration fully justifies our statement, that the doctrine strongly tended to the view of a deification of the human nature in Christ.

It seems quite needless to subject such a doctrine to the tests of criticism. Unless this change is held to have occurred at least as late as the ascension of Christ, the doctrine is openly contradicted

by the daily facts of his life. We may as readily question his divinity as his humanity. His life is replete with facts so thoroughly in the cast of the human that he must have possessed a human nature; for otherwise these facts have no rational or possible account. Besides, if the human nature assumed by the divine was so transmuted or absorbed, the incarnation loses its own true, deep meaning and assumes a purely docetic form. Thus all grounds of the atonement and of the sympathy of Christ through a law of common suffering with us are utterly swept away.

It may suffice to add that such a transmutation of the human nature into the divine is an absolute impossibility. We mean by [pg54] this that it is not within the power of God. This must be manifest to any mind which takes the proposition into clear thought.<sup>88</sup>

## II. Later Errors.

A review of all the modern phases of Christological error would be tedious, and without compensatory result. It will suffice that we consider some of the leading forms of such error.

1. The Socinian Christology. Socinianism, as a system of theology, originated in the sixteenth century, and took its designation from Laelius Socinus, an Italian, but who spent most of his active life in Poland, because he there found more liberty in the propagation of his peculiar doctrinal views.

However, while the original of this system is with Laelius Socinus, his nephew, Faustus Socinus, born 1539, more fully developed and propagated it, and first formed the converts to this faith into a distinct religious body, so that he may properly be regarded as one of the founders of Socinianism.

We here need only the most summary statement of its doctrinal tenets. Mostly, the Scriptures were admitted to be of divine origin, but rather as containing than as being a divine revelation. A strong rationalistic principle was held as a law of biblical exegesis. It was in this mode that Socinianism provided for itself so much liberty of interpretation, that it might the easier wrest the Scriptures from the proof of the orthodox faith and maintain its own opposing views. With all this rationalism, the earlier Socinianism admitted the supernatural in Christianity, particularly in its Christology. It held the miraculous conception of Christ; that he was the subject of supernatural moral and spiritual endowments,

---

88 Schaff : History of the Christian Church, vol. iii, §§ 140-145, 1886 ; Hooker : Ecclesiastical Polity, book v, §§ 53-54 ; Dörner : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. i, pp. 79-119.

and that he was temporarily taken to heaven in order to a better preparation for his great work in the redemption of the world. As Socinianism denied the divinity of Christ, so it denied the doctrine of the Trinity. Its anthropology was Pelagian, and its soteriology admitted no other ground or power of human salvation than the moral influence of the life and lessons of Christ.

With these tenets of doctrine in hand, the Christology of the system is easily stated. With all the concession of supernatural facts, as previously stated, the Christ of Socinianism is a man, nothing more. True, he was declared to be more than man, but no sufficient ground was given, or even [pg55] admitted, for the truth of the declaration. No supernatural fact conceded, nor all combined, could raise him in his own nature or being above the plane of the human. No other ground is given for the assertion that he was more than man. In its Christology, therefore, Socinianism was substantially the same as the old Ebionism. In many instances of its later purely rationalistic or Unitarian forms it has degenerated from the higher views of Christ with which it began.

The Christology of Socinianism is utterly false to the Christology of the Scriptures. It denies the divinity of Christ; the reality of the divine incarnation; the union of the two natures in the personal oneness of Christ. All ground of the atonement is excluded from the system.<sup>89</sup>

2. The Lutheran Christologic. This error lies in the ascription of divine attributes, particularly of omnipresence, to the human nature of Christ. Only in an omnipresence or, at least, multipresence of his human nature could the Lutheran Christology answer to the doctrine of consubstantiation the doctrine of the presence and communion of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the supper. If in this supper the communicants really partake of the body and blood of Christ, then in some real sense, however obscure its mode, he must be present in his human nature, and, therefore, he must be present in many places at the same time. This is not denied by those who hold the doctrine of the real presence; indeed, it is affirmed.

It has often been said by divines who controvert the Christology of the Lutherans that its construction was determined to by the requirements of their doctrine of the real presence.

---

89 Dorner : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. ii, pp. 249-265 ;  
Cunningham : Historical Theology, chap. xxiii ; Owen : Works (Goold's), vol. xii.  
The utter falsity of this and all other forms of Christology grounded in the mere humanity of Christ is fully shown in discussions of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, to which reference was given under our own treatment of these questions.

Lutherans, however, deny this, and maintain that their doctrine of the person of Christ was constructed directly upon the ground of the Scriptures, and in the proper interpretation of their Christological facts; yet it is admitted that the one doctrine confirms the other and sets it in a clearer light. Thus, Dr. Gerhart having maintained that the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ was developed from the Lutheran theory of the sacrament,<sup>90</sup> Dr. Krauth replies: 'If Dr. Gerhart means no [pg56] more than that God in his providence made the discussions in regard to the Lord's Supper the means of bringing more fully and harmoniously into a well-defined consciousness and into clearer expression the doctrine of the Scriptures in regard to the person of Christ, we do not object to it; but if he means that the doctrine of our Church on the person of Christ originated in the necessity of defending her doctrine in regard to the Lord's Supper, we think he is wholly mistaken. The doctrine of our Church rests upon the direct testimony of God's word; and her interpretation of the meaning of that word is not one of her own devising, but had been given ages before her great distinctive confession, by the fathers and councils of the pure Church.'<sup>91</sup>

Theologians of any distinct Christian communion have the right of stating their own case on any such issue ; but have no final authority. That the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ was the doctrine of the early fathers and councils is rejected as groundless. Further, it is in the truth of doctrinal history that the Christology of the Lutheran Church has ever been associated with her doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the supper, and that mostly the former has been treated as secondary or subordinate to the latter.

It is true that Dorner concedes to Luther a construction of his Christology independently of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but he also says this: "During the sixteenth century it was the doctrine of the supper that gave its direction and character to the concrete development of Christology."<sup>92</sup> The Lutheran doctrine is greatly lacking in clearness. Nor is this to be thought strange, especially in view of its peculiar tenets.

Further, Lutherans have differed widely among themselves, and in fact greatly blurs the clear apprehension of the doctrine. The contentions on this question within the Lutheran Church were quite equal to those which she maintained with Papists, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. There were two schools of special prominence in these

---

90 Bibliotheca Sacra, 1863.

91 ' The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, p. 502.

92 Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. ii, p. 301.



interior doctrinal issues: one in the following of Brentz; the other in the following of Chemnitz.

There were other schools, each with its own doctrine, and for which it contended against all opposing views. Among the contending parties there were real differences of doctrine. These contentions were fruitful of much evil. This came to be so clearly seen and deeply felt as to awaken an intense desire for peace and a harmony of doctrinal views. The attainment of these ends was [pg57] earnestly attempted. The Formula of Concord was the product of this endeavor. The aim was good, but the result brought little satisfaction. The desiderated concord was not attained. Divisions were rather increased than diminished. There was still a Brentzian doctrine, and still a Chemnitzian doctrine. Others were added, notably a Niessen doctrine, and a Tilbingen doctrine. There were others, but enough have been named to show the persistence and prevalence of the strife. These facts of division and disputation not only hinder the clear apprehension of the Lutheran Christology, but clearly point to peculiar difficulties of the doctrine, and really disprove it.

Where shall we find the doctrine? Naturally, we turn first to the Augsburg Confession; but it is not given in the looking for article which directly concerns this question.' In the the doctrine article on the Lord's Supper some facts are given which, if true in themselves, must be determinative of some vital elements of the doctrine.<sup>93</sup> We note specially the alleged facts that the body and blood of Christ are truly present with the bread and wine, and are communicated to those who partake of the supper. But the determination of the doctrine of the person of Christ from the contents of this article would subordinate it to the doctrine of the supper in a manner to which Lutheran divines strongly object.

The Formula of Concord, while giving a later formulation of the doctrine, and the latest with any claim to authority, formula of still leaves us in uncertainty, and for two reasons: one, concord. that this statement was a compromise among opposing parties; the other, that it has not been held in any unity of faith. Yet we know not any better source to which we may look for the Lutheran doctrine.

Much of the article on the person of Christ is in full accord with the Chalcedonian symbol, but it contains elements article which are peculiar to the Lutheran doctrine.<sup>94</sup> These eight. appear in the ascription of divine attributes to the human nature of Christ. It is not meant that the human nature is deified in any Eutychian sense, but that by virtue of the union of the two natures in Christ the human

---

93 Article iii. \* Article x. ' Article viii.

94 Krauth : The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, p. 479.

possesses the attributes of the divine. This is the sense of the communication turn, the communion of the attributes of the two natures in Christ. It seems obvious that, if the union is such that the human should possess the attributes of the divine, then, conversely, the divine should possess the attributes of the human. This, however, is denied. Omniscience, omnipotence, and ubiquity are the divine attributes which are more specially ascribed to the human nature of Christ. "Therefore now not only as God, but also as man, he [pg58] knows all things, can do all things, is present to all creatures, has under his feet and in his hand all things which are in heaven, in the earth, and under the earth." These facts are central to the Christology of the article, and other facts affirmed are in full accord with them. "What the divine has in its essence and of itself, the human has and exercises through the divine, in consequence of its personal union with it. We might imitate one of our Lord's own deep expressions in characterizing it, and might suppose him to say: "As my divine nature hath omnipresence in itself, so hath it given to my human nature to have omnipresence in itself."<sup>95</sup> If the union of the two natures is valid ground for the omnipresence of the human, the same union must be equally valid for its omniscience and omnipotence.

The statement of such a doctrine seems entirely sufficient for its refutation. The human nature assumed by the Logos in the incarnation remained human, with the attributes of the human. In itself it possessed the capacity for only such knowledge, power, and presence as are possible to the human.

How then could it become omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent? The answer is, through the divine nature with which it was united. But if this union answers for such results, either it must give to the finite attributes of the human nature the plenitude of the infinite, or invest that nature with the attributes of the infinite. Attributes of knowledge, power, and presence, such as we here contemplate, are concrete realities of being, not mere notions or names. There can be neither knowledge, nor power, nor presence without the appropriate attribute of being. The being must answer for the character of the attribute, and the attribute must answer for all that is affirmed of it. Only a mind possessing the power of absolute knowing can be omniscient. Omnipotence must have its ground in a will of absolute power. Omnipresence, such as the Lutheran Christology affirms of the human nature of Christ, is possible only with an infinite extension of being. Hence, either the finite attributes of the human nature assumed by the Logos must

---

95 Dörmann : *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. ii, vol. ii, pp. 53-115 ; 266-315 ; Schmid : *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Å§ 55.

be lifted into the infinitude of the divine attributes, or the divine attributes must be invested in the human nature, which is intrinsically finite, and which in itself, even as the Lutheran Christology concedes, must ever remain finite.

It is at this point that the doctrine encounters insuperable difficulties, even absolute impossibilities. There is no possibility that the human nature of Christ should possess the attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence [pg59] which the Lutheran Christology ascribes to it. It is properly regarded as an axiom that the finite has not a capacity for the infinite. The principle is absolutely true in application to the points which we here make. The finite attributes of the human nature can neither be enlarged to the infinitude of the divine attributes nor receive into themselves the plenitude of the divine. Neither can the finite nature of man receive the investment of these divine attributes. But there can be no omniscience without the attribute of absolute knowing; no omnipotence without a will of absolute power; no omnipresence of being without an infinite extension. Here are the impossibilities which the Lutheran Christology encounters in the ascription of such attributes to the human nature of Christ,'

3. The Kenotic Christology. The seed-thought of kenoticism in Christology is credited to Zinzendorf, but it remained fruitless for a long time after he cast it forth. In later years his thought has been developed into doctrinal form. Indeed, there are several forms of this development. Professor Bruce has carefully noted four leading types of the doctrine, as severally represented by Thomasius, Gess, Ebrard, and Martensen.<sup>96</sup> With this classification he proceeds to a careful statement and critical review of each type.<sup>97</sup> A study of this discussion is helpful toward a clear insight into the kenotic Christology. We, however, are mainly concerned with the deeper tenets of the doctrine.

Kenoticism is the doctrine that in the incarnation the Logos emptied himself of his divine attributes, or compressed them into the measure and cast of the human; that he parted with his omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence, and subjected himself to the limitations of a merely human life. These are the central ideas of the doctrine, though not all kenoticists hold so extreme a view.

Whether in the incarnation the Logos assumed a human soul as well as a body, or whether in his own humanized form he fulfilled

---

96 Gerhart : *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1863 ; Krauth : *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology*, article x.

97 Bruce : *The Humiliation of Christ*, lect. iv.

the functions of a human soul in Christ, is a question on which kenoticists are not agreed. The admission of a distinct human soul must mean, for this doctrine, the co-existence of two souls in Christ, two not different in their human cast. In this case there could be no personal oneness of [pg60] Christ. On the other hand, the denial of a distinct human soul must mean a denial of the divine incarnation. The reality of such an incarnation cannot lie in the assumption of a mere body of flesh and blood. Certainly such a limitation could not answer to the sense of the Scriptures respecting this profound truth.

This kenoticism has really no ground in Scripture, though it assumes such ground. The proofs which it brings are proofs, because it is only by an unwarranted interpretation of the texts adduced that they can give any support to the theory. We give a few instances. "And the Word was made flesh." ' This cannot mean any transmutation of the divine Logos into a body of human flesh. Much less can it mean a transformation of the Logos into a man, for this is much farther away from a literal sense than the former. The meaning is simply that in the incarnation the Logos invested himself in a human nature, of which a body of flesh is the visible part. This interpretation places the text in complete accord with other texts of the incarnation. Here are other instances: "God was manifest in the flesh."<sup>98</sup> Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." ' These texts give the same doctrine of the incarnation, but without any suggestion of the transformation of the Son into a man. That the Logos was made flesh can mean nothing more than these texts.

The special reliance of the theory is on a passage from St. Paul: 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.' We have cited the Revised Version, it being more literal than the Authorized. We gave the meaning of this text in the treatment of the incarnation, and therefore require the less in considering its application to the present question.

"Being in the form of God" must mean an existence of the, in the nature of God or in the glory of God. If the former be the true sense, then, on the ground of his divine nature, an equality of glory with the Father was his rightful possession. If the latter be the true sense, then we have simply the fact that the Son rightfully existed in the full glory of God. It should be specially noted that this estate of glory was not his merely in right, but his in actual possession.

---

98 ' John i, 14. ' 1 Tim. iii, 16. ' Heb. ii, 14. \* Phil, ii, 6, 7.

This meaning is in the words, "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself." This accords with another text: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with [pg61] the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Here the clear meaning is that the Son actually existed in the glory of the Father prior to his incarnation. Such is the sense of the great text now under special consideration.

What, then, is the truth of the kenosis in this case? The Son emptied himself. But of what? Surely not of his divine nature, nor of his divine perfections, which are inseparable from his nature. Nor can this act of kenosis mean the compression of his perfections into the cast and measure of mere human powers. Such an idea seems utterly foreign to any idea which the terms of the text either express or imply.

This act of kenosis has respect to that estate of glory which, on the ground of his divine nature, the Son rightfully possessed in equality with the Father. It means a self-emptying or self-divestment of that glory. This accords with his own words as previously cited: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."<sup>99</sup> That glory he once possessed, but had surrendered. The surrender was by the act of kenosis which we have in the text under special consideration. This interpretation brings all the parts of the text into complete harmony. The form of a servant in the likeness of men, which the Son assumed in the incarnation, stands in clear antithesis, not with his divine nature and perfections, but with the estate of glory which he possessed with the Father; which glory he might have rightfully retained, but with which he freely parted, and took instead the form of a servant in the likeness of men. The text gives no support to the kenotic Christology.

The aim of kenoticism is twofold: to secure the unity of the person of Christ, and to provide for the human facts of aim of kenosis his life. The self-limitation of the Son in the incarnation to a mere human cast and measure is held to be necessary to the personal oneness of Christ, and to the reality of the human facts of his intramundane or historic life. The personal oneness is declared to be impossible on the ground of the traditional doctrine of the divine incarnation. It is readily conceded that this personal oneness is incomprehensible; but surely the the mystery is not solved nor in the least relieved by the theory of a humanized Logos as co-existent with a human soul in Christ. A duality of persons seems absolutely inseparable from such a co-existence; and this attempt to secure and explain the personal oneness of Christ is utterly

---

99 John xvii, 5.

futile. Further : if, as we formerly pointed out, the deepest truth of the incarnation lies in [pg62] the divine consciousness of the human, may not this question of personal oneness have for us less pressing concern than we usually concede it? All that we require is such a relation of the divine to the human in Christ as will provide for this consciousness. And may there not be such a relation without the rigid unity of personality which is usually maintained ? Let it be observed, however, that, in this hypothetical putting of the case, we do not yield the doctrine of the personal oneness of Christ. But on the ground of this kenoticism there could be no divine consciousness of the human in the incarnation, because the humanized Logos could no longer have any divine consciousness.

The implications of this doctrine of the kenosis in Christology are contrary to the deepest truths of Christian theology. If the Son of God could part with his divine attributes himself, then divinity itself must be mutable. This consequence can be denied only on a denial of the divinity of the Son. But his divinity is conceded in the very idea of his self-divestment of his divine attributes. The theory is subversive of the divine Trinity. The humanized Son, self-emptied of his divine attributes, could no longer be a divine subsistence in the Trinity. Hence this kenosis of the Son must mean the destruction of the Trinity. The theory is not less subversive of other fundamental truths of Christian theology. No ground of an atonement in the blood of Christ could remain. That the Son once existed in the divine Trinity, and in the plenitude of the divine life, could avail nothing for such an atonement. If self-reduced to the measure of a man, his death could be no more saving than the death of a man. No ground of the sympathy of Christ could remain, as that sympathy is revealed in the Scriptures, and as it must be in order to meet the exigencies of Christian experience. Such a sympathy we have found to be possible only through the divine consciousness of human experiences of suffering and trial. But there can be no such consciousness in the mere human consciousness to which this kenoticism limits the incarnate Logos. A theory with such implications can have no ground of truth in the Scriptures.<sup>100 101</sup>

---

100 Bruce : *The Humiliation of Christ* ; Pope : *The Person of Christ*, note viii ; Goodwin : *Christ and Humanity* ; Martensen : *Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 237-288 ; Crosby : *The True Humanity of Christ* ; Hodge : *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii, pp. 430-440 ; Gess : *Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ*. Translation and additions by Reubelt. This work and Bruce's *Humiliation of Christ* are specially useful in the study of this question.

101 John Miley, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1 & 2*, The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, New York: Eaton and Mains, 1894, The Internet Archive

Other than this thorough treatment of errors, the nineteenth century Methodist scholar John Miley follows the same development of Christology as Cambron does. Other than the coverage of the leading errors of his day there is little value added by his coverage. He does, however, dismiss the *kenotic* view of Christ's incarnation, a view that fits the Scriptures better than any classic or orthodox view, for three reasons 1) it is not the orthodox view, 2) it does not fit with the orthodox view, and 3) it is destructive to the orthodox view. Since I previously promoted this view as the best fit to Scripture, let's briefly examine his oppositions.

### *Answering Miley – Kenosis Does Harmonize Scripture*

Openly examine some points of contention that John Miley has toward the *Kenotic* view of Christ's incarnation. Roman Catholicism, and consequently all Protestants are confused about the soul, and Methodist Miley is first confused that Christ, in a *Kenosis* position, might end up with two souls in co-existence. This confusion comes because orthodox theologians hold that the human is a dichotomy with only a material side and an immaterial side. That is what the learned philosophers had told them. The soul, they suppose, is something that God adds to this mix at some time during human development. The Bible student knows that man is formed with body, soul, and spirit united together in one. The Bible and its student pays little attention to exactly when and how the soul gets added; that is only important to Roman Catholic theologians who think themselves in complete control of souls of men. This orthodox insistence of discerning how two natures coexisted in Christ, and what part the soul played completely muddies the water when examining Scripture.

The Bible student knows that death is the separation of body, soul, and spirit, i.e. Christ commended his spirit into the hands of the Father (Luke 23:46), while his soul went to hell (Ps 16:10, Acts 2:31), and his body hung on a cross until it was taken to the tomb (Matt 27:60). (This separation is death, Christ's death occurred on Thursday, and he

remained dead on Thursday, on Friday, the high Sabbath, and on Saturday the weekly Sabbath. That is three days in a Bible students count, despite the Roman Catholic misinformation.) This understanding of body, soul and spirit, squelches all the orthodox misunderstandings about the union of a human soul with a divine being. When engineers got lost in minutia of design details the USAF pilot attendant in our meetings used to say “Pull up! Pull up! Your in the weeds!” Such an analogy is appropriate in the orthodox theologian's consideration of how two natures molded themselves together.

When Christ humbled himself, took on the form of a servant and was made in the image of men, he took on the body, soul, and spirit that man is made of. God is a trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit; man made in his image and likeness is a trichotomy, body, soul and spirit. This need not confuse the Bible student who believes first, and rationalizes second, but it does produce great confusion for the orthodox theologians who reject the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired testimony of God and first embrace the testimony of scholar, philosopher and theologian.

Once John Miley is certain that the *Kenotic* view is unorthodox, and unable to resolve issues about where the soul of Christ comes from, he dismisses it as “only an unwarranted interpretation of the texts adduced that they(*kenoticites*) can give any support to the theory.” Like other theologians of his day Miley considers theology a science wherein one stacks up all the facts, devises a hypothesis, refines a theory then debates until he has established the truth. Theology is nothing like that! It is not a science and cannot use the scientific method popularized and declared omniscient in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. A true Bible theologian stacks up all the revealed facts, declares them to be inerrant, infallible, and verbally inspired truth and only debates about the rational understanding that finite minds might use for comprehending those facts. Truth is not out their waiting for discovery, it is declared by ... The Truth, i.e. John 14:6, “Jesus saith unto him (Thomas), I am the way, (I am) the TRUTH and (I am) the life; no man (theologian, philosopher, or scholar) cometh unto the Father, but by me.” This is an important distinction missed by generations of theologians, theology is not a science and cannot follow



the normal scientific methods.

The Bible says the Word was made flesh, that Christ was made a little lower than the angels, that he made himself of no reputation, took on the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Miley contends “this cannot mean any transmutation of the divine” nor can it mean “a transformation into man,” it must only mean that Christ “invested himself in a human nature, of which a body of flesh is the visible part.” Orthodox theologians, and now John Miley, tiptoe around these verses because they cannot conceive that Christ was made in the likeness of men and that likeness has body, soul, and spirit. Their man made cliché that “Jesus was as much God as if he were not man, and as much man as if he were not God,” does not have the fidelity to tell what Christ did and has them, and many others, in a tailspin, not able to believe all that the Scripture is saying. When Christ humbled himself, and was made in the likeness of men, the infinite took on some level of finiteness, the eternal God was born into a merely everlasting body, and it is conceivable and adequate for understanding these Scriptures that for thirty-three years he set aside his omnipresence, his omnipotence, and his omniscience. John Miley says no, such an “interpretation” of these Scriptures is not orthodox and produces a two soul scenario. Go figure.

In exploring with his pen Miley does state that “This interpretation (*Kenosis*) brings all the parts of the text into complete harmony.” But alas, he rejects it because “A humanized soul in Christ cannot solve the mystery of the personal oneness of deity and humanity united.”<sup>102</sup> In other words *Kenosis* can bring all the Scriptures into harmony, but it cannot bring all the consternation of orthodox hypothesis and theory into harmony. As Miley wades out into the consternation of hypothesis and theory, the Bible student need only concern themselves with what brings all the inerrant Scriptures into harmony. The understanding that Christ temporarily set aside omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience, while retaining all the other attributes of his deity, and was made in the likeness of men does indeed bring all the Scriptures into harmony.

---

102John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 1894, pg 62

## Critique of Charles Hodge's 1878 Presbyterian Christology

Charles Hodge wrote no Christology section in his *Systematic Theology*.<sup>103</sup> A brief introduction of Charles Hodge, taken from Christian Classics Ethereal Library, where his public domain works are available, is included below:

Charles Hodge (December 27, 1797, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania – June 19, 1878, Princeton, New Jersey) was the principal of Princeton Theological Seminary between 1851 and 1878. A Presbyterian theologian, he was a leading exponent of historical Calvinism in America during the 19th century. He was deeply rooted in the Scottish philosophy of Common Sense Realism. He argued strongly that the authority of the Bible as the Word of God had to be understood literally.<sup>104</sup>

Charles Hodge, called the Father of printed systematic theology, only addresses a Christology as it is presented in its essential features under other topics of his systematic theology. Even then he presents his Christology as the predicates which the Church gives to Christ, rather than the predicates which the Holy Bible gives to Christ. Further, when he does address what the Bible says about Christ he speaks of what the Old Testament states, what the Gospels state, or what the Doctrine of Paul states in the Pastoral Epistles. Although Hodge is a learned Princeton graduate with a very scholarly manner, and is a very gifted communicator, his systematic theology is first and foremost laden with Presbyterian doctrine. He presents reformed theology well. Remember that for a Catholic or Protestant theologian a systematic theology book is important because there are so many loose ends of their religion that need to be tied up. For a Bible believer, holding to the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Holy Scriptures as their final authority, the Holy Bible is their Systematic Theology book, and

---

103Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology: Volume I-IV*. Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, Hardback- Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940.

104Christian Classics Ethereal Library <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/hodge> (Accessed 29 Sep. 2014).

this one, built on that premise, has only to unravel and expose those previously bound up loose ends. Ergo there is little value added in the review of Hodge's Christology.

### **Critique of Augustus Strong's 1907 "Baptist" Christology**

Much needs to be said about Christ. Saying much, in Greek, is pronounced "*ology*." Augustus H. Strong, 1836-1921, was a Yale graduate who taught theology at Rochester Theological Seminary for forty years and became the first president of the Northern Baptist Convention. His systematic theology has a tremendous depth and scope but his motivation and purpose must cause grave concern. Strong sets out to mold a traditional reformed emphasis and an atheistic evolutionary critical scholarship into the distinctive Baptist conviction. In his Christology, this dangerous blend caused A. H. Strong to follow Charles Hodge's lead and submerge his Christology as a by line of his Soteriology.

Even there, Strong begins his discourse on Christ with an emphasis making our Lord and Saviour little more than yet another decree of God. His opening paragraph states:

Since God did from eternity determine to redeem mankind, the history of the race from the time of the Fall to the coming of Christ was providentially arranged to prepare the way for his redemption. The preparation was two fold: I. Negative Preparation, in the history of the heathen world, and II. Positive Preparation, in the history of Israel.<sup>105</sup>

Strong's dogmatic belief in reformed theology, and their decrees of God, not only robs him of a passion in Christology, it prevents him from seeing God in all his glory. It overshadows the fact that God is capable of being a friend of man. Reformed, Presbyterian, and Calvinistic theology has God's sovereignty, God's decrees, and God's unfolding of events exactly as he knew from eternity past, held in such an overbearing consideration, that they cannot see the whole truth of

---

105A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology, Three Volumes in One*, Judson Press, 1907, 665.

Scripture. Baptists are first and foremost people of the Book. It is distressing that A. H. Strong sacrifices solid Baptist distinctives, on the altar of John Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion.

Once indoctrinated with reformed theology's notion that the catholic church is the new chosen people of God, elect in the foreknowledge of God, elect before the foundation of the world,... little else can penetrate that dogma. It feeds their Replacement Theology and nurtures their Covenant Theology, and here, not even the centerpiece of all Scripture, Christ in Christology, can bump their dogma. Their decrees must remain in its preeminent position, even above Christ himself.

Augustus H. Strong is a worthy student of theology but when reading his extensive systematic theology one must always keep in mind his objective. Strong's overriding purpose is to blend together reformed theology, Baptist distinctives, and the atheistic evolutionary process of creation. Abram was a friend of God forever.<sup>106</sup> The second lesson that Abram learned about God, was God does not need blenders he desires separators<sup>107</sup>. Strong is genius, but he is a blender that takes doctrines, blends them and tries to reconstruct a persuasive Bible doctrine. Although he is a deep thinker, and a profound communicator, or perhaps because of that, he is dangerous.

Strong's Christology is developed extensively.<sup>108</sup> It is embedded in his Soteriology in Part IV of his second volume. It is unfortunate that early systematic theology works kept theology divorced from Bible doctrine. That divorce procedure is evident in Strong's presentation of Christology. He begins by wedging it between the decrees of God, as if Christology were only another thing that God had decreed from eternity past. Concerning the person of Christ, Strong opens with the paragraph:

The redemption of mankind from sin was to be effected through a Mediator who should unite in himself to both the human nature and the divine, in order that he might reconcile God to man and man to God. To facilitate

---

1062Chron 20:7, Isa 41:8, James 2:23

107A cliché from the preaching of Lester Roloff.

108Ibid., 665-796.

an understanding of the Scriptural Doctrine under consideration, it will be desirable at the outset to present a brief historical survey of views respecting the Person of Christ.<sup>109</sup>

The study of theology should be systematic. The sole source of theology should be the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God. So any systematic method should start with that source as its foundation. Augustus H. Strong does not. His opening paragraph on the person of Christ gives a very practical function of the Christ and then delves into a historical survey of the doctrine. His Bible is not open. The seventh and last of his referenced historical doctrines is, "The Orthodox doctrine promulgated at Chalcedon, in A.D. 451." With no other development from Scripture, and his Bible still closed, A. H. Strong uses this "Orthodox" position as the doctrine of the Person of Christ and goes on to expand that Roman Catholic Orthodox position, which expounds the two natures of Christ. In a development of theology, that is certainly "systematic error." A. H. Strong's primary source of truth is not the Holy Bible, it is a Roman Catholic Synod!

The Council of Chacedon in 451 A.D., which A. H. Strong cites as his source of orthodox truth, convened 600 bishops under the auspicious of Pope Leo I<sup>110</sup>. It passed the "Definition of Faith" at the council's fifth session. In the sixth session the Pope and Emperor concurred, and the formula that Christ is one in two natures was "promulgated" solemnly. (Notice here that the pope and Augustus Strong, use the exact same word!) This counsel was transferred from Nicaea to Chalcedon so as to be close to Constantinople, and the Emperor Marcian. This "Definition of Faith" has a revealing first paragraph as follows:

The sacred and great universal synod by God's grace  
and by decree of your most religious and Christ-loving

---

109Ibid. 669

110From the Papal Encyclicals, [www.papalencyclicals.net](http://www.papalencyclicals.net) accessed Aug 2014 The decree, incidently, has a Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease of 1.7% and an Average Grade Level for readers of 22.4 grade (that is 12<sup>th</sup> grade plus 11 years of college!).

Emperors Valentinian Augustus and Marcian Augustus, assembled in Chalcedon, metropolis of the province of Bithynia, in the shrines of the saintly and triumphant martyr Euphemia, issues the following decrees.<sup>111</sup>

The Roman Catholic Religion's orthodoxy continues with more audacious claims of authority, and none of them are Scripture. It also continues with a detailed definition of their faith which is not referenced to any Scripture. They then "promulgate" the Roman Catholic Religion with twenty seven additional audacious disciplinary canons. The first of which states "We have deemed it right that the canons hitherto issued by the saintly fathers at each and every synod should remain in force."<sup>112</sup>

It is no small thing that A. H. Strong begins his Christology using Roman Catholic Canons as his defining authority. He does add foot notes that point to some shortfalls of these Roman Catholic doctrines, and he does develop their good points with the Holy Bible. But systematic development of theology needs a solid starting point in the Bible doctrine not in Roman Catholic doctrine.

A. H. Strong writes a scholarly Christology which may be effectively used to augment this work with an in-depth perspective. His two systematic flaws are: 1) his motive to blend reformed theology and atheistic evolution into Baptist distinctives, and 2) his failure to use the inerrant, infallible Word of God as a sole source for his theology, or even as his primary source of theology. These two systematic flaws are so flagrant that Strong's Systematic Theology can not be recommended as a complete work. However, his extensive and scholarly coverage of Christology provides a depth to ones studies that can be of benefit.

Strong's Christology does contain a thorough analysis of the two natures of Christ, their reality and integrity. After analyzing the humanity of Christ, and the deity of Christ, he carefully expounds on the union of the two natures in one person. (pg. 673, 681, 683) He explores the Scriptures that give the proof of this union. He discusses

111 [www.papalencyclicals.net/Councils/ecum04.htm#Definitiooffaith](http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Councils/ecum04.htm#Definitiooffaith) accessed Aug 2014

112 [ibid. /ecum04.htm#Canons](http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Councils/ecum04.htm#Canons)

the modern misrepresentations of this union, giving; A) the theory of incomplete humanity, to which he urges several objections, and B) the theory of gradual incarnation, found objectionable for his documented reasons.

A depth in Strong's coverage is next found in his treatment of the real nature of this union (pg. 691-700) With extensive foot notes he examines: (a) the great importance of this union, (b) the chief problems of this union (being only one personality with pre-incarnate, incarnate and post? incarnate considerations), (c) the reason for mystery in this inscrutable union, (d) the grounding of the possibility of the union in the original creation of man, (e) the possession of the two natures does not involve a double personality, (f) the effect upon the human nature, wherein the divine nature, with its power to be, to know, and to do as God, is imparted to the human nature without passing over into its essence, (g) the effect upon the divine nature wherein the human nature, with its ignorance, weakness, temptation, suffering, and death, is imparted on the divine nature without passing over into its essence, (h) the necessity of the union in order to constitute Jesus-Christ a proper mediator between God and man, (i) the union of humanity with deity in the person of Christ is indissoluble and eternal, and, (j) the infinite and the finite are no longer mutually exclusive.

Considering this kind of depth in the miracle of the incarnation is what extends a Bible doctrine of Christology into a systematic theology of Christology. A. H. Strong is a master at corralling all the considerations for an 'ology', on a subject. When guarding against his two systematic errors, it is always a joy to explore the great depth in his discourse.

### **Critique of Thiessen's 1949 “Baptist” Christology**

Henry Clarence Thiessen (19\_\_-1947) taught his "Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology" which were published in 1949. Little is written about Thiessen's background. John MacArthur's Master's College history annals records him as the fourth president of the Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary. It was after Thiessen's death in 1947 that that seminary matriculated into the neo-evangelical Master's College under John MacArthur, but the seeds of that

matriculation are evident in Thiessen's lectures.

The genius and integrity of Henry Clarence Thiessen needs to be unequivocally affirmed here with a rehearsal of the old truth, "It takes no size to criticize." Thiessen's theology lectures have steered hundreds into the straight and narrow path of truth. When up to your neck in alligators it is easy to lose sight of the goal of draining the swamp. Dr. Thiessen and many other sound independent fundamental Baptists did not see how extensive was the diabolical attack against God's Word, nor how Satan would use the multiplicity of copyright translations to his full advantage. Little compromises, viewed in hindsight, open large fissures that allow the adversary to gain strategic footholds. Here we exercise some of that hindsight.

Three systematic errors of Thiessen must be held in background while critiquing his Christology. First, he did not use the Holy Bible as his sole or even primary source of theology. In fact Thiessen even denies the existence of an inspired, inerrant, infallible Holy Bible. He solidifies his errant doctrine thus: "Inspiration is affirmed only of the autographs of the Scriptures, not of any of the versions, whether ancient or modern, nor any of the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, nor of any critical texts known. All these are either known to be faulty in some particulars, or are not certainly known to be free from all error."<sup>113</sup>

Thiessen continues in this misguided ruse to express his faith in ecumenical critics and their bibles, supposing they may eventually restore some approximate similitude of the very words which God failed to preserve for our present generation. Like all neo-evangelicals Thiessen makes a pretense that although God failed to accurately preserve his very words "textual critics tell us that the number of words that are still in doubt, whether in the Old Testament or in the New, is very small, and that no doctrine is affected by this situation."<sup>114</sup> (Those who say that never consider the doctrine of inspiration, the doctrine of inerrancy, the doctrine of infallibility, nor the doctrine of preservation, which are directly and blatantly attacked by Satan's modernist ecumenical textual critics, Bible critics, and translators.)

---

113 Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949, 107.

114 *Ibid.*, 107



Every lecture of Henry Clarence Thiessen is effected by his steadfast belief in this "situation." Ergo he does not use the Holy Scriptures as his sole source or even his primary source of theology. By his own testimony the Bible he holds in his hands is not the inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God. Everything in his 574 pages of published Systematic Theology must be weighed because of this systematic shortfall of Dr. Thiessen.

A reformed theologian is always a reformed Augustinian theologian. Augustinian's philosophy, which constructed the Roman Catholic Church, is what the reformers were reforming, and Thiessen was more reformer than Baptist. Roman Catholic Saint Augustine framed the doctrine that God has decreed and knows for certain everything, to the minutest detail, that ever is to happen in the universe. That is Augustinian doctrine, not Bible doctrine. Any theologian who makes the concerted effort of rationalizing Roman Catholic Saint Augustine's doctrine of decrees into some rendition of a Bible doctrine is a reformer of theologian and thus properly labeled a defender of reformed theology.

In force fitting Augustinian doctrine into his theology Thiessen makes this audacious declaration:

Some hold that prayer can have no real effect upon God, since he has already decreed just what He will do in every instance. But that is an extreme position. 'Ye have not, because ye ask not' (Jas. 4:2) must not be left out of account. The facts seem to be this, that God does some things only in answer to prayer; He does some other things without one's praying; and He does some things contrary to the prayers made. In His foreknowledge, again, He has taken all these things into account, and in His providence He works them out in accordance with His own purpose and plan. If we do not pray for the things that we might get by prayer, we do not get them. If He wants some things done for which no one prays, He will do them without anyone's praying. If we pray for things contrary to His will, He refuses to grant them. Thus there is perfect harmony between the foreknowledge, decrees, and

providence of God.<sup>115</sup>

There is no harmony between the Augustinian doctrine of decrees and the revelation of God in his Holy Word. No matter how much verbiage a theologian uses to rationalize the two revelations, Augustine's doctrines do not fit into God's doctrine. Those who repeatedly try to reconcile Augustinian doctrines into God's Word are reform theologians attempting to reform what should have been discarded long ago.

Thiessen's third systematic flaw is directly connected to the first two, but is so illuminating that it is included here as a separate entity. The inerrant, infallible, inspired Word of God is clear and emphatic that man is made in the image and likeness of God, that God is a triune being, and that man is a trichotomy, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Henry Clarence Thiessen declares that man is only material and immaterial, a dichotomy, just like the ancient Greek philosophers said. The Roman Catholic Church adopted this dichotomy of man as their doctrine. In order to hold on to this Roman Catholic dogma, Dr. Thiessen not only rejects the Scriptures that reference body, soul, and spirit as separate entities<sup>116</sup>, he attributes 1Thes 5:23<sup>117</sup> as nothing more than what Paul "seems to think."<sup>118</sup> Dr. Thiessen has already denied the inerrancy, infallibility, and inspiration of the bible he holds in his hands, he defends Roman Catholic and Reformed Roman Catholic doctrines of decrees, and now, in defense of a Roman Catholic dogma he calls Holy Scripture just a matter of Paul's opinion. These three systematic flaws in Dr. Thiessen's lectures make the work, on a whole, very suspect and not reliable for use as a systematic theology. His Christology suffers with these flaws.

---

115Ibid., "The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule", closing paragraph, 187-188.

1161Sa 1:15, Job 7:11, Isa 10:18, 26:9, 42:1, 51:23, Da 7:25, Mic 6:7, Mt 10:28, 12:18, 1Co 5:3 6:20, 7:34, 15:45, Eph 4:4, 1Th 5:23, Heb 4:12, Jas 2:26

1171Thes 5:23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

118Ibid., "The Trichotomous theory", 227

### *Thiessen's Christology*

Like Baptist theologian, A. H. Strong before him, Baptist theologian Thiessen starts his Christology with a historical survey of the many views about the person of Christ. Likewise, the orthodox view he settles on hangs on the Roman Catholic Chalcedon Canon of 451 AD, and not on Holy Scripture.

Thiessen speaks of the Pre-Incarnate Christ but only to bolster his support of the Reformed position on election. Dr. Chafer, in contrast, presents a whole informative section on the pre-incarnate Christ. Thiessen, lamely concludes his section: “We know very little of Christ's work during this period, only that the Father through Him framed the ages (Heb 1:2, A.S.V.<sup>119</sup> marg.) and that He chose the believers in Him before the foundation of the world (Eph 1:4).<sup>120</sup>

When a theologian is entangled in the error of reformed theology wherein God decrees who gets saved and who burns in hell, that error permeates every area of his theology. Here it even mars Thiessen's discourse on Christology.

### *Thiessen's Little Value Added*

Thiessen's *Lectures in Systematic Theology* adds nothing to a discourse on Christology. His commentary rehearses A. H. Strong's discourse but does not attain the depth of Strong. His rejection and denial of God's preservation of inerrancy, infallibility, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures make his writings a liability more than an asset. One need not read more of Thiessen's lectures on Christology.

---

119ASV is the registered trademark of Thomas Nelson & Sons and symbolizes the bible which was copyrighted and published by Thomas Nelson & Sons in 1901. In 1928, the International Council of Religious Education (the body that later merged with the Federal Council of Churches to form the National Council of Churches) acquired the copyright from Nelson and copyrighted the ASV in 1929. Even quoting Thiessen, this author cannot recommend or condone the use of any of the modernist ecumenical copyright bibles, all of which brazenly disregard the inerrancy and infallibility of the verbally inspired Holy Bible by utilizing the Westcott and Hort Bible criticism, textual criticism and critical text as their source.

120Ibid., "The Pre-Incarnate Christ", 287

## Critique of Chafer's 1948 Christology

Lewis Sperry Chafer, who waxed so incomprehensible in volume four and could not communicate the truth of "So Great Salvation" in volume three, waxes more eloquent than all predecessors of systematic theologies when expressing his Christology. It is an astounding transformation, likely lectured and written prior to his venture into a printed systematic theology effort. This volume is worth its price despite all the other volumes of his incorrigible effort.

Make no mistake, Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer started as a fundamentalist. The song leader under C.I. Scofield became a gifted teacher for the newly formed World's Christian Fundamentals Association (WCFA) and in 1924 his Evangelical Theological College became Dallas Theological Seminary in Dallas, Texas, a fundamental seminary.<sup>121</sup> Evangelicals became Neoevangelicals when they scoffed at the Fundamental Separatist position and refused the Fundamentalists' militant attitude. Dr. Chafer never scoffed, but he never separated either. Dr. Chafer never mocked militantism, but he never became one, and he never camped with any.

Dr. Chafer's Ecclesiology and his pandering to 70+ denominations, endangers his Christology. His belief in a Catholic Church with Denominational Divides is a poisonous root which renders his whole whole Systematic Theology dangerously suspect. The rationalizations that he imagines in his work, illustrate the ever present danger of mixing with apostasy, rather than separating from it. Such is the plight of the neoevangelical who purposefully rejected the staunch separatist position of the early Fundamentalist. When trying to appease 70+ denominations, Chafer is "conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood. And judgment is turned away backward, justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter." (Isa 59:13b-14)

Some would contend that Lewis Sperry Chafer was not neoevangelical leaning, and Dallas Theological Seminary was indeed Fundamental. One can let George W. Dollar, Professor of Church History at Bob Jones University answer that. In his 1973 book "A History of Fundamentalism in America", he states,

---

<sup>121</sup>Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 160

Alumni of Dallas Seminary would raise the old claim that all is sound and Fundamental there, although such known sympathizers with New Evangelicalism as H.G. Hendricks, H.W. Robinson, G.W. Peters, and R.H. Seume serve on the faculty... Each year an array of speakers who travel with New Evangelicals mold the mind of students to a middle-of-the-road position. These speakers have included R.A. Cook, Arnold T. Olsen, H.T. Armerding, Clark Pinnock, F.A. Schaeffer, Carl Henry, Clyde Taylor, and Ted Engstrom.<sup>122</sup>

Dr. Dollar also clarifies succinctly,

That the new evangelical strategy must be one of infiltration and not separation. In addition, he (New Evangelical Harold Ockenga, President of Fuller Seminary in Pasadena, California<sup>123</sup>) named the new evangelical forces as the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), Fuller Seminar, Billy Graham, and *Christianity Today*... In 1960 Ockenga wrote: 'my personal concern as the originator of the New Evangelicalism has been to stir the interest of Evangelical Christianity in meeting the societal problems through content of Biblical Christianity. This is the tradition of Calvin, Luther, and Knox.'<sup>124</sup>

Dollar goes on to clarify that Charles J. Woodbridge, a Fuller Seminary faculty member who left in protest to Ockenga's new

---

122George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 1973, Bob Jones University Press, 209

123Harold John Ockenga (1905-1985) was an American evangelical leader, a Congregational minister, and one of the co-founders of Fuller Theological Seminary. Harold John Ockenga (June 6, 1905 – February 8, 1985) was a leading figure of mid-20th-century American Evangelicalism, part of the reform movement known as "Neo-Evangelicalism". A Congregational minister, Ockenga served for many years as pastor of Park Street Church in Boston, Massachusetts. He was also a prolific author on biblical, theological, and devotional topics. Ockenga helped to found the Fuller Theological Seminary and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, as well as the National Association of Evangelicals. from [http://www.theopedia.com/Harold\\_Ockenga](http://www.theopedia.com/Harold_Ockenga) (Accessed 15 June 2014).

124Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 204

direction, called this new and dangerous direction,  
a theological and moral compromise of the deadliest sort. Such a threat is it that the sharpest language must be used to expose its threat and insidious danger... Neo Evangelicalism advocates toleration of error. It is following the downward path of accommodation to error, cooperation with error contamination by error, and ultimate capitulation to error.<sup>125</sup>

It is reiterated here that Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, founder of Dallas Theological Seminary in 1924, does not use the sharpest language and does not expose the error of the 70+ denomination that he is pandering to. He is the epitome of neoevangelicalism as herein defined. His Christology, however, has some saving merit.

Chafer's introduction to Christology brings out a notable difference between a Bible doctrine book and a theology book. The "ology" in theology emphasizes a discourse which meanders down every conceivable avenue of consideration for a topic. While a Bible doctrine must detail every straight and narrow consideration of what God has revealed, a thorough "ology" must do that, plus introduce and explore some of the major broad paths and wide gates of mans creation. It should thereby open some vistas which may not have been considered by the student of doctrine being ever vigil to show how the wide paths do lead to destruction. Chafer's Christology pursues this mind broadening purpose.

In previous volumes Chafer has missed this higher calling of a systematic theology. Dr. Chafer states his purpose to "collect and systematically arrange, compare, exhibit and defend all facts concerning God and his works from any and every source."<sup>126</sup> In making such a brash definition Chafer unwittingly puts philosophers such as Aristotle and Plato, and Roman Catholics such as Saint Augustine and Saint Aquinas, and Protestants who persecuted Baptist, men such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, on equal grounds with Holy Scripture. In writing his eight volumes on Systematic Theology he repeatedly makes this blunder. Systematically such an approach is

---

125Ibid. 205

126from [www.ChristianBook.com](http://www.ChristianBook.com) book promotion accessed Dec 2013

theological malpractice. His lack of organizing thoughts and direction is serious, but his total miss-organizing the "system" in systematic, coupled with his strong reliance on extra Biblical sources make his systematic theology inexcusable. His Christology, however, is still commendable.

This author has found no Systematic Theologies which carefully follow the aforementioned methodology. They each, more or less, follow Dr. Chafer's recipe and end up parked on some wide road, defending mans twisted ideas about eternal decrees of God, the election of individual souls, the Catholicness of a Church, an allegorical end time, or the replacement of God's chosen Israel with their Catholic Church. For that reason systematic theology has often been a dangerous venture for the impressionable student. For the student well grounded in Bible Doctrine, however, a careful venture into the mind broadening arena of mans ideology is still a worthwhile venture. Dr. Chafer's Christology documented in his fifth volume seems to be such a worthwhile excursion.

Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's opening chapter on the pre-incarnate Christ is the most comprehensive of all systematic theologies this author reviewed. Since his introduction to this chapter eloquently introduces his whole subject it is recited below:

### *Dr Chafer's Introduction to The Pre-incarnate Christ*

Christology (Χριστος, λογος), to which this entire volume is devoted, is the doctrine respecting the Lord Jesus Christ. In attempting to write on His adorable Person and His incomprehensible achievements - which achievements when completed will have perfected redemption, exercised to infinite satisfaction the divine attribute of grace, manifested the invisible God to His creatures, and subdued a rebellious universe in which sin has been permitted to demonstrate its exceeding sinfulness - the limitation of a finite mind which is weakened by a faulty perception are all to apparent. Samuel Medley expressed this sense of restriction when he sang:

"O could I speak the matchless worth,  
O could I sound the glories forth  
Which in my Saviour shine,  
I'd soar, and touch the heavenly strings,  
And vie with Gabriel while he sings  
In notes almost Divine."

Thus, again, the same inability is felt and expressed by Charles Wesley:

"O for a thousand tongues to sing,  
My great Redeemer's praise;  
The glories of my God and king,  
The triumphs of His grace."

Of this incomparable One it is said that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God"; yet such an One, who thus occupied the highest place of Deity in company with the Father and the Spirit, "Was made flesh, and dwelt among us." He who is from everlasting to everlasting was born of a woman and died on a cross. He who according to the mind of the Spirit is Wonderful, was spit upon by men. He who, by the same mind, is Counselor is rejected of men. He who is The might God is crucified in abject weakness. He who is The everlasting Father, is a Son who learned obedience by the things which He suffered. He who is the Prince of Peace must Himself tread the wine press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, for the "day of vengeance" must yet be in His heart and He must yet break the nations with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel. He who said, "I am among you as he that serveth," also said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword,;" He who is the chaste, wooing Lover of the Canticles is the King of glory who is might in battle. He who created all things occupied an infant's cradle. He who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners was made to be sin in behalf of others. He who was the Bread of Life was Himself hungry. He who was the giver of the supernatural Water of Life was Himself thirsty. He who was God's Gift of Life to a lost world was Himself dead. He who was dead is alive for evermore.<sup>127</sup>

Chafer also broadens the general outline of Christology to pursue a sevenfold division. He defends the need for such an expanded outline as follows:

### *Dr Chafer's seven fold divisions of Christology*

The larger and usual division of Christology is twofold - Christ's Person and His work. The work of Christ, being generally restricted to the redemption He has

---

<sup>127</sup>Lewis Sperry Chafer, Systematic Theology, Volume V, Christology, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, MI, 3-4.



achieved, does not include other essential features- his life on earth, His teachings, His manifestation of divine attributes, His offices as Prophet, Priest, and King, or His relationships to angelic spheres. It is with this larger consideration of Christology in view that a sevenfold division of this extended theme will be pursued: (1) the pre-incarnate Christ (Chap I), (2) Christ incarnate (chaps. II-VIII), (3) the sufferings and death of Christ incarnate (chap. IX), (4) the resurrection of Christ incarnate (chap. X), (5) the ascension and session of Christ incarnate (chap. XI), (6) the second advent and kingdom of Christ incarnate (chaps. XII-XIII), and (7) the eternal kingdom of Christ incarnate (chap. XIV).<sup>128</sup>

Despite Chafer's later complication of the genuine purpose of a theologian, he carefully defines it properly in this introduction. Chafer's Christology, likely written for lecture, rather than for his more inclusive, less direct systematic theology, follows this formula well, as can be seen in his outline for teaching the preincarnate Christ:

To the theologian whose task is to discover, arrange, and defend the truth which God has spoken, the assignment relative to the absolute Deity of Christ is simple indeed. The joining of the doctrine of Christ's humility to the doctrine of His Deity does create a problem which demand the most exact and careful consideration; but the doctrine respecting Christ's Deity when standing alone is without complications.

The general division of the divine revelation regarding Christ's preexistence may be comprehended under a sevenfold arrangement of truth: (1) Christ is God, hence His preexistence; (2) Christ is the Creator, hence His preexistence; (3) Christ is party to the before time covenant, hence His preexistence; (4) the Old Testament anticipation of Messiah which Christ answered is that of Jehovah God, hence His preexisted; (5) the Old Testament angel of Jehovah is Christ, hence His preexisted; (6) indirect Biblical assertions declare Christ to have preexisted; and (7) direct Biblical assertions declare Christ to have preexisted.<sup>129</sup>

---

128Ibid., 5

129Ibid., 7

In presenting the deity of Christ Dr. Chafer waxes the more eloquent. He uses the Westminster Confession's extensive delineation of God and follows that with this profound paragraph:

It is probable that no more comprehensive declaration respecting God has been framed than this; yet it is precisely this infinity of Being which Scriptures predicate of Christ. There is nothing which is said to be true of God which is not said to be true of Christ and to the same degree of infinite perfection. It is true that He took upon Himself the human form and that in so doing important problems arise regarding the theanthropic Person which He became. These problems have been considered under Theology Proper and will yet be resumed later when contemplating the incarnation and earth-life of the Savior. The fundamental issue is that Christ is God. This has also been proven earlier and is now to be demonstrated again. The student is enjoined not to pass over these proofs without having attained to a profound conviction of the Deity of Christ. If he wavers respecting this foundation truth, he should re-canvass every argument and attempt no forward step until this credence is definitely acquired, for apart from this conviction no true progress will be made. If, on the other hand, such a conviction is not gained, the student is fundamentally wrong and can, under such abnormal unbelief and want of amenableness to the Scriptures, serve no worthy purpose as an exponent of the Sacred Text. The Lord has Himself declared that "all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father" (John 5:23). The Son is dishonored when assigned a lower place than that of the Father. Such dishonor to the Son is displeasing to the Father, and a ministry is vain indeed which, though sincere, advances under the displeasure of God. The Deity of the Father is all but universally admitted, so also the Deity of the Spirit; but the Deity of the Son is challenged. Such a doubt would not have arisen had the Son not become incarnate. It is His entrance into the human sphere that has provided a field for unbelief. Thus it is required the more that the exact testimony of the Word of God should be given in its full authority. As would exist through misunderstanding of the theanthropic Person, the strongest evidence is supplied concerning the Deity of Christ. The Scriptures are as clear and conclusive in their expressions respecting the Deity of Christ as they are respecting His humanity. His humanity is revealed by the natural method of ascribing to Him human titles, human attributes, human actions, and human relationships. Similarly, His Deity is disclosed in the same manner by ascribing to Christ divine, divine attributes, divine actions, and divine relationships.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup>Ibid. 8-9.

One area where Chafer's description of the divine names applied to Christ exceeds Cambron's doctrine description is in the name of *Logos*. Since *Logos* is also the root stem of the "ology" in theology that whole thesis is included here:

1. The Divine Names. The names found in the Bible - especially those applied to divine Persons - are far more than empty titles. They define as well as indicate the Person to whom they belong. The name *Jesus* is His human designation, but it also embodies the whole redemptive purpose of His incarnation (cf. Matt. 1:21). Similar titles such as "The Son of man, The son of Mary, "The son of Abraham," "The son of David," assert His human lineage and relationships. In like manner the designations "Word," or *Logos*, "God," "Lord," "The might God," "The everlasting Father," "Immanuel," "Son of God," connote His Deity. Among these divine names, some are final in their implications.

a. DESIGNATIONS OF ETERNAL RELATIONSHIP: *Logos* (Λογος). As language expresses thought, so Christ is the Expression, the Revealer, the Manifester of God. The term *Logos* - used only by the Apostle John as a name of the Second Person - indicates the eternal character of Christ. As *Logos* He was in the beginning, He was with God, and He was God (John 1:1). He likewise became flesh (John 1:14) and thus is - according to divine functions - the manifestation of God to man (cf. John 1:18). In His manifestation, all that may be disclosed relative to the Person of God was not only resident in Christ - "In him dwelleth all the fullness [πληρωμα] of the Godhead bodily" (Col 2:9) - but all the competency of God - knowledge-surpassing, indeed - was resident in Him. No stronger declaration of the Deity of Christ can be made than is indicated by the cognomen *Logos*. Without the use of this specific title the Apostle Paul also has written both in Colossians and in Hebrews of the same preexistence of Christ; and concerning the origin of this title and the fact that the Apostle John employs it without explanation - suggesting a general understanding of its meaning - collateral reading may be pursued (cf. Dean Alford, M.R. Vincent, and in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, s.w., Alexander).

Bishop Lightfoot, in his commentary on Colossians, chapter 1, verse 15 ff., has declared the meaning of *Logos* and its use in the Sacred Text. He Writes:

As the idea of the *Logos* underlies the whole of this passage, though the term itself does not appear, a few words explanatory of this term will be necessary by way of preface. The word *Λογος* then, denoting both "reason" and "speech," was a philosophical term adopted by Alexandrian Judaism before St. Paul wrote, to express the

*manifestatio*' of the Unseen God, the Absolute Being, in the creation and government of the World. It included all modes by which God makes Himself known to man. As his reason, it denoted His purpose or design; as His *speech*, it implied His revelation. Whether the *logos* was conceived merely as the divine energy personified, or whether the conception took a more concrete form, I need not stop now to inquire; but I hope to give a fuller account of the matter in a later volume. It is sufficient for the understanding of what follows to say that Christian teachers, when they adopted this term, exalted and fixed its meaning by attaching to it two precise and definite ideas: (1) "The Word is a Divine Person," ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος; and (2) "The Word became incarnate in Jesus Christ," ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο. It is obvious that these two propositions must have altered materially the significance of all the subordinate terms connected with the idea of the λογος; and that therefore their use in Alexandrian writers, such as Philo, cannot be taken to *define*, though it may be brought to *illustrate*, their meaning in St. Paul and St. John. With these cautions the Alexandrian phraseology, as providential preparation for the teaching of the Gospel, will afford important aid in the understanding of the Apostolic writing. - 8th edition., pp. 141-142<sup>131</sup>

The designation of Christ which capture his eternal relationship is further enhanced by his title of "First Begotten" (ποθτοτοκος). This is explained by Chafer using John F. Walvoord's outline as follows:

First Begotten" (ποθτοτοκος). This title - sometimes translated *First-Born* - indicates that Christ is First-Born, the elder in relation to all creation; not the first created thing, but the antecedent to all things as well as the cause of them (cf. Col. 1:16). Of this title Dr. John F. Walvoord writes, "This term is used twice in the New Testament without referring to Christ. (Heb. 11:28; 12:23), and seven times as His title. An examination of these references will reveal a threefold use: (a) Before all creation (Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15). As the 'firstborn of every creature' (Col. 1:15), the title is obviously used of Christ as existing before all creation, hence, eternally self-existent. (b) Firstborn of Mary (Matt. 1:25; Luke 2:7; Heb 1:6). Here the reference is plainly to the fact that Christ was the first child born to Mary, a usage in contrast to that speaking of His eternal sonship. The term is used, then, of His pre-incarnate Person, and also of His incarnate Person. (c) Firstborn by Resurrection (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). The meaning here is that Christ is the first to be raised from the dead in resurrection life,

---

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., 9-10

hence, 'the firstborn from the dead' (Col. 1:18). In relation to the eternity of Christ, this title is another proof that Christ is the self-existent, uncreated God spoke of in Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15; and that in view of His eternal Person, He also has the honor of being the first to be raised from the dead in resurrection life" (*Outline of Christology*, unpublished ms., pp. 5-6).

A consideration of thee designations cannot but impress the devout mind with the truth that the Lord Jesus Christ existed as God from all eternity, and that He will so exist throughout eternity to come.<sup>132</sup>

Dr. Chafer puts more emphasis on types than do other theologians. In his introduction to the doctrine of Christ incarnate, under the heading, the major types of Christ, he quotes a whole section of Dr. Walvoord's unpublished notes.<sup>133</sup> In his section on the sufferings and death of Christ incarnate Dr. Chafer again includes a list of the major types of Christ.<sup>134</sup> These two lists are combined and inserted into his text and should be studied with care.<sup>135</sup>

Dr. Chafer included in his *Christology* an extensive and needful section on the second advent of Christ incarnate. The area is covered in this work under Eschatology, but it is of such importance that highlights are included in this section.

Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer set out as a young fundamentalist to reprove the Protestant's error and preach the Premillennial return of Christ and the dispensational doctrines that support it. That zeal was somewhat quenched when he settled into the midst of 70+ denominations and founded Dallas Theological Seminary, but his introduction to his chapter, "The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate" deserves audience. That introduction is included below:

### **Dr. Chafer's "The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate"**

Since Christ is the center of all Biblical prediction, there is properly an eschatology to be included in Christology. It contemplates the return of Christ to the earth, the kingdom which He will then set up

---

132Ibid., 11-12.

133Ibid., 43-44

134Ibid., 177

135Dr. Walvoord's notes on types of Christ was found at [www.walvoord.com](http://www.walvoord.com) , Browse Articles, Series in Christology (Accessed 15 June 2014), also found at [http://www.1stccchartfordwi.org/Systematic\\_Theology](http://www.1stccchartfordwi.org/Systematic_Theology) (Accessed 15 June 2014).

on the earth, and His eternal reign. The first of these is now to be considered, the second in the chapter following, while the last forms the theme of the closing main division of Christology or chapter XIV.

Though theologians differ about the time and the manner of Christ's second advent, all who receive the Bible seriously do agree that He will return to this earth. The Scriptures clearly teach that Christ will come for judgment and for the setting up of His kingdom on the earth. Over this kingdom He with His Bride shall rule forever. No apology is entered or entertained for taking the vast body of Scripture which presents Christ's coming again and his kingdom in other than its natural, literal, and grammatical sense. All predictions due to be fulfilled before the manner and without exception; it is therefore reasonable to believe that unfulfilled predictions will be accomplished as faithfully and as definitely. It is possible that for want of faith some men of the past age of law who were confronted with predictions respecting the first advent when it was yet future were inclined to place some so-called spiritualizing interpretations upon these great prophecies; but it remained true, and would have remained so though no living man had taken God at His Word, that the inspired predictions moved on majestically in their natural, literal, and grammatical fulfillment. For those who have not done so, it may be introduction into almost limitless fields of divine revelation and into overwhelming demonstrations of divine faithfulness to follow through an investigation which pursues this specific method of interpretation - such, anyway, is this division of Christology designed to be. The theme is as august, majestic, and consequential as the consummation of all divine purposes in mundane spheres must be. If matters of present world crises arrest the attention and spread consternation among all civilized inhabitants of the earth, how much more should believing men be aroused to unprecedented attention by the portrayal of those stupendous realities which constitute the closing scenes - the final disposition of evil and the final enthronement of righteousness and peace unto all eternity to come! However vividly - unless it be the creation of the universe - and that program which is yet to come is, so far as that which is sublunary is concerned, more of prophecy related to the first advent and the probability of literal fulfillment of prophecy related to the second advent, George N. H. Peters writes<sup>136</sup>: ...

... The truth that Christ is coming to the earth again is so emphatically and repeatedly asserted in the Sacred Text that nearly all creeds have included it in their declarations, and only those who are

---

136 Chafer is a complex writer. This paragraph analyzed by <https://readability-score.com> shows Chafer writes on an average grade level (based on the USA education system) of 17.2 (Twelfth grade plus 5 years of college!) Words per Sentence 34.3.

lacking in respect for the verity of the Bible text fail to acknowledge that Christ is to return; however, a wide variation in belief has existed about how and when He will return. A woeful lack of attention to the precise testimony of the Word of God is revealed in these conflicting sentiments more than is found in connection with any other one doctrine. Human notions and fancies have run riot with little apparent attempt to harmonize these ideas with the Scriptures. The assumption must arise that they are not diminished by it. An example of the human imagination's straying when making no reference to the extended testimony of Scripture is furnished - and similar quotation might be made from various theologians - by Dr. William Newton Clarke, late Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, in his book *An outline of Christian Theology* (5th ed., pp. 443-46). Having written at some length on certain points and having implied that Christ's second advent is fulfilled in the death of the believer - using John 14:1-3 as the proof-text, by the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost, and by the destruction of Jerusalem, he summarizes as follows:<sup>137</sup>...

The battle against Reformed Theology's Covenant Theology was well worded when Dr. Chafer quoted Dr. William Newton Clarke. That battle is ongoing. Their Roman gate may be wider and their Catholic path broader, but there is a straight and narrow truth expounding a Premillennial return of Christ, and a Pretribulational Rapture of the Church. Although there be few that find it, rejoice that you are herein standing on it.

Dr. Chafer has much more to say about Christology. His depth here is unique, not showing itself in other areas of his "Systematic Theology." The study of his fifth volume might be worthwhile, but this volume is not exemplary of Dr. Chafer's work.

### **+Critique of Geisler's 2002 Christology**

Normal L. Geisler has Christology as an appendix to his systematic theology.<sup>138</sup> Although that tells something about his organization, he does begin his appendix with this note:

Christology is discussed in three other places: The work of Christ on the cross is treated under Soteriology in

---

137 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, Vol V, 281-283.

138 Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology In One Volume*, Bethany House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2002, 3, 4, 5, 11.

chapters 60-61; the nature of Christ as a member of the Trinity is discussed in Chapter 40; Christ's future reign is examined in part 8 on eschatology ("last things"). Other elements of Christology are outlined here in this appendix.

This caption to his appendix reveals the importance of including a complete section for Christology in ones systematic theology. Although the preeminent topic touches every area of theology and might be addressed in other areas, there are concepts that need expounded in its own section. Secondly the caption tells us that Geisler only outlines his Christology, and does not expound any areas to the point of being an "ology."

Of Norman L. Geisler's *Systematic Theology in One Volume*<sup>139</sup>, Dr. Paige Patterson, President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary said,

Great theologians are best when they are outstanding philosophers also. Then, of course, you often cannot fathom what they are saying. Norman Geisler has the unique ability as a philosopher and theologian to deal with profound concepts in ways that the common man can easily grasp. Consequently, this systematic theology will not only sit on the desk of the scholar but also of the pastor, and on the coffee table of many a layman<sup>140, 141</sup>.

Geisler's single volume of systematic theology is indeed superior to Charles Hodge, and Augustus Strong's work. Charles Hodge was a meticulous and scholarly Princeton graduate but he was first and foremost a Presbyterian with a staunch reformed theology. Augustus Strong was a Baptist, equally meticulous and scholarly, but desiring to meld Baptist doctrine with reformed theology and atheistic

---

139 Ibid.

140 The author objects to the Roman Catholic categorization of Christians being clerics, or clergy, who are denominationally trained to read and interpret the Holy Bible, and laity or laymen, who were not trained and professional in their denomination. True, Bible believing, Born-again ones, are indwelt by the Christ and have eyes made to see, and ears made to hear. Such exude the priesthood of all believers.

141 Ibid., flyleaf



evolution. Where Dr. Henry Thiessen did not believe an inspired, inerrant, infallible Holy Bible was in existence in his day, Dr. Geisler uses such as his *prima facie* source, if not his sole source for his doctrine. Dr. Geisler's work in one volume is also superior to Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's eight volumes of systematic theology. Whereas Dr. Chafer wrote an extensive Christology, and a superior chapter on the pre-incarnate Christ, Dr. Geisler's concise style and complete organized coverage of theology exceeds Dr. Chafer's verbose eight volumes of effort.

Despite Geisler's outlined treatment of Christology in an appendix, some of his outline forms present remarkable insight to the wealth of Bible information available. His presentation of fourteen direct physical evidence of the death of Christ<sup>142</sup> is a good example. And concerning the resurrection of Christ, he fully expounds on the twelve appearances of the resurrected Christ.<sup>143</sup> His tabling of the miracles of Christ<sup>144</sup> marks a very useful outlining in considering the whole life of Christ. The presentation of this outline prompts the inclusion the more extensive table compiled by this author.

---

142 Ibid., 1510-1512.

143 Ibid., 1512-1518.

144 Ibid., 1504 - 1506.

## Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ

The consideration of the life of Christ incarnate can be enhanced by the study of the following chronological table showing the harmony of the life of Christ. It is a reference I have used repeatedly in my studies.

The order of event in general according to Andrews' 'Life of Christ'<sup>145</sup>

### Introduction Childhood and 1<sup>st</sup> Year of Public Ministry

#	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
1	Preexistence						1:1-14
2	Genealogies			1:1-17		3:23-28	
3	Annunciation to Mary	Nazareth	March, 5 BC			1:26-38	
4	Birth of John the Baptist	Judea	June, 5 BC			1:57-80	
5	Birth of Jesus	Bethlehem	Dec, 5 BC	1:18-25		2:1-7	
6	Song of the angels	Bethlehem				2:8-20	
7	Visit of the Wise Men	Bethlehem	Jan, 4 BC	2:1-12			
8	Flight into Egypt	Egypt	Feb, 4 BC	2:13-23			
9	Childhood and Youth	Nazareth	2-26 BC	2:23		2:39-52	
10	First Passover at age 12	Jerusalem	Apr 8 AD			2:41-50	
11	John the Baptist Ministry	Wilderness	26-28 AD	3:1-12	1:1-18	3:1-18	
12	Baptism of Jesus	Jordan	Jan 27 AD	3:13-17	1:9-11	3:21-23	
13	Temptation of Christ more likely fits between John 4 & 5, after John lists the daily sequences after Christ's baptism.	John 4 n 5					
14	First Disciples	Bethabara	Feb 27 AD				1:15-51
15	First Miracle	Cana	Tuesday Feb				2:1-12
16	First Temple Cleansing	Jerusalem	Apr 11-17				2:13-25
17	Discourse to Nicodemus	Jerusalem	Apr 11-17				3:1-21
18	Great Ministry in Judea	Judea	<b>Apr</b>				3:22-36

145 Cyclopedic Concordance of my mothers Scofield Reference Bible, New York Oxford University Press, 1945

## Vol 04 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

19	Departure to Galilee		<b>Apr</b>				4:1-3
20	Samaritans at Jacobs Well	Sychar	<b>Apr</b>				4:4-42
21	Healing of Nobel mans Son	Capernaum	<b>Apr</b>				4:43-54
13	<b>Temptations of Jesus</b>	Wilderness	<b>Apr</b>	4:1-11	1:12-13	4:1-13	
23	<del>Passover</del> likely <b>Pentecost</b>	Jerusalem	<b>June 27 AD</b>				5:1
24	Healing at pool Bethesda	Jerusalem	<b>June 27 AD</b>				5:2-47
24 b	<b>Discourse w Pharisees (without disciples, who were likely off fishing)</b>	Jerusalem	<b>June 27 AD</b>				<b>5:16-47</b>

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

### Public Ministry of Christ in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Year

#	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
22	Unrecorded Jan – Mar 28 AD		Jan-Mar, 28				
23	Passover <b>(more likely Pentecost)</b>	Jerusalem	Mar 30-Apr 5				5:1
24	Healing at pool Bethesda	<b>( See above)</b>	<b>(See 1<sup>st</sup> year)</b>				5:2-47
25	Imprisonment of John	Macherus	March	14:3-5	6:17,18	3:19,20	
26	Return to Galilee	Galilee	April	4:12	1:14,15	4:14,15	
27	Rejection at Nazareth	Nazareth	“			4:16-30	
28	Takes up abode in Capernaum	Capernaum	April May	4:13-17		4:31	
29	Calling disciples to be fishers	Sea of Galilee	April May	4:18-22	1:16-20	5:1-11	
30	Many Miracles	Capernaum	April May	8:14-17	1:21-34	4:31-41	
31	First circuit of Galilee	Galilee	April May	4:23-24	1:35-39	4:42-44	
32	Healing of a Leper	Galilee	May	8:2-4	1:40-45	5:12-16	
33	Healing Paralytic	Capernaum	May June	9:2-8	2:1-12	5:17-26	
34	The call of Matthew	Capernaum	May June	9:9	2:13-14	5:27-28	
35	Discourse on Sabbath	Capernaum	May June	12:1-8	2:23-28	6:1-5	
36	Withered Hand Sabbath Day	Capernaum	May June	12:9-14	3:1-6	6:6-11	
37	Calling of the Twelve	Horns Hattin	Midsummer	10:2-4	3:13-19	6:12-19	
38	Sermon of the Mount	Horns Hattin	Midsummer	Ch 5 -8:13		6:20-49	
39	Healing Centurion's Servant	Capernaum	Midsummer	8:5-13		7:1-10	
40	Raising the Widow's Son	Nain	Midsummer			7:11-17	
41	John Baptist sends to Jesus	Galilee	Midsummer	11:2-19		7:18-35	
42	Warnings and invitations	Galilee		11:20-30			
43	The woman, a sinner		Midsummer			7:36-50	
44	Another tour of Galilee	Galilee	Autumn			8:1-3	
45	Healing blind and dumb	Capernaum	Autumn	12:22-45	3:22-30	(11:14-23)	
46	Visit of his mother +	Capernaum	Autumn	12:46-50	3:31-35	8:19-21	
47	Eight parables by the sea	Sea of Galilee	Autumn	13:1-53	4:1-34	8:4-18	
48	Stilling the Tempest			8:18-27	4:35-41	8:22-25	
49	Restoration of the demoniac			8:28-34	5:1-20	8:26-39	

## Vol 04 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

50	Matthew's Feast			9:10-17	2:15-22	5:29-39	
51	Jairus' Daughter raised, Woman Cured			9:18-26	5:21-43	8:40-56	
52	Heal two blind men and dumb possessed			9:27-34			

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

### Public Ministry of Christ in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Year

#	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
53	2 <sup>nd</sup> rejection at Nazareth	Nazareth	Winter 29	13:53-58	6:1-6		
54	The 12 sent forth	Galilee	Winter 29	9:35-11:1	6:6-13	9:1-6	
55	Death of John the Baptist	Macherus	March 29	14:1-12	6:14-29	9:7-9	
56	Feeding of the 5,000	Bethsaida	April 29	14:13-21	6:30-46	9:10-17	6:1-15
57	Jesus walks upon the water	Sea of Galilee	“	14:22-23	6:47-52		6:16-21
58	Heals many that are sick	Gennesaret	“	14:34-35	6:53-56		
59	Discourse - Bread of Life	Capernaum	“				6:22-71
60	Discourse – Unwashed Hands	Capernaum	April 29	15:1-20	7:1-23		
61	To Sidon + Syrophenician Woman's daughter	Region of Tyre & Sidon	Summer 29	15:21-28	7:24-30		
62	Return through Decapolis, Miracles of healing	Decapolis	“	15:29-31	7:31-37		
63	Feeding the 4,000	“	“	15:32-39	8:1-10		
64	Demanding a sign warning	Capernaum	“	16:1-12	8:11-21		
65	Blind man healed	Bethsaida	“		8:22-26		
66	Peter's confession of faith	Near Cesaera Philipi	“	16:13-20	8:27-30	9:18-21	
67	Jesus' 1 <sup>st</sup> mention Death & Resurrection	“	“	16:21-28	8:31 – 9:1	9:22-27	
68	The Transfiguration	“	“	17:1-13	9:2-13	9:38-36	
69	Healing of Demoniac boy	“	“	17:14-21	9:14-29	9:37-43	
70	Foretells death & resurrection	Galilee	“	17:22-23	9:30-32	9:43-45	
71	Jesus & Children	Capernaum	“	18:1-14	9:13-50	9:46-50	
72	Discourse/ Parb - Forgiveness	“	“	18:15-35			
73	At Feast of Tabernacles	Jerusalem	Autumn 29				7:1 - 10:21
74	Discourse – Water of life	“	11-18 Oct 29				7:32-44
75	On light & freedom	“	“				8:12-59
76	On one born blind	“	“				9:1-39
77	The good shepherd	“	“				10:1-21
78	Return to Galilee	“	Autumn 29				
79	Final Departure from Galilee	Galilee	Nov, Dec 29	19:1	10:1	9:5	
80	The Mission of the 70	Perea	“			10:1-24	
81	Parable of Good Samaritan	“	“			10:25-37	
82	Discourse on prayer	“	“			11:1-13	

## Vol 04 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

83	Ans attacks of Pharisees	“	“			11:14-54	
84	Discr. - Great Moral Truths	“	“			12:1-59	
85	Discr- Galileans slain Healing on Sabbath Mustard Seed	“	“			13:1-35	
86	Guest of Mary & Martha	Bethany	“			10:38-42	
87	Feast of dedication	Jerusalem	20-27 Dec 29				10:22-39
88	Retires Beyond Jordan	Perea	Jan 30				10:40-42
89	Dines with Pharisee	“	“			14:1-14	
90	Parab- Great Supper	“	“			14:15-24	
91	Counting the Cost	“	“			14:25-35	
92	Parab- Lost Sheep, Silver	“	“			15:1-10	
93	Parab- Lost Son	“	“			15:11-32	
94	Parab- Unjust Steward	“	“			16:1-13	
95	Rich man & Lazarus	“	“			16:14-31	
96	Forgiveness & Faith	“	“			17:1-10	
97	Raising of Lazereth	Bethany	Feb 30				1:11-46

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

### The 3<sup>rd</sup> Entry into Jerusalem, From Galilee to Calvary

	<b>Events</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Matt</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>John</b>
098	Jesus to Ephraim in N Judea	Ephraim	1-4 Abib				11:47-57
099	Healing 10 Lepers	Samaria	Mon 4 Abib			17:11-19	
100	Coming Kingdom	Jezreel?	Tue 5 Abib			17:20-37	
101	Discourse on Divorce		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	19:2-12	10:2-12		
102	Widow, Pharisee Publican	Tirzah?	Wed 6 Abib			18:1-14	
103	Christ blessing little children		Wed 6 <sup>th</sup>	19:13-15	10:13-16	18:15-17	
104	The rich young ruler		Wed 6 <sup>th</sup>	19:16-30	10:17-31	18:18-30	
105	Parable of vineyard laborers	Shilo?	Thr 7 Abib	20:1-16			
106	Foretold death and resurr.		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	20:17-19	10:32-34	18:31-34	
107	James and Johns Ambitions		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	20:20-28	10:35-45		
108	Healing 2 blind men	Jericho	Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	20:29-34	10:46-82	18:35-43	
109	Zaccheus the publican		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>			19:1-10	
110	Parable of pounds		Fri 8 Abib			19:11-28	
111	Jesus arrives at Bethany	Bethany	Fri 8 <sup>th</sup>				12:1
112	Anointing by Mary		Fri 8 <sup>th</sup>	26:6-13	14:3-9		12:2-9
112 b	Plot to kill Jesus & Lazarus		Sat 9 Abib				12:10-11
113	Triumphal Entry		Sun 10 Abib	21:1-11	11:1-11	19:29-44	12:12-19



The Week of His Passion (Acts 1:3)

	Events	Place	Date	Matt	Mark	Luke	John
101	Discourse on Divorce		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	19:2-12	10:2-12		
105	Parable of vineyard laborers	Shilo?	Thr 7 Abib	20:1-16			
106	Foretold death and resurr.		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	20:17-19	10:32-34	18:31-34	
107	James and Johns Ambitions		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	20:20-28	10:35-45		
108	Healing 2 blind men	Jericho	Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>	20:29-34	10:46-82	18:35-43	
109	Zaccheus the publican		Thr 7 <sup>th</sup>			19:1-10	
110	Parable of pounds		Fri 8 Abib			19:11-28	
111	Jesus arrives at Bethany	Bethany	Fri 8 <sup>th</sup>				12:1
112	Anointing by Mary		Fri 8 <sup>th</sup>	26:6-13	14:3-9		12:2-9
112 b	Plot to kill Jesus & Lazarus		Sat 9 Abib				12:10-11
113	Triumphal Entry		Sun 10 Abib	21:1-11	11:1-11	19:29-44	12:12-19
113 a	Cleansing temple	Jerusalem	Mon 11 <sup>th</sup>	21:12-17	11:15-19	19:45-48	
114	Cursing the barren fig tree	Mt Olives	Mon 11 Abi b	21:18-19	11:12-14		
115	Cleansing temple	Jerusalem	Mon 11 <sup>th</sup>	21:12-17	11:15-19	19:45-48	
116	Fig tree withered, in and out	Mt Olives	Tue 12 Abib	21:20-22	11:20-26	(21:37-38)	
117	Christ's Authority Questioned	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	21:23-27	11:27-33	20:1-8	

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

	Events	Place	Date	Matt	Mark	Luke	John
118	Parable of 2 sons	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	21:28-32			
119	Para of wicked husbandman	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	21:33-46	12:1-12	20:9-19	
120	Para-Marriage of kings son	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	22:1-14			
121	Question of tribute	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	22:15-22	12:13-17	20:20-26	
122	Sadusees ? Resurrection	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	22:23-33	12:18-27	20:27-40	
123	Lawyer ? great command	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	22:34-40	12:28-34		
124	What think ye of Christ	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	22:41-46	12:35-37	20:41-44	
125	Woes to Scribes	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	23:1-36	12:38-40	20:45-47	
126	Lamentation over Jerusalem	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	23:37-39			
127	Widows mite	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>		12:41-44	21:3-4	
128	Greeks Seek Jesus	Temple	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>				12:20-50
129	Prophecy of end of world	Mt Olives	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	24:1-51	13:1-37	21:5-36	
130	Parable of 10 Virgins	Me Olives	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	25:1-13			
131	Parable of Talents	Mt Olives	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	25:14-30:			
132	Last Judgment	Mt Olives	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	25:31-46			
133	Plotting of Rulers w Judas	Jerusalem	Tue 12 <sup>th</sup>	26:1-5,14-16	14:1-2,10-11	22:1-6	
134	Jesus in	Bethany??	Added	fit	into	tradition	

Vol 04 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

	Events	Place	Date	Matt	Mark	Luke	John
	retirement???	?	to	good fri	errant	!	
135	Preparation for Passover	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:17- 19	14:12- 16	22:7-13	22:7-13
136	Arrival at upper room	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:20	14:17	22:14	
137	Strife for prominence	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>			22:24- 30	
138	Washing Feet	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>				13:1-20
139	Paschal Supper	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>			22:15- 18	
140	Betrayer declared	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:21- 25	14:18- 21	22:21- 23	13:21- 35
141	Lords Supper Instituted	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:26- 29	14:22- 25	22:19- 20	1Cor11: 23-5
142	Peter's fall foretold	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>			22:31- 38	13:36- 38
143	Farewell Discourse	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>				14:-16
144	Prayer of Jesus	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>				17:1-26
145	Jesus and Peters confidence	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:30- 35	14:26- 31	22:39	18:1-3
146	Garden Gethsemane	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:36- 46	14:32- 42	22:40- 46	
147	The Betrayal	Jerusalem	Wed 13 <sup>th</sup>	26:47- 50	14:43- 45	22:47,4 8	18:4-9
148	The Arrest	Jerusalem	Midni ght	26:50- 56	14:46- 52	22:49- 53	18:10- 12
149	Jesus Led to Annas, Caiaphas	Jerusalem	Thr 14 <sup>th</sup>				18:13- 15
150	Jesus before Caiaphas	Jerusalem	Thr 1- 5am	26:57- 58	14:53,5 4	22:54,5 5	18:19- 24

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

	Events	Place	Date	Matt	Mark	Luke	John
151	Jesus before the Sanhedrin	Jerusalem	Thr 1-5am	26:59-66	14:55-64		
152	Denials of Peter		Thr 1-5am	26:69-75	14:66-72	22:56-62	18:15-27
153	Jesus Mocked		Thr 1-5am	26:67, 68	14:65	22:63-65	
154	Sanhedrim Condemns Jesus		Thr 5-6 am	27:1,2	15:1	22:66-71	
155	Condemned & Blasphemed		Thr 5-6 am			23:1	
156	Death of Judas		Thr 5-6 am	27:3-10	Act 1:18-19		
157	Jesus before Pilot		Thr 5-6 am	27:11-14	15:2-5	23:2-5	18:28-38
158	Jesus sent to Herod		Thr 5-6 am			23:6-12	
159	Pilot releases Barabbas		Thr 5-6 am	27:15-23	15:6-14	23:13-23	18:38-40
160	Jesus condemned, scourged		Thr 5-6 am	27:26-30	15:15-19	23:24,25	19:1-3
161	Pilot seeks to release Jesus		Thr 5-6 am	27:24-25			19:4-16
162	Led away to crucifixion		Thr 9 am	27:31-34,38	15:20,23-28	23:26-32	19:16-18
163	The Superscription			27:37	15:26	23:38	19:19-22
164	1 <sup>st</sup> words Forgive them					23:33,34	
165	Soldiers cast lots			27:35-36	15:24	23:34	19:23,24
166	Jews Mock			27:39-44	15:29-32	23:35-37	
167	2 <sup>nd</sup> words to thief					23:39-43	

Vol 04 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

	Events	Place	Date	Matt	Mark	Luke	John
168	3 <sup>rd</sup> words Woman behold son						19:25-27
169	Darkness covers the land		Thr Noon	27:45	15:33	23:44,45	
170	4 <sup>th</sup> words Distress to God			27:46,47	15:34,35		
171	5 <sup>th</sup> words I thirst			27:48,49	15:36		19:28-29
172	6 <sup>th</sup> words It is finished						19:30
173	7 <sup>th</sup> words Into thy hands		Thr 3pm			23:46	
174	Death, Veil rent, Earthquake			27:50-56	15:37-41	23:45-49	19:30
175	Spear pierces side						19:31-37
176	The burial, the watch	Garden	Thr 3-6 pm	27:57-66	15:42-47	23:50-56	19:38-42

## A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

### His Resurrection and Appearances

	<b>Events</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Matt</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>John</b>
177	The Morning of Resurrection	Garden	Sun 17 Abib	28:2-4			
178	Women come to the sepulcher			28:1	16:1-4	24:1-2	20:1
179	Mary Magdalene tells Peter						20:2
180	The women at sepulcher			28:5-8	16:5-8	24:3-8	
181	Peter and John race to tomb					24:12	20:3-10
182	Jesus appears to Mary				16:9-11		20:11-18
183	Jesus appears to women			28:9,10		24:9-11	
184	Guard reports to priests			28:11-15			
185	Jesus on Road to Emaus				16:12-13	24:13-25	
186	Jesus appears to Peter				1Cor 15:5		
187	Appears to apostles - Thomas			1Cor 15:5	16:14	24:36-48	20:19-23
188	Appears to all the apostles		Sun 24 Abib				20:24-29
189	Jesus to seven in Galilee	Galilee	Sun 1 Zif				21:1-23
190	Appears to more than 500	Galilee	Sun 8 Zif	28:16-20	16:15-18	1Cor 15:6	
191	Jesus appears to James		Sun 15 Zif		1Cor 15:7		
192	He appears to all the apostles	Jerusalem	Sun 22 Zif	Act 1:1-8			
193	The Ascension	Bethany	Thur 26 Zif	Act 1:9-12	16:19	24:50-53	
194	Conclusions Mark, John				16:20		20:30-31
195	Epilogue of John						21:1-25
196	Holy spirit given, Pentecost	Jerusalem	Sun 6 Sivan	Act 2:1-11			
197	Jesus appears to Paul	Damascus	37 AD	Acts 22:6-16			
198	Jesus appears to John	Patmos	96 AD	Rev 1:9-20			

Vol 04 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ

	<b>Events</b>	<b>Place</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Matt</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Luke</b>	<b>John</b>
199	Our high priest in heaven				Heb 9:11-28		
200	Jesus reigns in new heaven				Rev 21:1-27		

## Chapter 12 – Christology Conclusion

Christology is such a prominent, perhaps preeminent, consideration in theology, that these hundred pages seem introductory, and the study of our Lord Jesus Christ will never be complete. One will not grow in the knowledge of God, without first growing in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. As Jesus puts it, “Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works’ sake. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father” (John 14:9-12).

When you read your Bible find Christ on every page. When you spend an hour in prayer, find him listening to every word. When you make your conversation with your neighbor, include him as a centerpiece. Make much of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he can make much of you. Again this study is but an introduction for the greatest study ever undertaken.

In the last verse of his Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Apostle John put it thus, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.... And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen" (John 20:30-31, 21:25)



Vol 5 Pneumatology – The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century –  
Vol 5 Pneumatology

Download pdf at [www.GSBaptistChurch.com/theology](http://www.GSBaptistChurch.com/theology)

By Dr. Edward Rice,  
Pastor Good Samaritan Baptist Church  
54 Main St. Box 99, Dresden NY 14441  
[www.GSBaptistChurch.com](http://www.GSBaptistChurch.com)

## Volume 5 Pneumatology The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit

### Chapter 1 Pneumatology Introduction

*Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:... Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.*

John 16:7-8,13<sup>146</sup>

When Jesus summarizes a subject, there is no greater summary. This one from John 16 plants the seeds for understanding the person of the Holy Ghost, the purpose of the Holy Ghost and the methods of the Holy Ghost. Note that this is announced by Christ as a new role for the Holy Spirit of God, a role not seen in the Old Testament. Those seeds of understanding need to be developed into a proper pneumatology.

In the Bible the Holy Spirit of God is not only symbolized as wind and breath, he is titled with the Greek word for breath, *πνοα (pnoa)*.<sup>147</sup> Thus the title of the Holy Ghost, in Greek is *πνευμα (pneuma)*, literally *the breath of God*. The study of the Holy Ghost is thus called *pneumatology* from the Greek. However, pneumatology is much more than just “a study of” the Holy Ghost.

If one were to set in order everything that could be said about the Holy Spirit of God, the world could not contain all the words, he is infinite. This effort endeavors to set in order everything that should be said about the Holy Ghost. Such an effort would properly be called an “*ology*,” which comes from the familiar Greek word “*logos*.” Recall that in John 1 the Lord Jesus Christ was called “*Logos*” because he was the communication tool of God, indeed he was the manifestation of God. Because our topic is the Holy Ghost, it might be interjected here

---

146The Holy Bible

147 “*The New Testament, The Greek Text Underlying The English Authorised Version of 1611*”, The Trinitarian Bible Society, Public Domain

that some have tried to make him the manifestation of God. It is shown in this study that such practice is unBiblical and arrogantly dangerous. Christ, not the Holy Ghost, is the *Logos*.

The suffix “ology” is, however, derived from the Greek word “*logos*.” It implies a complete manifestation and communication of a subject. An “ology” is thus more than just “the study of” a subject. “*Pneumatology*,” is the manifestation of everything that should be considered about the Holy Spirit of God.

The difference between college and seminary is the difference between the “Doctrine of the Holy Ghost” and “Pneumatology.” It is the same study but going to a different depth. Just as one does college before seminary, it is necessary, in pneumatology, to start with a sound Biblical doctrine of the Holy Ghost. The late Dr. Cambron, a theology professor and dean at Tennessee Temple Bible College and Seminary founded by Dr. Lee Roberson, will supply the thorough Bible doctrine for this pneumatology. Dr. Roberson was a framer of the Independent Baptist movement. At the Bible doctrine level he establishes a firm foundation from which other insights are herein constructed.

Three areas of concern should be kept in focus during this effort. Satan, that masterful deceiver, would be well pleased if the Holy Spirit of God was not understood to be a person of the Godhead. If the Holy Ghost was just an influence of God, and not a person of the Godhead, then a wedge of ignorance could keep man from a full and complete knowledge of the trinity of God. Man's iniquity causes him to be very pliable to Satan's deceptions, so much so, that the rational mind of man will take a little deception further than it is initially want to go. The idea that the Holy Ghost is not a person, but just the power of God, found its strongest defense (and could it be said its strongest “rationalism”) in German Rationalism. Ergo every Biblical study of the Holy Ghost will, of necessity, emphasize that the Holy Ghost is a genuine person of the Godhead.

When the trinity and the person of the Holy Ghost are settled in doctrine, Satan is all too eager to mislead in other avenues. Man began developing an un-Biblical doctrine concerning the methods and purpose of the person of the Holy Ghost. It became widespread when the Holiness and Pentecostal movement turned into the Charismatic-Tongues movement. This movement put an untoward emphasis on the

“spirit” and began to allow the “spirit” to serve as its final authority, rather than the Holy Bible serving as the final authority. Within the movement, the “filling of the spirit” began to represent the manifestation of the presence of God, rather than the only begotten Son of God being the sole manifestation of God.

Recall that the Holy Spirit of God “shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak” (John 16:13). All the speaking and all the truth was to come solely from the WORD. When the “spirit” leads followers to disobey the commands of Christ, recorded in the WORD of God, red flags should appear. In light of these areas, more might be said about the role of the Holy Ghost.

The role of the Holy Ghost has not changed from what Jesus outlined so systematically in John 16. There are movements afoot in the last hundred years which have departed from this clear Bible mandate, and consequently this untoward understanding of the role and operation of the Holy Ghost has misled many. The Holiness movement, in putting its major emphasis on the Pentecostal tongues experience took a lead role in misrepresenting the role of the Holy Ghost. Therein they announced a new theme, “Don't let doctrine divide us, let the spirit unite us.” This “unifying spirit” which downplays Bible doctrine and defies Scripture, i.e. Scripture which according to 2 Timothy 3, “is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works,” is intended to unify all the “Christian Faiths and Denominations” into one unified movement. Such is not a function of the Holy Ghost, but it is the primary function of the “spirit” eluded to in the Pentecostal movement, the Charismatic movement, the “Signs and Wonders” movement, and their myriad of offshoots. These offshoots include the “Promise Keepers” and the “Purpose Driven” extensions of the Pentecostals. The role of the Spirit of God is to lead into truth and magnify the Lord Jesus Christ, not to lead into unity and magnify Benny Hinn<sup>148</sup>, or Rick Warren.<sup>149</sup>

---

148 "Benny" Hinn (born December 3, 1952) is a televangelist, best known for his regular "Miracle Crusades"—revival meeting or faith healing summits that are usually held in stadiums in major cities, which are later broadcast worldwide on his television program, This Is Your Day. From [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benny\\_Hinn](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benny_Hinn) accessed 12/11/2014

149 The trademarked term “purpose driven” comes from the teaching of Rick Warren,

The uniting of Pentecostals and Roman Catholics is characterized very well in an article titled “Pope and Cope extend Hope for Catholic/Charismatic union” which states:

Pope to Copeland: Catholics and Charismatics must spiritually unite. We are galloping toward a one-world melding of religions, and the ramifications are staggering. Pope Francis has now sent a video message to Word of Faith father Kenneth Copeland, urging a reconciliation between Catholics and Charismatics.

“The Catholic and Charismatic Renewal is the hope of the Church,” exclaims Anglican Episcopal Bishop Tony Palmer, before a group of cheering followers at the Kenneth Copeland Ministries. (Palmer was killed in an accident shortly after this story was published) Palmer said those words are from the Vatican. Before playing the video message from Pope Francis to Kenneth Copeland, Palmer told the crowd, “When my wife saw that she could be Catholic, and Charismatic, and Evangelical, and Pentecostal, and it was absolutely accepted in the Catholic Church, she said that she would like to reconnect her roots with the Catholic culture. So she did.”

The crowd cheered, as he continued, “Brothers and sisters, Luther’s protest is over. Is yours?”

Even Kenneth Copeland finds this development incredible: Said Copeland, “Heaven is thrilled over this... You know what is so thrilling to me? When we went into the ministry 47 years ago, this was impossible.”<sup>150</sup>

With these backdrops in place, the person of the Holy Ghost, the purpose of the Holy Ghost and the methods of the Holy Ghost can be

---

senior pastor of Saddleback Church in Lake Forest, California. It originally came into use as a paradigm taught to pastors and other Christian leaders. This teaching is embodied in Warren’s best-selling book, *The Purpose Driven Church*, first published in 1995. From [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Purpose\\_Driven](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Purpose_Driven) accessed 12/11/2014

<sup>150</sup>From <http://standupforthetruth.com/2014/02/pope-to-copeland-catholics-and-charismatics-must-spiritually-unite/> accessed 01/22/15

more carefully detailed in a proper pneumatology. These errors about the role of the Holy Ghost will be examined more fully after careful examination of the doctrine of pneumatology. The precision of the King's English should be further examined before Dr. Cambron's documentation of sound doctrine is delineated.

## **The Holy Ghost vs The Holy Spirit of God**

In proper English, the word “ghost” is synonymous with “spirit” and it is used when the Person of the Spirit is referenced as the direct object of a sentence. It is not used in the possessive forms of the title. This represents a careful precision in the use of English form and that care best captures the exactness of God's wordings in the Bible's original languages. The modernist bible versions, translated from Westcott and Hort's critical texts, desired to steer away from this exacting use of the English language, preferring to “dummy down” the language and fit it into the modern vulgar English,... where they can secure lucrative copyrights. They were successful, and consequentially no modernist bible translation uses the proper English term “Holy Ghost.” In fact, in an effort to promote their copyright ventures they actually malign the more exacting English used in the King James Bible. Their modernized English, they say, makes their bible easier to understand, but it makes these modern versions much less exact. This author and this effort take great strides to trust exclusively in the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God, thus relying on the most exacting translation into the English language. Would to God that every theologian did.

Such exactness, and staunch reliance on the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God, is not found in any modernist version. Each uses Westcott and Hort's critical text as its basis. These Bible critics did not hold to Scripture's inerrancy. Each modern English version uses modernist translators that did not hold to Scripture's inerrancy or even its inspiration, supposing only original autographs were inspired. Moreover, each uses modern English which cannot capture the exacting genders, plurals, and singulars of Greek and Hebrew. The careful constructs of the King James English, the “thee”s and “thou”s, as it were, are necessary for the containment of verbal inspiration. Such care is only found in the King James Bible called the Authorized Bible. The slovenly translated, modernist, critical,

ecumenical, copyright bibles are not used in this effort, and should not be used in any serious theology effort. Examine for a moment the careful use of the title “Holy Ghost.”

Of the 93 New Testament uses of Greek *αγιος πνευμα* (*hagios pneuma*) there are eighty-nine<sup>151</sup> translated “Holy Ghost” and only four times was it translated “Holy Spirit,” Lu 11:13, Eph 1:13, Eph 4:30, and 1Th 4:8. That is no accident or coincidence. When God's words are exact, an English translation should be kept as exacting as possible.

Whether or not you become comfortable in carefully using the title “Holy Ghost” for all your direct object usages, be assured that the exactness of the King James English in this regard was carefully crafted. Many mistakenly think that the words of the Holy Bible were fit into the common English of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Not so. In actuality, the common English language was crafted by the translators to capture the exactness of God's wording in the original languages. This fact is fully developed in the section titled “Bibliology” of this effort. Ergo God's Word modified the common English usage, rather than allowing the common English usages to modify the exactness of God's wordings.

This exactness is most visible in the use of “thee,” “thou,” and “thine” to indicate the singular second person, and “you,” and “your” to indicate the plural second person. These constructs were forced into the common English language by their reverent use in Bible translation where the Greek and Hebrew were just that exacting as to singular and plural usages. Thus, in truth, the Bible translation from very exacting written Greek and Hebrew drove the development of the King's English to approach their exactness. Thus, we find the use of the title “Holy Ghost” in all the direct object reference to the Holy Spirit of God, and the use of the title “Holy Spirit” in the four references where the title is used in the possessive or descriptive usage. One would properly say “the Holy Spirit of God” or “his Holy Spirit” in these possessive usages. Moreover, one would properly say, “found with child of the Holy Ghost” in a direct object usage of the title.

---

151 Mt 1:18,20 3:11 12:31,32 28:19, Mr 1:8 3:29 12:36 13:11, Lu 1:15,35,41,67  
2:25,26 3:16,22 4:1 12:10,12, Joh 1:33 7:39 14:26 20:22, Ac 1:2,5,8,16 2:4,33,38  
4:8,31 5:3,32 6:3,5 7:51,55 8:15,17, Ac 8:18,19 9:17,31 10:38,44,45,47  
11:15,16,24 13:2,4,9,52 15:8, Ac 15:28 16:6 19:2,6 20:23,28 21:11 28:25, Ro 5:5  
9:1 14:17 15:13,16, 1Co 2:13 6:19 12:3, 2Co 6:6 13:14, 1Th 1:5,6, 2Ti 1:14, Tit  
3:5, Heb 2:4 3:7 6:4 9:8 10:15, 1Pe 1:12, 2Pe 1:21, 1Jo 5:7, Jude 1:20

These are the same rules implanted in you when you learned not to say, “Give I the ball, me want it back.” Most of us never learned the rules about subject, direct object, indirect object, and possessive forms before we learned to communicate properly. Don't let modernist translators, trying to “dummy down” the words of God, throw you a curve about the title of the Holy Ghost or the giving of His Holy Spirit. They have erred, not knowing exacting English, preferring to move the Words of God down to the modern common language, rather than moving the modern guttural English up to the language of God as found in the Greek and Hebrew. For reference, below are the four uses of the title “Holy Spirit” as properly used in the King James Bible.

1) Lu 11:13 “If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the **Holy Spirit** ( αγιος πνευμα ) to them that ask him?” (Note that it is not the whole person but a portion that is given)

2) Eph 1:13 “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that **holy Spirit** ( αγιος πνευμα ) of promise.” (Never is it translated “that holy Ghost” coming after a pronoun.)

3) Eph 4:30 “And grieve not the **holy Spirit** ( αγιος πνευμα ) of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.” (Never is the possessive form translated “the holy Ghost of...”)

4) 1Th 4:8 “He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his **holy Spirit** ( αγιος πνευμα ).” (Never is the possessive form translated “his holy Ghost.”)

Doubtless, the exacting nature of the forms for subjects, objects, and possessives is not this authors forte. It was, however the forte of the 57 linguistic experts who took 7 years to translate the King James Bible into an exacting and unparalleled English rendition of God's Word. These linguists took God's Wordings and framed the King's English into an exacting language. Those who would malign their great care in order to sell a copyright version which has no such exactness should always be kept at bay.

In the Old Testament Hebrew text the title is never translated “Holy Ghost” it is always translated “Holy Spirit,” but alas, it is for the same reason. In Ps 51:11 it is referenced to “Thy Holy Spirit,” in a



possessive form. And in Isa 63:10 and 11, it is referencing “His Holy Spirit,” likewise in the possessive. When in the possessive, proper English would not use “Holy Ghost,” it is properly rendered “Holy Spirit.” “Holy Ghost” is used to speak of the person in the most direct sense. When God's words are exact, an English translation should be kept as exacting as possible. This is minutia to some. Nevertheless, the point is critical; ecumenical modernists market the departure from the Old English as making their bible more readable. The marketers mock the use of the word “Ghost” in this context. Such marketers are in error.

### **The “Comforter” Is The Best English Word**

Jesus carefully used the Greek word παρακλητος (*parakletos*) on purpose four times<sup>152</sup>. On those four occasions the word is carefully and meticulously translated “Comforter.” Therein fifty-seven of the greatest linguists ever assembled for a seven year task of translating every word of God from the original languages into English<sup>153</sup>, determined that there was no better word to capture that Greek word's full meaning in Christ's context. Its fifth use in 1John 2:1 is translated “*advocate*” by those same linguistic experts. Bible critics, seeking to discredit the Authorized Version and sell their “*improved*” copyright version have been moved by copyright law to use a different word than “Comforter,” but the change is not otherwise warranted.

There should be little tolerance for the modernists who think they could outperform those fifty-seven linguists who finished their task in A.D. 1611. They suppose that “*comforter*” is not the right word. Even some “*fundamentalists*” have jumped into this fray. Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, founder of Dallas Theological Seminary, accuses these fifty-seven of turning from the work of translation into the “way of misleading interpretations.”<sup>154</sup> This is a powerful and even libelous accusation. There is no justification for this libel and Dr. Chafer offers no better translation, but supposes that a “*transliteration*” would be better. He thus supposes that, “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another *Paraklete*,” as a transliteration of the Greek term, is

152 John 14:16, 26, 15:26, 16:7

153 D. A. Waite, “*Defending the King James Bible*”, The Bible For Today Press, 1992, 67.

154 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 5, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1948, 38.

the better translation.

Transliteration is indeed a tool used in the Authorized Version. To “*baptize*” is a good example. There was no English equivalent for “completely immersing one into or under” and so the Greek word was transliterated and added to the English language. “For John truly *baptized* with water; but ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost not many days hence” (Acts 1:5). The fifty-seven accomplished linguists had authority from the King of England to modify, enhance, and extend the English language in order to accommodate their translation task. They wisely chose not to transliterate the Greek word, *Paraclete* (παράκλητος), and critical modernist striving for an ecumenical bible are ill-advised to reverse that decision.

The linguists translating the Authorized Bible chose to stretch the envelope of a current English word around the Greek word that Christ used for the coming Holy Spirit of God. Again, this is not unprecedented. The Greek word *ἐκκλησία* (*ekklesia*) might have been transliterated, but instead the English word “Church” meaning “the Lord's house,” was taken and stretched to mean “the called out and assembled together body of believers belonging to Christ.” There can be latent confusion in stretching a word's envelope; some people still think Church has something to do with a building.

Rather than second-guess the fifty-seven linguists, it is better to comprehend and cooperate with their intent. The translation “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another **Comforter** (παράκλητος), that he may abide with you for ever;” uses the best English word available, but the envelope of that word needs to be extended enough to realize that “comforting” must needs be multifaceted. There is the act of consoling in the word, but there is also the act of identifying with our best interest, the act of becoming our representative, the act of leading us along, and the act of going with us hand-in-hand. The word chosen here, “comforter,” is not restrictive of any of these functions, and each of these functions is carefully explained in the context of its use.

The Authorized Bible's English has become the platform where an English reader with no Greek learning could rightly extend the envelope of this word because of the functionality of its context. “But the Comforter (παράκλητος), which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father

will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:26). And again, “But when the Comforter ( παρακλατος ) is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me”(15:26). The Greek scholars give themselves far too much credit for interpreting the word “Paraclete” for us when, the role of the “Comforter” is perfectly captured in the context which Christ gives. The entire role of the Holy Ghost is not captured in the word “Comforter,” neither is it intended to be. It is, however, captured in the Holy Scriptures, as it is intended to be.

There are many Greek and Hebrew words that have levels of understanding and depth of meaning that cannot be contained in one English word. The fine art of translation involves capturing those words in an English equivalent. This word, “Comforter” has captured this Greek word “Parakletos,” ( παρακλατος ) with the best English word for this context. Ecumenical marketers of copyright bibles must set aside their integrity to attack its use.

With this much of a defense against the critics of Holy Scriptures, let us examine more fully the doctrine to the Holy Ghost. Such a defined Biblical doctrine needs to be the foundation for the furtherance of pneumatology.

## **Chapter 2 Cambron's Doctrine of the Holy Ghost (Pneumatology)**

Dr. Mark G. Cambron (1911-2000) rapidly became a foremost theologian after his salvation in a Billy Sunday campaign in Chattanooga, Tennessee in 1919. He served from 1948 – 1959 as theology professor and dean at Tennessee Temple College. From 1962 – 1977 he was co-founder and president of Florida Bible College, but during his tenure at Tennessee Temple he published his 300 page “*Bible Doctrines, Beliefs That Matter*”<sup>155</sup>. His strong stance on the Bible as the infallible, inerrant, verbally inspired Word of God, and its use as the sole authority for all doctrine, causes that Dr. Cambron's work is used

---

<sup>155</sup> Mark G. Cambron, “*Bible Doctrines*”, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1954.

without revision in this section of pneumatology. On this subject the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. It is given in the block quote below:[block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 117-151, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 89-113] Dr. Cambron writes:

## Chapter 3

Pneumatology - The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit 88

### PNEUMATOLOGY

(The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit) 89

#### OUTLINE FOR CHAPTER III

##### PNEUMATOLOGY

##### I. The Personality of the Holy Spirit.

- A. Personal Property.
- B. Personal Pronouns.
- C. Personal Acts.
- D. Personal Reactions.
- E. Personal Relationships.
- F. Personal Designations.

##### II. The Deity of the Holy Spirit.

- A. He Is Identified as the Old Testament Deity.
- B. He Is Called God.
- C. He Possesses Divine Attributes.
- D. He Performs the Works of God.
- E. He Exercises the Sovereignty of God.
- F. He Is to Be Recognized as God.
- G. He Is to Be Depended Upon as God.
- H. He, God, Can Be Sinned Against.

##### III. The Work of the Holy Spirit.

- A. As Set Forth in the Old Testament.
- B. As Set Forth in the New Testament.

pg90

#### *Chapter III*

#### PNEUMATOLOGY

Pneumatology is derived from the Greek word *pneuma*, meaning spirit, wind, or breath. Thus, pneumatology is the doctrine of the Spirit,

or breath of God: the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of the Holy Spirit is indeed a Bible doctrine. The Bible is the only source from whence we can secure any information concerning Him. The Christian religion alone has the Holy Spirit.

As we study the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, let us keep in mind that *Christ* is the center of the Book, the theme of the entire secret writings. If we put someone in His place, confusion will result. The Holy Spirit cannot displace the Son of God. The Holy Spirit did not come to speak of (or from) Himself, but of Christ. One who speaks continually about the Spirit and omits the Son shows evidence that he really does not have the Spirit.

### **I. Personality of the Holy Spirit**

Here is one word of caution: Do not call the Holy Spirit “It.” We sometimes confuse personality with visibility. Personality is not an attribute of a body; it is the attribute of a spirit. You yourself have never been seen; you are not a body, but a spirit having a body.

#### *A. Personal Property.*

1. *He Possesses Intelligence.* “To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit” (I Cor. 12:8). See also Isaiah 11:2, 3; Nehemiah 9:20; I Peter 1:11; II Peter 1:21; I Corinthians 2:10, 11.

2. *He Possesses a Will.* “All these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will” (I Cor. 12:11).

3. *He Possesses Power.* “Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost. . . . through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; so that from Jerusalem, and round about Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ” (Rom. 15:13, 19). See also Zechariah 4:6; Isaiah 11:2; Ephesians 3:16.

[pg91]

4. *He Possesses Knowledge.* “God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit

which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God” (I Cor. 2:10-12).

5. *He Possesses Love.* “Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me” (Rom. 15:30).

*B. Personal Pronouns.*

The personal name of the Holy Spirit is unknown. The title “Holy Spirit” is a designation — what He is; it is not His name. The silence of the Scriptures concerning His personal name is very significant. He withholds His own name, that the name of the Lord Jesus Christ may be exalted. The title “Holy Spirit” is a neuter noun in the Greek, but whenever a pronoun is in its place, the pronoun used is always masculine. “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that *he* may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth *him* not, neither knoweth *him*: but ye know *him*; for *he* dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. . . . But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, *whom* the Father will send in my name, *he* shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:16, 17, 26). See also John 16:7, 8, 13-15; Romans 8:16, 26, R.V.<sup>156</sup>

*C. Personal Acts.*

Why do we act like human beings? Because we are human. Why does the Holy Spirit act like a person? Because He is a person.

1. *He Speaks.* “As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them” (Acts 13:2).

2. *He Intercedes.* “Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered” (Rom. 8:26).

3. *He Testifies.* “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth

---

156 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26).

4. *He Commands*. “Now when they had gone through Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not” (Acts 16:6, 7). [pg92]

5. *He Oversees*. “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28).

6. *He Guides*. “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come” (John 16:13).

7. *He Teaches*. “The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you” (John 14:26).

#### *D. Personal Reactions.*

Acts can be committed against the Spirit that can only be committed against a person. The Holy Spirit has feelings.

1. *He May Be Grieved*. “Grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30).

2. *He May Be Vexed*. “They rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them” (Is. 63:10).

3. *He May Be Tested*. “Then Peter said unto her, how is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? behold the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out” (Acts 5:9).

4. *He May Be Resisted*. “Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcized in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye” (Acts 7:51).

5. *He May Be Blasphemed*. “He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation: because they said, He hath an unclean spirit” (Mark 3:29, 30).

#### *E. Personal Relationships.*

1. *With the Father.* “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 28:19).

2. *With Christ.* “He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you” (John 16:14).

3. *With the Christians.* “It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things” (Acts 15:28). [pg93]

#### *F. Personal Designations.*

1. *The Name Paraclete.* This is the Greek word meaning Comforter: one who is called to help. “When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me” (John 15:26).

#### *2. Other Specifications.*

a. *Spirit of Promise.* “After that ye believed [in Christ], ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise” (Eph. 1:13).

b. *Spirit of Might.* “The spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, and the spirit of wisdom and understanding. the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD” (Is. 11:2).

c. *Spirit of Truth.* “He shall give you another Comforter... even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you” (John 14:16, 17).

## **II. The Deity of the Holy Spirit**

He is a divine person. He is God! He is co-equal, co-eternal, co-existent with the Father and the Son. However, He is designated as the third person of the Trinity. In our own lives, there may be persons who are equal in station, but in position they are subordinate to others. It is the same with the Holy Spirit. As a Being, He is equal with the Father and the Son, but in position He is subordinate to the Father and gives precedence to the Son. Take note: there is no jealousy in the Godhead!

#### *A. He Is Identified as the Old Testament Deity.*

Jesus of the New Testament is Jehovah of the Old Testament; the Holy Spirit of the New Testament is the Jehovah of the Old Testament. “This shall be the covenant that I shall make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward



parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people” (Jer. 31:33). “By one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts and in their minds will I write them” (Heb. 10:14, 15, 16).

*B. He Is Called God.*

1. *In Acts 5:3, 4.* “Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.” Ananias and Sapphira died instantly for lying unto the Holy Spirit. They lied in the time of consecration. They were not struck dead because of withholding their money, but because they claimed to have given it all. They lied unto the Church, thus to the Holy Ghost. [pg94]

2. *In I Corinthians 3:16.* “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.” We are the temple of God because the Spirit dwells within.

3. *In II Corinthians 3:17, R.V.*<sup>157</sup> “Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”

*C. He Possesses Divine Attributes.*

1. *Omnipotence.* “The angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35).

2. *Omniscience.* “The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God” (I Cor. 2:10). See also Luke 2:25-32.

3. *Omnipresence.* “Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me” (Ps. 139:7-10).

4. *Everlastingness.* “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (Heb.

---

157 Ibid.

9:14).

5. *Love*. “Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me” (Rom. 15:30).

6. *Holiness*. “Grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30).

*D. He Performs the Works of God.*

1. *Creation*. “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” (Gen. 1:1,2). “Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth” (Ps. 104:30). “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life” (Job 33:4).

2. *Regeneration*. “Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God . . . Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I say unto thee, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell <sup>[pg95]</sup> whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit” (John 3:3,5-8).

3. *Resurrection*. “If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom. 8:11).

4. *Transformation*. “If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness” (Rom. 8:10).

5. *Salvation*. “Ye are washed . . . ye are sanctified . . . ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God” (I Cor. 6:11).

*E. He Exercises the Sovereignty of God.*

“All these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will” (I Cor. 12:11). See also Zechariah 4:6.

*F. He Is to Be Recognized as God.*

1. *As Set Forth in the Great Commission*. “Jesus came and spake

unto them saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen” (Matt. 28:18-20).

2. *As Set Forth in the Apostolic Benediction.* “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen” (II Cor. 13:14).

3. *As Set Forth by Scriptural Designation.* “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches” (Rev. 3:22).

4. *As Set Forth in the Church’s Administration.* “Now there are diversities of gifts but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all” (I Cor. 12:4-6).

*G. He Is to Be Depended Upon as God.*

“When they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate: but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost” (Mark 13:11). See also Romans 8:26.

[pg96]

*H. He, God, Can Be Sinned Against.*

“Peter said, Ananias, why hast Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God” (Acts 5:3, 4).

### **III. The Work of the Holy Spirit**

*A. As Set Forth in the Old Testament.*

Someone has said that the Holy Spirit is mentioned eighty- eight times in the Old Testament. However, the teaching of the Holy Spirit is not as clear in the Old Testament as it is in the New.

1. *His Manifestations.*

a. *As Coming Upon Men.* “Balaam lifted up his eyes, and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes; and the spirit of God came upon him” (Num. 24:2). “Then the Spirit of the LORD came upon Jephthah, and he passed over Gilead, and Manasseh, and passed over

Mizpeh of Gilead, and from Mizpeh of Gilead he passed over unto the children of Ammon” (Judg. 11:29). See also Judges 3:10; 14:6.

b. *As Clothing Men*. “The Spirit of Jehovah came upon [Hebrew — *clothed itself with*] Gideon; and he blew a trumpet; and Abiezer was gathered together after him” (Judg. 6:34). See also II Chronicles 24:20.

c. *As Poured Out Upon Men*. “Upon the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers . . . until the spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest” (Is. 32: 13, 15).

d. *As Filling Men*. “I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship” (Ex. 31:3). See also Micah 3:8.

e. *As Resting Upon Men*. “The LORD came down in a cloud, and spake unto him, and took of the spirit that was upon him, and gave it unto the seventy elders: and it came to pass, that when the spirit rested upon them they prophesied, and did not cease” (Num. 11:25). See also Numbers 11:26; Isaiah 11:2.

The Holy Spirit is never represented as indwelling the believer. The Holy Spirit filled them, but never took his abode within them.

No Old Testament saint was ever baptized with the Holy Ghost. That initial baptism came at Pentecost, fifty days after Christ arose from the dead.

## 2. *His Ministration.*

### a. *In Relation to Creation.*

#### (1) *Generation.*

(a) *Of Heavens and Earth*. “By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. He gathered the waters of the sea [pg97] together as an heap: he layeth up the deep in storehouses. Let all the earth fear the LORD: let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him. For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast” (Ps. 33:6-9). See also Job 26:13.

(b) *Of Animals*. “O LORD, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all: the earth is full of thy riches. . . . Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth” (Ps. 104: 24, 30).

(c) *Of Man*. “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the almighty hath given me life” (Job 33:4). See also Genesis 1:26, 27;

2:7.

(2) *Regeneration.*

(a) *Of the Fallen Earth.* “The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters” (Gen. 1:2b)<sup>158</sup>.

(b) *Of Fallen Man.* “Then said he unto me, Prophesy unto the wind, prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord God; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. So I prophesied as he commanded me, and the breath came into them, and they lived and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army” (Ezek. 37:9, 10). See also Isaiah 55:3.

(3) *Preservation.*

a. “Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth” (Ps.104:30).

b. *In Relation to Satan.* From the beginning the Holy Spirit has been the antagonist of Satan. “The LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years” (Gen. 6:3).

c. *In Relation to Israel.*

(1) *Her Fathers* (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob etc.). “Pharaoh said unto his servants, Can we find such a one as this is, a man in whom the Spirit of God is?” (Gen. 41:38).

(2) *Her Founders* (Moses and his helpers). “The LORD said unto Moses, Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there: and I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone” (Num.11:16, 17). See also Numbers 27:18, 19; Deuteronomy 34:9; Nehemiah 9:20.

(3) *Her Judges.* “The Spirit of the LORD came upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war” (Judg. 3: 10a).

---

158 Dr. Cambron makes this reference to “The Fallen Earth” as if he held to the GAP theory devised in the nineteen hundreds in an attempt to correct the Bible because rocks are obviously millions of years old and the Bible needs correction to keep up with “science.” Once they force-fit a gap into Genesis 1 they crammed it full of some pre-earth creature that messed up and fell into destruction and death before the garden of Eden was created. Such foolishness needs a “Fallen Earth” scenario, The Bible does not.

(4) *Her Kings*. Saul: “The Spirit of God came upon Saul when he heard those tidings, and his anger was kindled greatly” (I Sam. 11:6). See also I Samuel 6:14 — an evil spirit was sent by God as judgment upon Saul.

David: “Then Samuel took the horn of oil and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the LORD came upon David from that day forward. So Samuel rose up, and went to Ramah” (I Sam. 16:1:3). See also Psalms 51:11, 12; 143:10.

(5) *Her Priests*. “The Spirit of God came upon Zechariah the son of Jehoiada the priest, which stood above the people” (II Chron. 24:20a).

(6) *Her Prophets*. “Yea, they made their heart as an adamant stone, lest they should hear the law, and the words which the LORD of hosts hath sent in his spirit by the former prophets: therefore came a great wrath from the Lord of hosts” (Zech. 7:12). See also Nehemiah 9:30; Ezekiel 2:2; Daniel 5:1-14; Micah 3:8. [pg98]

(7) *Her Sanctuary*.

(a) *The Tabernacle*. Nothing was left to human wisdom; it was not made by the natural ability of man. “He hath filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship” (Ex. 35:31). See also Exodus 28:3; 31:1-5.

(b) *The Temple*, “Then David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of the porch and of the houses thereof, and of the treasuries thereof, and of the upper chambers thereof, and of the inner parlours thereof, and of the place of the mercy seat, and the pattern of all that he had by the spirit, of the courts of the house of the LORD, and of all the chambers round about, of the treasuries of the house of God, and of the treasuries of the dedicated things” (I Chron. 28:11, 12).

d. *In Relation to Messiah*. “The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn” (Is. 61:1, 2). See also Isaiah 11:2.

e. *In Relation to the Millennium*. “It shall come to pass afterward that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your

daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants, and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit” (Joel 2:28, 29). “Afterward” means after Israel’s restoration. See also Ezekiel 36:25-28 37:14.

f. *In Relation to Inspiration.* “Now these be the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue” (II Sam. 23:1, 2). See also Numbers 24:2; Acts 1:16; 4:25; I Peter 1:10-12; II Peter 1:21; II Timothy 3:16, 17.

B. *As Set Forth in the New Testament.*

1. *The Holy Spirit and Christ.*

a. *Reference to His Work in the Old Dispensation.*

(1) *In Preaching.* “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water” (I Peter 3:18- 20). This passage of Scripture has been used by several cults, which teach that God gives man a second chance beyond death. They interpret this portion of the Word as follows: Christ, between His crucifixion and resurrection, went to Hades and offered salvation to the wicked dead. If they believed in Him then, they were saved.

We know that the above theory is not true, for, “It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment” (Heb. 9:27). No second chance here. The correct interpretation is that Christ, by the Holy Spirit in Noah, preached the Gospel to the people, warning them of world judgment. They refused the message; they died in the flood; thus, their spirits are now in prison, waiting for the last resurrection. [pg99]

(2) *In Prophecy.* “The prophets have searched diligently . . . what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow” (I Peter 1:10, 11).

(3) *In Type.* The Tabernacle is a type of Christ. Everything about it reveals the Saviour, And it was the Holy Spirit who endowed men to

build the Tabernacle. “See, I have called by name Bezaleel the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah: and I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting of stones, to set them, and in carving of timber, to work in all manner of workmanship. And I, behold, I have given with him Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan: and in the hearts of all that are wisehearted I have put wisdom, that they may make all that I have commanded thee” (Ex. 31:2-6).

b. *Reference to His Work in His Earthly Manifestation.*

(1) *The Birth of Christ.* “The angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). *Never* in Scripture do we find that Jesus is declared to be the Son of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit produced the body, sinless; “a body hast thou prepared me” (Heb. 10:5c), not the Person.

(2) *The Baptism of Christ.* “Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased” (Luke 3:21, 22). See also Mark 1:10, 11; John 1:32, 34.

(3) *The Testing of Christ.* “Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, being forty days tempted of the devil” (Luke 4:1, 2a). See also Matthew 4:1; Mark 1:12.

(4) *The Anointing of Christ.* “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him” (Acts 10:38). See also Luke 4:16-21.

(5) *The Teaching of Christ.* “He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for he giveth not the Spirit by measure” (John 3:34, R.V.<sup>159</sup>).

(6) *The Miracles of Christ.* “If I cast out devils by the Spirit of

---

159 Ibid.



God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you” (Matt. 12:28).

(7) *The Life of Christ*. “Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness” (Luke 4:1). See also Luke 10:21, R.V.<sup>160</sup>; Hebrews 9:14.

(8) *The Death of Christ*. “How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” (Heb. 9:14).

(9) *The Resurrection of Christ*. “If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you” (Rom. 8:11).

(10) *The Pre-ascension Commands of Christ*. Luke tells us that in his Gospel he wrote “of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles [pg100] whom he had chosen” (Acts 1:1,2). See also Acts 1:8.

c. *Reference to His Work During This Dispensation*.

(1) *He Glorifies Christ*. “He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you” (John 16:14).

(2) *He Witnesses to Christ*. “The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him” (Acts 5:30-32).

(3) *He Enthrones Christ*. “I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost” (I Cor. 12:3).

2. *The Holy Spirit and the World*.

a. *Conviction*. “When he is come, he will reprove [convict] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. Of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more: of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged” (John 16:8-11).

(1) *Of Sin*. It is not the business of the Holy Spirit to convict the

---

160 Ibid.

world of murder, adultery, etc; the law of the land does this. The Holy Spirit convicts the world of *unbelief*: “because they believe not on me” (John 16:9). Many times we get the word “convict” confused by thinking that it means to feel guilty; but that is not the meaning at all. “Convict” means to be found guilty as charged. The sinner has already been found guilty of sin — unbelief — whether he feels it or not. Yes, the sinner is already convicted, condemned, and waiting to be sentenced. “He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned *already*, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. . . . the wrath of God abideth upon him” (John 3:18, 36c). The Great White Throne is not the place to determine the guilt of the sinner (to convict him as a sinner), but the place to sentence him to the degree of punishment which his works merit.

(2) *Of Righteousness*. In what manner does the Spirit convict the world of righteousness? The Holy Spirit does not convict the world of the righteousness it has, but convicts the world where righteousness is — in Christ: “because I go to my Father” (John 16:10).

(3) *Of Judgment*. If the world rejects Christ, there is nothing left but judgment. “Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). The world’s conception of future judgment is confusing. Man has one false idea after another. Yet these universal beliefs, however wrong they may be, are proof positive that there is a time when man must give an account of himself unto God. The Bible is the only true source of the Great White Throne judgment.

b. *Regeneration*. “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new” (II Cor. 5:17). See also John 3:5. Man may lower the bars, thinking he can become a child of God another way, but God does not. He still requires that you must be born again. [pg101]

c. *Hindrances of Evil*. “The mystery of iniquity does already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way” (II Thess. 2:7). Lawless-ness will one of these days be headed up in one man, the Antichrist. There is a Person in the world who keeps sin from taking full sway even today; and that person is the Holy Spirit. During the Great Tribulation, when the Antichrist is revealed, the Holy Spirit

shall step aside, taking His constraining hand off of sinful man, allowing him to plunge unto the depths of degradation.

3. *The Holy Spirit and the Church.* See Ephesians 1:22, 23; 2:12-16; 3:4-16.

a. *The Holy Spirit Constitutes the Church.* The Spirit's baptism is the operation by which the Church is constituted. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one spirit" (I Cor. 12:13).

There are seven references to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Five are prophetic (Matt. 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5); one historic (Acts 11:16); and one didactic (I Cor. 12:13). In the five prophetic Scriptures, we find that two speak of the baptism of the Spirit, and of fire. The baptism of the Spirit, and of fire, are not the same. The baptism of the Spirit speaks of the formation of the Church, while baptism of fire speaks of judgment. Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16 are those passages which speak of the baptism of fire. It was in these Scriptures that Christ was addressing His messages to saved people and to "vipers" (unbelievers). Mark's and John's accounts include no "baptism of fire," for they are not addressed to "vipers."

All five prophetic portions point to the future; the one historic passage looks back; therefore, the baptism of the Spirit comes in between the two. This is Pentecost.

The baptism of the Holy Spirit was not that endowment of power which enabled the apostles to do miracles, for they performed miracles before they were baptized with the Spirit. The Church is an organism, not an organization, and the baptism of the Spirit is that act of God which unites believers into that organism. Whenever the words "baptism of the Spirit" are used, they are always applied collectively, to a group, never to an individual. When were "we" and the Corinthians (I Cor. 12:13) baptized with the Spirit? At Pentecost, once and for all. When one receives Christ, he is sealed in Christ with the Spirit. "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13). He receives the baptism of the Spirit at the same time also.

As far as *God* is concerned, there is only *one* Calvary, and there is

only *one* Pentecost. The sinner, however, must appropriate Calvary by faith, and he must acknowledge Pentecost by faith, to make both a reality to his own soul. This takes place immediately upon his acceptance of Christ as his Lord and Saviour.

We would like to give an explanation of the following verse, inasmuch as many use it for the above argument: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism” (Eph. 4:5). This does not speak of the Spirit’s baptism, but of water baptism. The preceding verse explains the Spirit’s <sup>[pg102]</sup> baptism: “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling” (Eph. 4:4). That one body is constituted by the baptism of the Spirit.

Pentecost always came fifty days after the Feast of Firstfruits. The Feast of Firstfruits was a type of the resurrection of Christ. The second chapter of Acts records the account of the hundred and twenty disciples in the upper room waiting for the fifty days to expire. The Holy Spirit did not come in answer to their prayer, for all of their prayers and fasting would not have hastened His coming. He came on time. It is inconceivable to think of the Spirit coming forty-nine, or even fifty-one days after His resurrection. He came on time — *fifty* days after the resurrection.

The Holy Spirit would have come had they not prayed. They would have been baptized and indwelt by the Spirit had they not prayed, but they would not have received power; they would not have been filled with the Spirit had they not prayed. More will be said about the filling of the Spirit later.

The Feast of Passover was fulfilled at Calvary. Christ will never die again. The Feast of Pentecost was fulfilled by the baptism of the Spirit, and there will be no more Pentecost. There will never be a re-fulfillment of the Passover Lamb, and there will never be a refulfillment of Pentecost.

The original Feast of Pentecost was also known as the Feast of Weeks, when the *harvest* was gathered. In Leviticus 23:22 we read: “When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance of the corners of thy fields when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleanings of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I am the LORD your God.” Thus, we see that the harvest was for three classes:

1. Israel in General.
2. The Poor.
3. Strangers.

All three received blessings of the harvest. The baptism of the Spirit, which was the fulfillment of the Feast of Harvest (Weeks), was for three classes of people: 1. Israel. At Jerusalem (Acts 2:37, 39).

2. Samaritans (the Poor). At Samaria (Acts 8:9-17).

3. Gentiles (Strangers). At Caesarea (Acts 10:34-44).

The following is the process by which the above three classes received the Holy Spirit:

1. The Jews at Jerusalem.

(a) By faith in Christ.

(b) Then by water baptism.

(c) And then by receiving the Holy Spirit. [pg103]

2. The Samaritans at Samaria.

(a) By faith in Christ.

(b) Then by water baptism.

(c) Then by laying on of hands.

(d) Then by receiving the Holy Spirit.

3. The Gentiles at Caesarea.

(a) By faith in Christ.

(b) Then by receiving the Holy Spirit.

(c) Then by water baptism.

There were two operations of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. They must not be confused. The two operations were the “baptism” and the “filling.” The believers were baptized with the Spirit at Pentecost, although the word “baptism” cannot be found in Acts 2. We know that the baptism occurred then, because of the words spoken by the Lord Jesus only a short time before His ascension. “John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence” (Acts 1:5).

There are some who believe that speaking in tongues was a sign of the baptism of the Spirit, but if you look closely, you will notice that they spoke in tongues because they were *filled* with the Spirit. No one was converted while tongues were spoken on the day of Pentecost, but three thousand were saved when Peter preached. Peter declared, “*This is that* which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass

in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy” (Acts 2:16-18). “This is that.” What? The event? The speaking in tongues? No. “This” is a quotation from Joel, and I am quoting him. Peter was giving Joel as an example, for He, God, who will bring to pass those things which Joel has prophesied, has caused these things to happen which you have witnessed.

b. *The Spirit Abides in the Church.* “Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?” (I Cor. 3:16).

c. *The Spirit Builds the Church.* “Ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit” (Eph. 2:22).

d. *The Spirit Administers the Church.*

(1) *He Appoints the Officers.* “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood” (Acts 20:28). See also Acts 6:3, 5, 10.

(2) *He Directs the Work.* “As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them” (Acts 13:2). See also Acts 29; 10:19; 16:7. [pg104]

4. *The Holy Spirit and the Christian.*

a. *Beginning in the Spirit.* “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” (Gal. 3:1-3).

We become Christians by the operation of God alone. A new life is imparted by the Holy Spirit. It is a new birth: “Ye must be born again. . . . That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (John 3:7, 6). God has never fellowshiped with unregenerated men in any dispensation until man received a new nature from Him.

b. *Indwelling of the Spirit.* “What? know ye not that your body is

the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own” (I Cor. 6:19). What assurance does the Christian have of the Spirit’s indwelling? By feeling? By some great ecstasy? No — by the Word of God! The Spirit indwells the believer when he acts upon what Christ has done, when he accepts Christ Jesus by faith. The proof of His indwelling is not based upon feeling, for one’s feelings may change from one day to another. Christ’s work upon Calvary never changes.

“In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not glorified.)” (John 7:37-39). This portion of God’s Word plainly states that the disciples had not as yet received the Holy Spirit, but would in the future — and they did so at Pentecost. Another passage reveals that they were not as yet indwelt by the Spirit until Pentecost: “For he dwelleth *with* you, and shall be *in* you” (John 14: 17c). Before Pentecost, the Spirit was *with* them; after Pentecost, the Spirit was *in* them. No believer is to pray as David did, “Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me” (Ps. 51:11), for David was not indwelt by the Holy Spirit. The Christian is! “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his” (Rom. 8:9).

Still another Scripture which has confused the child of God is Luke 11 13: “If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to them that ask Him?” Some propose that we must ask for the Spirit in order to have him; but remember, this was spoken *before* Pentecost.

We have no place in Scripture which says that one should ask for the Spirit *after* Pentecost. Would the Father have given the Spirit to the disciples *before* Pentecost if they had asked for Him? The Lord Jesus said He would, but the truth is, they did not ask for Him. [pg105]

The last Scripture we shall deal with concerning the indwelling of the Spirit is John 20:22: “And when he had said this, he breathed on

them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.” Many say that at this time the disciples were indwelt by the Holy Spirit, instead of at Pentecost. We know, however, that they did not receive the Holy Spirit at that time, for they were commanded that “they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the holy Ghost not many days hence” (Acts 1:4, 5). Now, if they had already received the Holy Ghost, why were they to wait to receive him?

c. *Sealing of the Holy Spirit.* ‘In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise’ (Eph. 1:13).

“Sealing” is used many times in Scripture.

(1) *The Sealer.* The Sealer is God the Father. “Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts” (II Cor. 1:21, 22).

(2) *The Sealed.* There are two who are sealed by the Father — the Son and believers. “Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give you: for him hath God the Father sealed” (John 6:27). “Grieve not the holy Spirit, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30). The Son was sealed because of who He is. We are sealed because of Jesus and our position in Him. The time of the believer’s sealing is when he accepts Christ as his Saviour: “In whom, having also believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise” (Eph. 1:13, R.V.<sup>161</sup>).

(3) *The Seal.* The Holy Spirit Himself is the seal. The seal is not secured through some emotional experience, but through belief in Christ: “In whom, *having also believed*, ye were sealed with the holy Spirit of promise” (Eph. 1:13, R.V.).

(4) *Signification.*

(a) *The Seal Signifies Ownership.* If we are sealed we have the ownership seal of God upon us. “Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his.

---

161 Ibid.



And, Let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity (II Tim. 2:19).

(b) *The Seal Signifies Identification.* It is our identification for the future. “In whom [Christ] ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory” (Eph. 1:13, 14).

(c) *The Seal Signifies Security.* In Revelation 7:4-8 there are 144,000 sealed. Satan is sealed in the bottomless pit during the Millennium, (Rev. 20:3). The Book of Revelation has seven seals that no man can open (Rev. 6-8). We, the believers, are sealed unto the time of our redemption (Eph. 1:13, 14).

(d) *The Seal Signifies a Finished Transaction.* “I subscribed the evidence, and sealed it, and took witnesses, and weighed him the money in the balances” (Jer. 32: 10). The seal of the Holy Spirit is that legal evidence which testifies to the fact that we have entered into the finished work of Christ. [pg106]

(e) *The Seal Signifies Genuineness.* “He received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also” (Rom. 4:11). See also Esther 3:12.

(f) *The Seal Signifies Unchangeableness.* “Write ye also for the Jews, as it liketh you, in the king’s name, and seal it with the king’s ring: for the writing which is written in the king’s name, and sealed with the king’s ring, may no man reverse” (Esth. 8:8).

(g) *The Seal Signifies Value.* “Is not this laid up in store with me, and sealed up among my treasures?” (Deut. 32:34).

(h) *The Seal Signifies Impression.* The seal always left its impression in the wax. If we are sealed with the Spirit, His impression should be on us. “It is turned as clay to the seal; and they stand as a garment” (Job 38:14). “Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistles of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart” (II Cor. 3:3).

d. *The Earnest of the Spirit.* “[God] hath also sealed us, and given

the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts” (II Cor. 1:22). See also II Corinthians 5:5; Ephesians 1:13, 14.

“Earnest” is an emblem which speaks of the future. It is a part payment of that which will be paid in full at a future date. When earnest money is paid on a piece of property, both parties are bound. When God bestows His Earnest on us, He is bound for all time and eternity. The Holy Spirit is God’s Earnest, God’s down payment of our salvation. The believer has not all things as yet which he is to receive. There is more to follow. Indeed, this does stagger the imagination. If the Holy Spirit is only part of what we are to receive, and He is God, and God is *everything*, what will the *rest* be?

If earnest money has been placed upon a piece of property, and the purchaser should fail to complete the transaction, he will have lost his earnest money. God has given us His Earnest, the Holy Spirit. Should He fail to complete our salvation, He will have lost His Earnest; but we know this is impossible. Thus, it is a guarantee of our eternal salvation.

(1) *Illustrations of Earnest.*

(a) *The Presents to Rebecca* (Gen. 24). These presents were the earnest of what was to follow.

(b) *The Fruit of Canaan* (Num. 13). The fruit was the earnest of that which was promised, a foretaste of their inheritance which was to come.

(c) *The Gifts of Boaz* (Ruth 2). The handfuls of grain left for Ruth, and only for Ruth, were just an earnest of what Boaz had to offer in marriage.

(d) *The First fruit* (Lev. 23). This wave offering to God was man’s earnest that one tenth of his harvest was yet to go to God.

(2) *Giver of the Earnest.* God is the Giver! “Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ and hath anointed us, is *God*; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts” (II Cor.1:21,22).

(3) *Description of the Earnest.* The Holy Spirit is the earnest: “The earnest of the *Spirit*” (II Cor. 1:22b).

(4) *The Place of the Earnest.* That place is our hearts: “The earnest of the Spirit in our *hearts*” (II Cor.1:22b). [pg107]

(5) *Guarantee of the Earnest.*

(a) *Guarantees Our Resurrection*. “Not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body” (Rom. 8:2.3).

(b) *Guarantees Our Inheritance*. “If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together” (Rom. 8:17).

(c) *Guarantees Our Glory*. “We are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: Whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ” (II Thess. 2:13, 14).

e. *Filling With the Spirit*. “They were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance” (Acts 2:4). “When they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness” (Acts 4:31). “Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit” (Eph. 5:18).

The filling of the Spirit has to do with the life and work of the Christian, by which he is empowered to do that which is commanded by the Lord.

(1) *What?* There are many opinions as to the meaning of the “filling” of the Spirit. Some say it happens when a person is born again. The believer does receive the Holy Spirit at conversion but this is not the *filling* of the Spirit; it is the *regeneration* of the Spirit (Titus 3:5). Others propose that the “filling of the Spirit is that experience by which [the believer] receives the Holy Spirit sometimes later after he is saved.” However, the Word declares that *all* believers have received the Holy Spirit: “Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his” (Rom. 8:9).

The “filling” of the Spirit may be confusing to many because of that word “filling.” They think of a material filling, as a vessel being filled with water. The Spirit, however, is not a material thing, but a Person. It is true that a half-empty vessel can be filled with more water, but it is impossible for the believer, who has the Spirit, to get more of Him. One cannot get more of God, but God can get more of him.

Now the believer already has the Spirit, yet he is told to be “filled” with Him. The believer is indwelt by the Spirit; he is sealed with the Spirit; he is baptized with (in) the Spirit, and he is regenerated by the Spirit; and still he is commanded to be “filled” with the Spirit. What is the “filling” of the Spirit? A better word or thought for “filling” is “controlled by” the Spirit. Thus, the Christian is admonished to be controlled by, to be possessed by, to be dominated by the Spirit. We know the full meaning now of the expression, “It is not how much of the Holy Spirit one has, but how much of one the Holy Spirit has.”

(2) *How?* Is this experience secured through seeking, and through prayer? There is no passage in the Word where a person ever prayed for the “filling” of the Spirit and received it. It is all brought about by *yieldedness* to the Lord. When we are yielded to him, our wills die, and His will is the will for our lives; our ambitions fall as ashes at our [pg108] feet. Some may ask, “What is ‘yieldedness’?” It is that act of the believer which places himself upon God’s altar: “Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour” (Eph. 5:2). The sweet-smelling savour offering spoken of here is the continual burnt offering: that offering which never lacked a sacrificial lamb, for when one was consumed, another was put in its place immediately — one in the morning and one at night. This was the only way it could be a continuous offering. This burnt offering was never instituted as a sin offering, but rather as a praise offering. The Christian is beseeched to give himself as a living sacrifice, a continual burnt offering, showing forth the praises of Him who hath called him out of darkness into His marvelous light (I Peter 2:9).

(3) *When?* When does the Spirit take over? When does He control the believer?

Just as *soon* as the believer yields — completely yields!

Are there a certain number of steps one must take in order to become yielded? No. What are the requirements, then, for yieldedness? *A complete subjection to the will of God!* For some it may take death to self; others, obedience to God’s call; still others, the forsaking of known sin, etc. Whatever it may take to become yielded to the will of God — that is the requirement!

(4) *Why?* Should the believer ever ask this question? Is there a

need for the “filling” of the Spirit? We answer “yes” to both of these questions. Some Christians do not understand that there is such a thing as the “filling” of the Spirit, and therefore they are powerless. In addition to God’s command to be “filled” with the Spirit, we realize that this “filling” is mandatory for power in service and in life — not for selfish gain, but for the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ and the winning of the lost to him.

(5) *What Then?* A survey of those who have been truly “filled” with the Spirit reveals these results:

- (a) They Will Reproduce Christ.
- (b) They Will Convict the World.
- (c) They Will Love the Word.
- (d) They Will Be Filled With Power.
- (e) They Will Be Full of Life. [pg109]

*Contrast of Baptism With Filling*

<i>Baptism of the Spirit</i>	<i>Filling of the Spirit</i>
1. Has to do with the body.	1. Has to do with the individual.
2. Baptism is external.	2. Filling is internal
3. Every believer is baptized with the Spirit	3. A believer may or may not be filled with the Spirit.
4. No believer is ever exhorted to be baptized with the Spirit.	4. All believers are exhorted to be filled with the Spirit.
5. An initial work at the time of salvation.	5. One may be filled years after the time of salvation.
6. The believer is baptized but once.	6. The believer may be filled many times.
7. No believer was ever baptized before Pentecost. Baptism puts the believers into the Body.	7. Some believers were filled before Pentecost. Filling is essential for service.

f. *The Fruits of the Spirit.* “The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law” (Gal. 5:22, 23). The fruit of the Spirit is true Christian character. You will notice that the word “fruit” is singular. One has presented this portion of Scripture in this manner: “The fruit of the Spirit is love: joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.”

The life of our Lord is the greatest example of the fruit of the Spirit. Fruit always comes from the life within. When at Christmas time we see apples and oranges on Christmas trees, we know they have been tied on. You do not have to tie apples on apple trees; they grow there naturally. There are many social religions that are figuratively tying apples and oranges on Christmas trees. They pretend to bear fruit, but there is no life within, for they have not the Spirit; therefore, they have only the form of godliness and deny the power thereof. An apple tree does not *work* to produce apples; it simply *yields*. The same with the Christian. He does not bear the fruit of the Spirit by his own *labor*, but simply by *yieldedness*.

(1) *Fruit in Relation to the Individual*. Love; joy; peace.

(2) *Fruit in Relation to Men*. Longsuffering; gentleness; goodness.

(3) *Fruit in Relation to God*. Faith; meekness; temperance. [pg110]

g. *Walking in the Spirit*. “This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh” (Gal. 5:16). Another way of saying it is: “By the Spirit be walking.” The Spirit will do the walking. An old example is the suit of clothes: the person inside the suit does the walking. The responsibility of the suit is just to hang on. We should not have a will of our own, but like the suit, just hang on. Wherever the Spirit goes, we go. The will of the Spirit is our will.

h. *Renewing of the Spirit*. “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost” (Titus 3:5).

This refers to a daily enduement of the Spirit to live a victorious Christian life. We never come to the time of self-sufficiency.

i. *Strengthening of the Spirit*. Paul prays that God might grant the Ephesians, “according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man” (Eph. 3:16). The saints have attested to the truth of this Scripture.

j. *Sowing to the Spirit*. “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting” (Gal. 6:7, 8). This passage is not written to the unsaved, but to Christians. The Christian can sow to the flesh, that is, live in sin; however, reaping time will come.

k. *Leading of the Spirit.* “As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God” (Rom. 8:14). Some interpret this to mean that “those who ask the Spirit for advice in their decisions of life are thus assured they are the sons of God.” Now it is a blessing to ask and receive of the Holy Spirit His will in our decisions, but this is not what this Scripture refers to. The leading of the Spirit has reference to His guidance of Christians on the way to glory.

Though sorrow befall us and Satan oppose,  
God leads His dear children along.  
Through grace we can conquer, defeat all our foes,  
God leads His dear children along.

Some through the waters, some through the flood,  
Some through the fire, but all through the blood.  
Some through great sorrow, but God gives a song,  
In the night season, and all the day long.

1. *Sanctification of the Spirit.* “Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied” (I Peter 1:2).

m. *The Supply of the Spirit.* “I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ” (Phil. 1:19).

n. *The Gifts of the Spirit.* [pg111]

(1) *As to the Enumeration of the Gifts.* “Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant...For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit: to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will” (I Cor. 12:1, 8-11).

(2) *As to the Bestowing of the Gifts.* The first thing we would like to point out is that the gifts are not given to man because of his desires and prayers, but according to the will of the Spirit: dividing to every man severally as he will.” The next thing we would call attention to is that gifts were given in order to substantiate the claims of Christ and His disciples, that Jesus Christ was truly the Son of God, and that the old

dispensation of Law was at an end, and that the dispensation of Grace had begun. “How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation: which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?” (Heb.2:3, 4). Certainly there was a need for God to verify this new teaching which was begun by the Lord Himself inasmuch as the people had been under the traditions of the law for over fourteen hundred years, and thus it was hard for them to realize that God had done away with the Old Covenant and had established the New. Also, there were no New Testament Books yet written. Lastly, we emphasize the fact that no *one* believer receives every one of the gifts. “God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?” (I Cor. 12:28-30) The answer is *no*.

(3) *As to Utilization of the Gifts.* How were these gifts to be used? The thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians plainly declares they should be motivated by love. Paul, by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, states that if he had *all* the gifts, and had not love, he would be nothing; his life would be fruitless, and his rewards nil.

Some may ask, “Is the gift of tongues for today?” “Doesn’t the Bible say, ‘Forbid not to speak with tongues?’” This subject will be dealt with more fully in the next section; however, something may be said about it here.

First Corinthians 14:39 does clearly state: “Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.” But if chapter 14 is to be used as permission to speak with tongues, then they who speak in tongues must be governed by this same chapter as to their use of this gift. Should a person, then, be allowed to speak in tongues in a church service? Certainly, *if* it is done according to 1 Corinthians 14. “If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there is no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God” (I Cor. 14:27, 28). Whenever the gift of tongues is



employed, only two or at the most, three, can speak at one service. This rule would eliminate much of the so-called tongue movement of today. Next in order is that the speaking shall be “by course” — one at a time. This would eliminate even more tongue [pg112] movement, for sometimes scores, and even hundreds are upon the floor at the same time. Then the Scriptures say that if there is no interpreter, let there be no talking in tongues whatsoever. More would be eliminated if this were followed. Finally, “Let your women keep silence in the church” (I Cor. 14:34). This practically puts to an end all tongue movement, for the majority of those participating are women.

Many will rebel at the quoted passage, saying that it does not mean “tongues.” If this does not mean “tongues,” it refers to everything, including tongues, when it says for the women to keep silent in the churches. This, however, has reference only to tongues, for other portions of this same book of I Corinthians allow a woman to speak or pray in church. “But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven” (I Cor. 11:5). “Prophesieth” means to “forth-tell”; thus, a woman is allowed to “forth-tell” the Word of God at Sunday school, upon the mission field, and in like places.

(4) *As to the Withholding of the Gifts.* Can it be possible that God withholds many of the gifts from the believers of today, which He gave at the first? Not only possible, but a certainty. In chapter 13 of I Corinthians, the Holy Spirit states, “Charity [love] never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away” (verses 8-10). Remember, I Corinthians 13 is speaking about “gifts” of the Spirit, and when it says prophecies shall fail, it does not mean that some of the prophecies foretold by men of God, as recorded in the Bible, will fail to be fulfilled. It means that the *gift* of prophecy will one day be withheld. When it says that “tongues shall cease,” it does not mean that some time in the future all tongues will be silenced, but that the *gift* of the tongues will be withheld. And when it says that “knowledge shall vanish away,” it does not mean that there will be a time when knowledge will not be in existence, but that the *gift* of knowledge will be withheld. When will the

gifts of prophecy, tongues and knowledge be withheld? When “that which is perfect is come.” This is not speaking of Christ’s second coming, but rather of when the full revelation of God’s Word is given. Have we the full revelation of God today? *Yes*, when the apostle John wrote, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all, Amen” (Rev. 22:21), God’s full revelation was completed — that which was perfect had come. Therefore, since we have the full revelation, the gifts of prophecy, tongues, and knowledge have vanished away; they have been withheld. They are not for today.

Turning to Ephesians 4:11 we read, “He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers.” We note by this later revelation that no miraculous gifts are listed, as were listed in I Corinthians 12, 13 and 14. There is no need for the gifts of miracles anymore, because we have the full revelation of God. The child of God is blessed more by having the complete revelation of God than if he had all the miraculous gifts.

The claim is made by some that we need these gifts for signs of the “filling” of the Spirit. It is true that God gave these miraculous gifts for signs; not however, for the “filling” of the Spirit, but for the confirmation of Paul’s apostleship (II Cor. 12:12); of Paul’s [pg113] confirmation to the Gentiles (Rom. 15:18, 19); of the confirmation of salvation through Christ (Heb. 2:3, 4); of the confirmation of the Word (Mark 16:20). Do we need these gifts today to confirm the Word, the Gospel, and the Apostle Paul? Two thousand years of Church history has confirmed them.

(5) *As to the Remainder of the Gifts.* “Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love” (I Cor. 13:13). These three gifts are possessed by every Christian. He, being controlled by the Holy Spirit, is to utilize them.

o. *Witness of the Spirit.* “The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God” (Rom. 8:16, R.V.<sup>162</sup>).

The law states that in the mouth of two witnesses shall the truth

---

162 Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible in this instance stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the “Bible Critics,” the “Bible Correctors,” the “Textual Critics,” and the “Copyright Mongers” of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

be declared. Thus, we have the two witnesses who declare that we are the children of God. They are the Holy Spirit, and our spirit. How does the Holy Spirit bear witness to our salvation? Through the Word. How does our spirit bear witness? By feeling, or conscience? No. Feelings are deceiving. Our spirit bears witness by *faith* in God's Word. God's Word declares our salvation when we trust Christ; we believe it. Therefore, the Spirit bears witness "together with" our spirit.

p. *As to the Unction of the Spirit.* "Ye have an *unction* from the Holy One, and ye know all things...But the *anointing* which ye received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same *anointing* teacheth you of all things, and in truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him" (I John 2:20, 27).

The words "unction" and "anointing" are the same in the Greek. "Anointing" in the Scriptures, whether in the Old or New Testament, was for some service. Kings and priests were anointed for their special service. Christ was anointed (Acts 10:38). The very name "Christ" means "anointed one." He was anointed Prophet (for the past); Priest (for the present); King (for the future). The believer in Christ receives his anointing for service when he is born again: "Ye *have* received." The anointing of the Spirit is not for a favored few. All believers are anointed: "Ye have received." The Spirit's anointing is once and for all: "abideth in you." There is no place in the Scriptures where one receives a fresh anointing. False religions may try to turn you away from Christ, to induce you away from your faith; but you, upon hearing their inducements, do not yield, because you have the unction of the Spirit. "And ye need not that any man teach you."

q. *As to Worship by the Spirit.* "We are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh" (Phil. 3:3, R.V.<sup>163</sup>).

The only worship accepted by God has to be inspired by the Spirit. One does not worship Him with hands, feet and lips, but by the Spirit through the hands, feet and lips.

r. *As to Communion of the Spirit.* "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen" (II Cor. 13:14). The word "communion" is better

---

163 Ibid.

translated<sup>164</sup> “fellowship; partnership.” Thus, “communion” means “participating, partaking, and sharing.” The Holy Spirit and Christians have one thing in common — Jesus Christ!

s. *As to Praying in the Spirit.* “The Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth [pg114] what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God” (Rom. 8:26, 27).

Is it wrong to pray to the Holy Spirit? There is no place in Scripture commanding us to do so, yet He is a member of the Godhead; when we pray to God, we pray to Him.

t. *As to the Warfare of the Spirit.* The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would” (Gal. 5:17).

u. *As to the Teaching of the Spirit.* “God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God” (I Cor. 2:10). The Holy Spirit reveals His Word to only born-again Christians, and not to those outside of the Body of Christ. Man without the Spirit of God cannot learn the truths of God.

#### 5. *The Holy Spirit and the Scriptures.*

a. *Inspiration.* “All scripture is given by *inspiration* of God” (II Tim. 3:16a). The literal meaning of “*inspiration*” is “God-breathed.” No prophecy is of man’s own ingenuity. We believe in the verbal inspiration of the Word of God. The words, not merely the thoughts, are inspired, as given by God in the original<sup>165</sup>. Some may ask, “Did not God use human instruments?” Yes, but the use of human instruments did not lessen it as the Word of God. When you read the Pentateuch, you do not read the words of Moses, but you read the words of God. See I Corinthians 2:12, 13; 10:11; Romans 4:20-25; 15:4.

---

164 Dr. Cambron use of the phrase “better translated” here is unfortunate; so many use that to attack the KJV translators. I am sure if he was confronted by the fifty-seven expert linguists who took seven years to come up with “communion” he would rethink his argument.

165 Modernists consider that only the original autographs were inspired and nobody has an inerrant inspired Holy Bible after the Apostle John's ink dried. I am sure Dr. Cambron would rethink this ugly slant on inspiration, if he saw how far modernists corrupted God's words.

b. *Enlightenment.* The best way to study the Book is to know its author. The best interpreter of the Book is the writer, the Holy Spirit. Just as the Lord Jesus made known the Scriptures unto the disciples, so the Holy Spirit will do for us today (I Cor. 2:9-14).

6. *The Holy Spirit and Sins.*

a. *Grieving the Spirit.* “Grieve not the holy Spirit of God whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption” (Eph. 4:30). Grieve is a word that has to do with love. People who do not love you will never grieve over you. The Holy Spirit grieves over us; therefore, He must love us.

b. *Lying to the Spirit.* “Peter said, Ananias, why hast Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?” (Acts 5:3). Ananias lied to the Church, the temple of the Holy Ghost.

We, too, can lie to the Holy Spirit. We can sing a lie. Sometimes in an emotional meeting people dedicate their lives to definite Christian service, but shortly after they neglect this decision. This is lying to the Holy Ghost.

c. *Quenching the Spirit.* “Quench not the Spirit” (I Thess. 5:19). To “quench” means to “extinguish.” One can quench the gifts of the Spirit, and can quench the Spirit in others by forbidding them to use the gifts of the Holy Spirit (Num. 11:28, 29).

d. *Resisting the Spirit.* “Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost” (Acts 7:51b).

e. *Insulting the Spirit.* “Of how much sorer punishment...shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God . . . and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace” (Heb. 10:29).

f. *Blaspheming Against the Spirit.* This is the so-called unpardonable sin found in Matthew 12:31, 32 and Mark 3:29, 30. If the grace of God, which will pardon *all* the sins of mankind, will not pardon *this* one, it must be an unusual sin. Murder is not the unpardonable sin. Unbelief is not the unpardonable sin. Where would we be if this were [pg115] true? Rejection of Jesus Christ is not the unpardonable sin; however, the man who rejects Christ and dies is indeed lost. The Spirit will not strive with man after death. His final rejection is not unpardonable, but unpardoned.

Man should distinguish between the following:

Unpardoned — Unpardonable

Unforgiven — Unforgivable

### Unsaved — Unsaveable

I believe the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which some term “unpardonable,” was a dispensational sin, limited for thirty-three years, during Christ’s stay on earth. There are no sinners on God’s blacklist today. God has never commissioned any man to go out and preach the message that there are some men He will not save.

Has anyone who has committed this blasphemy been saved? Yes, the Apostle Paul, “who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief. . . . Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting” (I Tim. 1: 13, 16).

The word “speaketh” in Matthew 12:32, and verse 30 of Mark 3 are the keys to the correct interpretation.

#### *7. Emblems of the Holy Spirit.*

a. *The Dove.* “John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him” (John 1:32). Upon no other one did the Spirit descend in this manner. In Genesis 1:2 the Holy Spirit is pictured as moving upon the face of the waters, as a dove brooding upon her eggs. The dove is a gentle, clean bird, particular about its food. So are they who are of the Spirit. “Harmless as a dove” (Matt. 10:16). Truly an emblem of the Holy Spirit. The Word pictures to us the wrath of the Son, but never the wrath of the Holy Spirit.

b. *Water.* “I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessings upon thy offspring” (Is. 44:3). See also John 7:38, 39. What water means to thirsty lips, and what rain means to the parched land, is what the Spirit means to the individual. There is nothing that quenches thirst better than water; there is nothing that satisfies the longing of the heart as the Holy Spirit.

c. *Oil.* “Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren: and the Spirit of the LORD came upon David from that day forward. So Samuel rose up, and went to Ramah” (I Sam. 16:13). See also Isaiah 61:1; Acts 10:38. When the priest was anointed with oil, it took place in this manner: first, his ear — he was always to hear God’s Word; his thumb — his actions were to be for God’s glory;

his big toe — he was to walk with God.

d. *Wind*. “Then he said unto me, Prophecy unto the wind, prophesy, son of man, and say to the wind, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live. . . . and [I] shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the LORD [pg116]

e. *Fire*. “There appeared unto them cloven tongues like as a fire, and it sat upon each of them” (Acts 2:3). fire signifies the Spirit of God. It is fire which purifies, consumes, warms, tests, illuminates and energizes. It is the same with the Holy Spirit.

f. *Clothing*. “The Spirit of Jehovah clothed himself with Gideon; and he blew a trumpet; and Abiezer was gathered together after him” (Judg. 6:34, R.V.<sup>166</sup>). Clothing speaks of protection. The Spirit is our Protection. p116<sup>167</sup>

---

166 See previous note on the unfortunate paradox in Dr. Cambron's preference for an R.V.

167 Block quote of Dr. Cambron's Bible Doctrines (Zondervan) 117-151, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 89-113

## Chapter 3 The Baptism of vs The Filling of the Holy Ghost

It may be remiss to add to what Dr. Cambron documented about the filling of the Holy Ghost and the baptism of the Spirit, but Charles Finney wrote extensively on that subject. Charles Finney (1792-1875) was an American Presbyterian preacher known for his revival services and extemporaneous preaching. As he observed other church leaders, he began to feel many of them lacked the “power from on high”—the filling of the Holy Spirit. In his book “Power from On High”<sup>168</sup>, he describes a filling of the Holy Ghost which drives home the outline of Dr. Cambron on this subject. Included below, from his book, is his Chapter 1 and 2, and one profound illustration from his Chapter 3:

### *Power From On High By Charles Finney*

Many of the chapters in Finney's book, were originally published in "THE INDEPENDENT" in NEW YORK , from 1871-74 That series, in a somewhat different order with an additional article not published in The INDEPENDENT, was published as POWER FROM ON HIGH in 1944, and public domain portions, Chapter 1, 2 and portions of 3 are repeated below:

### **Finney's Ch 1 Power From On High**

Please permit me through your columns to correct a misapprehension of some of the members of the late Council at Oberlin of the brief remarks which I made to them; first on Saturday morning, and afterwards on the Lord's Day. In my first remarks to them I called attention to the mission of the Church to disciple all nations, as recorded by Matthew and Luke, and stated that this commission was given by Christ to the whole Church, and that every member of the Church is under obligation to make it his lifework to convert the world. I then raised two inquiries:

1. What do we need to secure success in this great work?

---

<sup>168</sup> Charles G. Finney, “*Power from On High*”, Christian Literature Crusade, from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/finney/power.html>



2. How can we get it?

Answer. 1. We need the enduement of power from on high. Christ had previously informed the disciples that without Him they could do nothing. When He gave them the commission to convert the world, He added, “But tarry ye in Jerusalem till ye be endued with power from on high. Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. Lo, I send upon you the promise of My Father.” This baptism of the Holy Ghost, this thing promised by the Father, this enduement of power from on high, Christ has expressly informed us is the indispensable condition of performing the work which he has set before us.

2. How shall we get it? Christ expressly promised it to the whole Church, and to every individual whose duty it is to labour for the conversion of the world. He admonished the first disciples not to undertake the work until they had received this enduement of power from on high. Both the promise and the admonition apply equally to all Christians of every age and nation. No one has, at any time, any right to expect success, unless he first secures this enduement of power from on high. The example of the first disciples teaches us how to secure this enduement. They first consecrated themselves to his work, and continued in prayer and supplication until the Holy Ghost fell upon them on the Day of Pentecost, and they received the promised enduement of power from on high. This, then, is the way to get it.

The Council desired me to say more upon this subject; consequently, on the Lord’s Day, I took for my text the assertion of Christ, that the Father is more willing to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him than we are to give good gifts to our children.

1. I said, This text informs us that it is infinitely easy to obtain the Holy Spirit, or this enduement of power from the Father.

2. That this is made a constant subject of prayer. Everybody prays for this, at all times, and yet, with all this

intercession, how few, comparatively, are really endued with this spirit of power from on high! This want is not met. The want of power is a subject of constant complaint. Christ says, "Everyone that asketh receiveth," but there certainly is a "great gulf" between the asking and receiving, that is a great stumbling-block to many. How, then, is this discrepancy to be explained? I then proceeded to show why this endowment is not received. I said:

(1) We are not willing, upon the whole, to have what we desire and ask.

(2) God has expressly informed us that if we regard iniquity in our hearts He will not hear us. But the petitioner is often self-indulgent. This is iniquity, and God will not hear him.

(3) He is uncharitable.

(4) Censorious.

(5) Self-dependent.

(6) Resists conviction of sin.

(7) Refuses to confess to all the parties concerned.

(8) Refuses to make restitution to injured parties.

(9) He is prejudiced and uncandid.

(10) He is resentful.

(11) Has a revengeful spirit.

(12) Has a worldly ambition.

(13) He has committed himself on some point, and become dishonest, and neglects and rejects further light.

(14) He is denominationally selfish.

(15) Selfish for his own congregation.

(16) He resists the teachings of the Holy Spirit.

(17) He grieves the Holy Spirit by dissension.

(18) He quenches the Spirit by persistence in justifying wrong.

(19) He grieves Him by a want of watchfulness.

(20) He resists Him by indulging evil tempers.

(21) Also by dishonesties in business.

(22) Also by indolence and impatience in waiting upon the Lord.

(23) By many forms of selfishness.

(24) By negligence in business, in study, in prayer.

(25) By undertaking too much business, too much study, and too little prayer.

(26) By a want of entire consecration.

(27) Last and greatest, by unbelief. He prays for this enduement without expecting to receive it. “He that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar.” This, then, is the greatest sin of all. What an insult, what a blasphemy, to accuse God of lying!

I was obliged to conclude that these and other forms of indulged sin explained why so little is received, while so much is asked. I said I had not time to present the other side. Some of the brethren afterward inquired, “What is the other side?” The other side presents the certainty that we shall receive the promised enduement of power from on high, and be successful in winning souls, if we ask, and fulfill the plainly revealed conditions of prevailing prayer. Observe, what I said upon the Lord’s Day was upon the same subject, and in addition to what I had previously said. The misapprehension alluded to was this: If we first get rid of all these forms of sin, which prevent our receiving this enduement, have we not already obtained the blessing? What more do we need?

Answer. There is a great difference between the peace and the power of the Holy Spirit in the soul. The disciples were Christians before the Day of Pentecost, and, as such, had a measure of the Holy Spirit. They must have had the peace of sins forgiven, and of a justified state, but yet they had not the enduement of power necessary to the accomplishment of the work assigned them. They had the peace which Christ had given them, but not the power which He had promised. This may be true of all Christians, and right here is, I think, the great mistake of the Church, and of the ministry. They rest in conversion, and do not seek until they obtain this enduement of power from on high. Hence so many professors have no power with either God or man.

They prevail with neither. They cling to a hope in Christ, and even enter the ministry, overlooking the admonition to wait until they are endued with power from on high. But let anyone bring all the tithes and offerings into God's treasury, let him lay all upon the altar, and prove God herewith, and he shall find that God "will open the windows of heaven, and pour him out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

## **Finney's Ch 2 What Is It?**

The apostles and brethren, on the Day of Pentecost, received it. What did they receive? What power did they exercise after that event?

They received a powerful baptism of the Holy Ghost, a vast increase of divine illumination. This baptism imparted a great diversity of gifts that were used for the accomplishment of their work. It manifestly included the following things: The power of a holy life. The power of a self-sacrificing life. (The manifestation of these must have had great influence with those to whom they proclaimed the gospel.) The power of a cross-bearing life. The power of great meekness, which this baptism enabled them everywhere to exhibit. The power of a loving enthusiasm in proclaiming the gospel. The power of teaching. The power of a loving and living faith. The gift of tongues. An increase of power to work miracles. The gift of inspiration, or the revelation of many truths before unrecognized by them. The power of moral courage to proclaim the gospel and do the bidding of Christ, whatever it cost them.

In their circumstances all these enduements were essential to their success; but neither separately nor all together did they constitute that power from on high which Christ promised, and which they manifestly received. That which they manifestly received as the supreme, crowning, and all-important means of success was the power to prevail with both God and man, the power to fasten saving impressions upon the minds of men. This last was doubtless

the thing which they understood Christ to promise. He had commissioned the Church to convert the world to Him. All that I have named above were only means, which could never secure the end unless they were vitalized and made effectual by the power of God. The apostles, doubtless, understood this; and, laying themselves and their all upon the altar, they besieged a Throne of Grace in the spirit of entire consecration to their work.

They did, in fact, receive the gifts before mentioned; but supremely and principally this power to savingly impress men. It was manifested right upon the spot. They began to address the multitude; and, wonderful to tell, three thousand were converted the same hour. But, observe, here was no new power manifested by them upon this occasion, save the gift of tongues.

They wrought no miracle at that time, and used these tongues simply as the means of making themselves understood. Let it be noted that they had not had time to exhibit any other gifts of the Spirit which have been above named. They had not at that time the advantage of exhibiting a holy life, or any of the powerful graces and gifts of the Spirit. What was said on the occasion, as recorded in the gospel, could not have made the impression that it did, had it not been uttered by them with a new power to make a saving impression upon the people. This power was not the power of inspiration, for they only declared certain facts of their own knowledge. It was not the power of human learning and culture, for they had but little. It was not the power of human eloquence, for there appears to have been but little of it. It was God speaking in and through them. It was a power from on high—God in them making a saving impression upon those to whom they spoke. This power to savingly impress abode with and upon them. It was, doubtless, the great and main thing promised by Christ, and received by the apostles and primitive Christians. It has existed, to a greater or less extent, in the Church ever since. It is a mysterious fact often manifested in a most surprising

manner. Sometimes a single sentence, a word, a gesture, or even a look, will convey this power in an overcoming manner.

To the honour of God alone I will say a little of my own experience in this matter. I was powerfully converted on the morning of the 10th of October. In the evening of the same day, and on the morning of the following day, I received overwhelming baptisms of the Holy Ghost, that went through me, as it seemed to me, body and soul. I immediately found myself endued with such power from on high that a few words dropped here and there to individuals were the means of their immediate conversion. My words seemed to fasten like barbed arrows in the souls of men. They cut like a sword. They broke the heart like a hammer. Multitudes can attest to this. Oftentimes a word dropped, without my remembering it, would fasten conviction, and often result in almost immediate conversion. Sometimes I would find myself, in a great measure, empty of this power. I would go out and visit, and find that I made no saving impression. I would exhort and pray, with the same result. I would then set apart a day for private fasting and prayer, fearing that this power had departed from me, and would inquire anxiously after the reason of this apparent emptiness. After humbling myself, and crying out for help, the power would return upon me with all its freshness. This has been the experience of my life.

I could fill a volume with the history of my own experience and observation with respect to this power from on high. It is a fact of consciousness and of observation, but a great mystery. I have said that sometimes a look has in it the power of God. I have often witnessed this. Let the following fact illustrate it. I once preached, for the first time, in a manufacturing village. The next morning I went into a manufacturing establishment to view its operations. As I passed into the weaving department I beheld a great company of young women, some of whom, I observed, were looking at me, and then at each other, in a manner that

indicated a trifling spirit, and that they knew me. I, however, knew none of them. As I approached nearer to those who had recognized me they seemed to increase in their manifestations of lightness of mind. Their levity made a peculiar impression upon me; I felt it to my very heart. I stopped short and looked at them, I know not how, as my whole mind was absorbed with the sense of their guilt and danger. As I settled my countenance upon them I observed that one of them became very much agitated. A thread broke. She attempted to mend it; but her hands trembled in such a manner that she could not do it. I immediately observed that the sensation was spreading, and had become universal among that class of triflers. I looked steadily at them until one after another gave up and paid no more attention to their looms. They fell on their knees, and the influence spread throughout the whole room. I had not spoken a word; and the noise of the looms would have prevented my being heard if I had. In a few minutes all work was abandoned, and tears and lamentations filled the room. At this moment the owner of the factory, who was himself an unconverted man, came in, accompanied, I believe, by the superintendent, who was a professed Christian. When the owner saw the state of things he said to the superintendent, “Stop the mill.” What he saw seemed to pierce him to the heart.

“It is more important,” he hurriedly remarked, “that these souls should be saved than that this mill should run.” As soon as the noise of the machinery had ceased, the owner inquired: “What shall we do? We must have a place to meet, where we can receive instruction.” The superintendent replied: “The muleroom will do.” The mules were run up out of the way, and all of the hands were notified and assembled in that room. We had a marvelous meeting. I prayed with them, and gave them such instructions as at the time they could bear. The word was with power. Many expressed hope that day; and within a few days, as I was informed, nearly every hand in that great establishment,

together with the owner, had hope in Christ.

This power is a great marvel. I have many times seen people unable to endure the word. The most simple and ordinary statements would cut men off from their seats like a sword, would take away their bodily strength, and render them almost as helpless as dead men. Several times it has been true in my experience that I could not raise my voice, or say anything in prayer or exhortation except in the mildest manner, without wholly overcoming those that were present. This was not because I was preaching terror to the people; but the sweetest sounds of the gospel would overcome them. This power seems sometimes to pervade the atmosphere of one who is highly charged with it. Many times great numbers of persons in a community will be clothed with this power, when the very atmosphere of the whole place seems to be charged with the life of God. Strangers coming into it, and passing through the place, will be instantly smitten with conviction of sin, and in many instances converted to Christ. When Christians humble themselves, and consecrate their all afresh to Christ, and ask for this power, they will often receive such a baptism that they will be instrumental in converting more souls in one day than in all their lifetime before. While Christians remain humble enough to retain this power the work of conversion will go on, till whole communities and regions of country are converted to Christ. The same is true of ministers. But this article is long enough. If you will allow me, I have more to say upon this subject.

### **Finney's Ch 3 The Enduement of The Spirit**

Since the publication in the Independent of my article on "The Power from on High" I have been confined with protracted illness. In the meantime I have received numerous letters of inquiry upon that subject. They relate mostly to three particular points of inquiry:

1. They request further illustrations of the exhibition of this power.



2. They inquire, “Who have a right to expect this endowment?”

3. How or upon what conditions can it be obtained?

I am unable to answer these inquiries by letters to individuals. With your leave I propose, if my health continues to improve, to reply to them in several short articles through your columns. In the present number I will relate another exhibition of this power from on high, as witnessed by myself. Soon after I was licensed to preach I went into a region of country where I was an entire stranger. I went there at the request of a Female Missionary Society, located in Oneida County, New York. Early in May, I think, I visited the town of Antwerp, in the northern part of Jefferson County. I stopped at the village hotel, and there learned that there were no religious meetings held in that town at the time. They had a brick meetinghouse, but it was locked up. By personal efforts I got a few people to assemble in the parlour of a Christian lady in the place, and preached to them on the evening after my arrival. As I passed round the village I was shocked with the horrible profanity that I heard among the men wherever I went. I obtained leave to preach in the school-house on the next Sabbath; but before the Sabbath arrived I was much discouraged, and almost terrified, in view of the state of society which I witnessed. On Saturday the Lord applied with power to my heart the following words, addressed by the Lord Jesus to Paul (Acts 18:9,10): “Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city.” This completely subdued my fears; but my heart was loaded with agony for the people. On Sunday morning I arose early, and retired to a grove not far from the village to pour out my heart before God for a blessing on the labours of the day. I could not express the agony of my soul in words, but struggled with much groaning, and, I believe, with many tears, for an hour or two, without getting relief. I returned to my room in the hotel; but almost immediately

came back to the grove. This I did thrice. The last time I got complete relief, just as it was time to go to meeting. I went to the school-house, and found it filled to its utmost capacity. I took out my little pocket Bible, and read for my text: "God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." I exhibited the love of God as contrasted with the manner in which He was treated by those for whom He gave up His Son. I charged home their profanity upon them; and, as I recognized among my hearers several whose profanity I had particularly noticed, in the fullness of my heart and the gushing of my tears I pointed to them, and said, "I heard these men call upon God to damn their fellows." The Word took powerful effect. Nobody seemed offended, but almost everybody greatly melted. At the close of the service the amiable landlord, Mr. Copeland, rose and said that he would open the meeting-house in the afternoon. He did so. The meeting-house was full, and, as in the morning, the Word took powerful effect. Thus a powerful revival commenced in the village, which soon after spread in every direction. I think it was on the second Sabbath after this, when I came out of the pulpit in the afternoon, an aged man approached, and said to me: "Can you not come and preach in our neighborhood? We have never had any religious meetings there." I inquired the direction and the distance, and appointed to preach there the next afternoon, Monday, at five o'clock, in their school-house. I had preached three times in the village, and attended two prayer-meetings on the Lord's Day; and on Monday I went on foot to fulfill this appointment....

The baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the filling of the Holy Ghost are thus distinguished in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the power and importance of the filling of the Holy Ghost is given ample emphasis by Charles Finney's coverage of that subject. A clear understanding of each is important, and an endowment, as explained by Charles Finney, of the later is empowering.

## **Chapter 4 Holiness – Pentecostal Movement Touching Pneumatology**

The 21<sup>st</sup> century has found a major disruption in its sound Bible doctrine about the Holy Spirit of God. The Holiness – Pentecostal movement draws away from the clear role of the Holy Ghost in the New Testament Church. The multifaceted role of the Holy Ghost has two primary functions, (1) to draw attention to the Word that became flesh, i.e. the Lord Jesus Christ called “the Word” in John 1, and (2) to draw attention to the Word which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, i.e. The Word of God. The Holiness – Pentecostal movement, on the other hand, exalts the Pentecostal experience as the function of the Holy Ghost. In practice they make the experience the primary manifestation of God and the primary authority for their faith and practice. These two functional errors make for the systematic failures of the Holiness, Pentecostal, Charismatic movement, referenced herein as the Charismatic-Pentecostal-Tongues movement.

The North American “Holiness” movement of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was a throwback of Free Methodists who wanted to go all the way back to Bible teaching. They broke from the Free Methodists who wanted only to go back to the teachings of the Wesleyan standards of the church. The movement put its major focus on the Pentecostal experience and swiftly took on that emphasis in their name. Frank S. Mead describes them in his “Handbook of Denominations in the United States.”

*Pentecostalism* is an inclusive term applied to a large number of revivalistic American sects, assemblies, and churches. Many have either a Methodist or Baptist background, and they are primarily concerned with perfection, Holiness, and the Pentecostal experience.... Most believe in... manifestations and “blessings” of the working of the Holy Spirit – the fiery Pentecostal baptism of the Spirit, ... Many practice divine healing, and speaking in tongues is widespread.... Varying in size from small group meetings to huge mass meetings, pentecostalists are found in every state in the union, with greatest strength in the South, West, and Middle West. The churches bear a great variety of names and do not always include the word

*Pentecostal* – for instance, the largest single group, Assemblies of God, with over half a million members, and the Church of God groups....The General Council of the Assemblies of God is actually an aggregation of Pentecostal churches and assemblies accomplished at Hot Springs, Arkansas, in 1914 <sup>169</sup>

While German Rationalism, which inferred that the Holy Ghost was not a person but just an influence, was Satan's weapon of choice in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the gross misleading about the role of the Holy Ghost seems to be his weapon of choice through the 20<sup>th</sup>. In this regard, the Pentecostal-Charismatic-Tongues movement is a primary misleader. Protestants, in general, are broken into two major camps that divide along beliefs of Calvinism or Arminianism. The Pentecostals, springing from the ranks of Free Methodists, are predominately Arminian. (Recall, that Baptists are not Protestants, and dare not divide between these camps, remaining, instead, as strict Biblicists on the matters of election and predestination, and Dispensational rather than holding to Covenant/Replacement Theology.) The Calvinist's fatalism keep them from fully exploring the influence of the Holy Ghost on man's "free-will"<sup>170</sup>, and the Arminian's overt "free-will" causes them to over emphasize the effect of the Holy Ghost, seeking a Pentecostal tongues experience.

It is Christ who is the manifestation of God, it is not in the role of the Holy Ghost to be that manifestation. John Baptist said, "(Christ) must increase, and I must decrease." So too for the Holy Ghost;

*Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things*

---

169 Frank S. Mead, "*Handbook of Denominations in the United States*" Pierce and Smith, 1951, 194 - 195

170 "Free-will" is a common misnomer, Man's will is not perfectly "free", however he clearly does have a will and some sovereign ability to determine his own destiny. That, despite Roman Catholic doctrine, John Calvin's ideology and Reformed Theologies decrees.

*that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you (John 16:13-15).*

The Pentecostal tongues experience exalted by the Charismatic movement is predominately about the “spirit” speaking with little about the Spirit exalting Christ. It is the opposite of Scripture, in this sense.

In John 14:16-26 the role of this Comforter is not to be seen, but to indwell, to “teach you all things,” as the “Spirit of truth,” he shall “bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I (Jesus Christ) have told you.” (verse 17, 26). The genius of C.I. Scofield says the role of this Comforter deals with four “I”s, Indwelling, Ignorance, Infirmary, and Intercession. The charisma of this misguided tongues movement says the role of the Comforter is only the Pentecostal tongues experience.

The Charismatic-Pentecostal-Tongues movement teaches that speaking in tongues is a sign of the Spirit of God being in you, but John 14:16-26 teaches us that the only such sign is “having and keeping Christ's commandments” (verse 21). In practice, the Pentecostals ignore many commandments of Christ because the “spirit” that is manifest in them has “lead” them to ignore Christ's commandments. Note especially the ignored commandment that women in the church are forbidden from speaking in tongues. Women are forbidden to preach, pray, or prophecy in the New Testament Church. Following that command alone would completely shut down the Charismatic-Pentecostal-Tongues movement. Alas, they have a strange manifestation and a strange authority.

Christ is the manifestation of God to the world. The manifestation of Christ in us is “to have and keep his commandments” (John 14:21, 15:10) and that we love one another (15:12, 17, 13: 34-35). The Holy Ghost is not to magnify himself, not to speak “of” himself, nor be the manifestation of God in the believer. Contrarily, all these roles are accomplished by the “spirit” in the Charismatic-Pentecostal-Tongues movement. Further, they take the leading of the spirit over and above the commands of the Word of God.

It is the Word of God that is the authority of God for our lives, it is not the role of the Holy Ghost to be that authority. Many in the Charismatic-Pentecostal-Tongues movement allow the “spirit” which moves them to override the clear commandments from the Word of God. The inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God is to be our

guide to all faith and practice. Letting a “spirit” take that role, has led to exotic abuses. There was a short period of time when the Holy Ghost authenticated the Word of God, but when the Word was perfectly written that ceased. In the 60 years it took God to have his Word perfectly written, men, i.e. males, in the churches would otherwise receive a message from the Lord and *prophecy* that message in the church. Prophecy was not, and is not, telling the future as some still suppose, it is, simply stated, bringing a message that begins, “Thus saith the Lord.” In Acts 11:28 where some “signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth,” there seems to be a foretelling of the future, but it is done with the unspoken context of “Thus saith the Lord.” Tongues, signs, and wonders were sometimes given to these first and second century prophets, in order to authenticate their prophecy. During this period these tongues, signs and wonders were judiciously allocated by God as an authentication of the preaching, they were not for the manifestation of God's presence.

For example, four times recorded in the book of Acts speaking in an unknown tongue is used as a sign of God's authentication; 1) at Pentecost, to authenticate the preaching of the gospel of Christ to the Jews (Acts 2), 2) at the city of Samaria<sup>171</sup> to authenticate the preaching of the gospel of Christ to the Samaritans (Acts 8), 3) at Cornelius' house in Caesarea, to authenticate the preaching of the gospel of Christ to the Gentiles (Acts 10), and 4) at Ephesus to authenticate the preaching of the gospel of Christ to the disciples of John (Acts 19).

Further, consider that the Acts of the Apostles covers thirty years of history, A.D. 33 – 63, and at its close twenty-one New Testament Bible books were published and being distributed amongst the churches. The table below shows the approximate dates that these works were published.

<i>Bible Book</i>	<i>Publication Date</i>
The Gospel of Matthew	A.D. 37
The Epistle of James	A.D. 40
Paul's Epistle to Galatians	A.D. 50
1&2 Thessalonians	A.D. 51 & 52
1Corinthians	A.D. 56
The Gospel of Mark and Paul's 2Corinthians	A.D. 57

---

<sup>171</sup> receiving the Holy Ghost with miracles and signs

<i>Bible Book</i>	<i>Publication Date</i>
Romans	A.D. 58
Peter's First Epistle	A.D. 60
Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, Philippians, and The Gospel of Luke	A.D. 61
1Timothy, Titus, 2Peter, Jude, Acts	A.D. 63
2Timothy	A.D. 66

In the same year that Luke closes and publishes his history book, The Acts of the Apostles, Paul writes 1<sup>st</sup> Timothy and Titus, Peter writes his second epistle, and Jude writes his epistle. Three years after Luke sets down his pen, the Apostle Paul writes his second epistle to Timothy. Thus, in a matter of 33 years, 21 of the 27 books of the New Testament are published and being distributed among the churches. The Book of Hebrews was subsequently published in A.D. 70 and the Gospel According to John, his Epistles 1,2&3 John and the Revelation of Jesus Christ were written after A.D. 90.

It needs stated again that these books were canonized by the Apostle's authority. The Apostles needed no aid from a Roman Catholic Church Father, Athanasius, from Alexandria Egypt in A.D. 367. The Apostles authority which canonized Scripture did not need "centuries of reflection." They did not need the Council of Trent in A.D. 1546, or the Protestant's Thirty-nine Articles written in A.D. 1563. The canonization of Scripture had no reliance on the Westminster Confession of Faith in A.D. 1647, or an Orthodox Church's Synod of Jerusalem in A.D. 1672! All these entities are errantly credited for some involvement in the canonization of Scriptures. The Apostles are the only authority for writing and canonizing the New Testament Scriptures. This truth is thoroughly documented in the section of this work titled Bibliology.

When that which was perfect was come, the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired written Word of God, there was no need that men, i.e. males, would stand and say, "I have a word from the Lord, Thus saith the Lord..." No, now anyone could stand with a copy of the Word of God and say, "Thus saith the Lord..." and so it continues to this day. The tongues, signs and wonders did all cease in the Christian churches for eighteen centuries. They were improperly resurrected by the North American Pentecostal movement.

During these centuries where tongues-signs-and-wonders ceased, there are only mystical miracles and apparitions of “The Blessed Virgin Mary” documented by the Roman Catholic Church. In A.D. 330, the mother of Emperor Constantine located the site of the crucifixion and ergo the Church of the Holy Sepulcher by some such mystical sign where she supposedly recovered the “true cross.” Her son also converted the whole Roman Empire to a forced Roman Christianity because crosses on soldier shields magically produced a great victory. Indeed the Roman Canonized Saints had to have a notable miracle attributed to their intercession, and so some mystical signs and wonders continued in the Roman Catholic Church, but nowhere where they present in the Christian churches that the Roman Catholic Church was persecuting. The signs-and-wonders of late reared up with an unBiblical format in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century in the North American Pentecostal movement.

The Pentecostals and their reliance on “the Spirit” as their authority, rather than the Word of God as their authority, have two “tells” which expose their underpinnings. First is their motto, “Don't let doctrine divide us, let the Spirit unite us.” The spirit which unites believers with unbelievers, light with darkness, Protestants with Roman Catholics, and Christians worshiping the Son with Eskimo's worshiping the Sun, is a spirit, sure enough, but it is not the Holy Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit of God brings separation from false teachers, not unity amongst all professors. Bible truth on unity and separation herein ignored by the Charismatics, is found in 2Cor 6:14-18,

- 14 Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?*
- 15 And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?*
- 16 And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*
- 17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will*



*receive you,  
18 And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and  
daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.*

A second “tell” obvious when the Pentecostals express reliance on “the Spirit” as their authority, rather than the Word of God as their authority, is their disregard for God's clear instruction about women praying and prophesying in the church. This is against a direct command from God.

### **The Bible and the Role of the Woman.**

The Bible is quite emphatic about the role of the woman. This emphasis is applied collaterally in the home, in the church and in the society. The rebellion against God's authority is exposed collaterally with rebellion in the home, rebellion in the church, and rebellion in society. Comprehending God's emphasis on the role of the woman in the home requires that we see it universally applicable in the church and in the Godly society.

God's role for woman is emphasized in, and illustrated in three particular commands of God. Women are not to lead in public prayer. The letter to Timothy, explaining how to behave in the Church (1 Tim 3:15) is very clear on this point. Leadership in prayer is for men not women. "I will therefore men (males) pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting. In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with embroidered hair, or gold, or pearls or costly array; but which becometh woman professing Godliness) with good works" (1 Tim 2:8).

The phrase "in like manner" does not connect the woman's role to leading in public prayer, it connects the woman's modest apparel, shamefacedness and sobriety to doing it "without wrath and doubting." Also, often taken out of context from this text is the broidered hair, gold and pearls. This Scripture is about the kind of attitude a woman professing Godliness should have. It has been used by some to forbid women from wearing makeup or jewelry. Such a legalistic stance gives little thought to the actual context of this command. The context teaches who should and should not be leading in prayer.

Secondly, women should not be in a position to teach a man. Again,

this letter to Timothy is emphatic. "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor usurp authority over a man, but to be in silence" (1Tim 2:11-12). Again, this Scripture might easily be taken out of context. The context clarifies who is to be doing the teaching. Scoffers dismisses this whole text because a woman keeping silence is beyond anything they could imagine. Women often roll their eyes when this Scripture is read because they refuse to acknowledge the context and its truth. Women should not teach men, the Holy Bible says so very emphatically.

Pause here to understand God's threefold reasoning behind these two commands. "For Adam was first formed, then Eve" (2:13). God first resorts back to his purpose in creation. The woman was created to be an appropriate help and companion to the man. "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression" (2:14). The woman is a completely different emotional and hormonal package than the man. One is built for confrontational leadership decisions. One is built for non-confrontational compromised solution finding, and she is called the weaker vessel. (1Pet 3:7) It is not politically correct to say any of this, but it is certainly Biblical and correct. You must choose which correctness you will pursue, and there is not a non-confrontational compromised solution between the two.

The threefold in the chord of God's reasoning, reasoning which refuses women from leading men in prayer and in teaching men in class, is found in the next verse. "Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety" (2:15). Being "saved" in this verse has nothing to do with a soul's salvation. In the Holy Bible soul salvation is only done by grace through faith; not of works (Eph 2:8-9). When we "confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him (the Lord Jesus Christ) from the dead" (Rom 10:9). Then, and only then, can one have soul salvation. This verse in the letter to Timothy (1Tim 2:15) is referencing where the woman's greatest value is, what her function in life is, and what her emotional and physiological function was designed for. A woman was designed for motherhood. A woman, who will accept that role by faith and charity, and holiness with sobriety, has her perfected place, knows her place, and stays in the role for which God created her.

When God revealed to Joshua, his role for his life, he said, "This book of the law shall not depart out of they mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make they way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success" (Joshua 1:8). This promise is applicable and fitting for the woman who accepts her role as defined by God in his Holy Word. Submission to that role will bring prosperity and good success. Rebellion against it is the norm for our society, and unfortunately for our church leaders. Choosing it for your home will bring God's blessing.

The Bible further clarifies that the woman should not prophecy. Prophesying, in the Bible, is not foretelling the future. Prophesying is the receipt and delivery of a message from the Lord. Today, anyone who can read and has God's sixty-six books of completed revelation, has received a message from the Lord. Set aside the shenanigans of Benny Hin, Oral Roberts, Charles Taze Russel, and Joseph Smith, and recognize them as charlatans who claim to receive extra-Biblical revelations. Those who would take a Bible and proclaim, "Thus saith the Lord," are prophesying. And according to the Word of God, women are refused that position.

The Church at Corinth was having problems with this prophesying issue. They did not yet have the 27 books of the New Testament Scripture and in Paul's letter of reproof women were forbidden to prophesy or to speak in tongues. "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law" (1Cor 14:34) This whole discourse on prophesying, and the woman's role, begins back in chapter eleven, but here it concludes very concisely, "And if they (women who wish to prophesy) will learn anything, let them speak to their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church" (14:35). This Scripture is dogmatic, and the principle that women are to know their position, is equally dogmatic. "But I would have you to know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (11:3).

Many think this Scripture in 1Cor 11, is about whether a woman should wear a head covering. It is not. It is about whether we will recognize God's plan and order in life. The woman is not to be the

leader, 1) she is not to prophesy, 2) she is not to lead in prayer, and 3) she is not to teach men. These three commands of God are justified in that 1) Adam was first formed, then Eve, 2) Adam was not deceived, the woman was, 3) the head of the woman is man (male), and 4) the woman has the physical, psychological, and emotional character for mothering, not for leadership.

Those who respond to these Scriptures with the unbeliever's cliché, "That is just your interpretation," are simply positioning themselves to reject God's role for the woman and press toward the more rebellious "woman libber's" position. Those who acknowledge the truths of these Scriptures, but then contend that it just doesn't work for them, need to acknowledge Christ's advice, "If ye<sup>172</sup> know these things, happy are ye if ye do them" (John 13:17). There are also many who acknowledge these truths and pretend to abide by them, but their hearts are not in it. Such are wolves in sheep's clothing. And wolves in sheep's clothing, especially when they live in the Church parsonage, do appreciable harm to the cause of Christ.

A woman who will acknowledge this as her role and goal for her life, "if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety," can indeed have "all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ" (Eph 1:3). Marriage and home are meant to be a taste of paradise on Earth. A husband and wife who take up God's will and calling for their marriage is an essential first step in achieving that paradise.

### **The Woman's Role in Home, Church, and Society**

God does not have three sets of separate roles for the creatures made in his image and likeness, one for the home, one for the Church and one for society. God's rules apply equally in the Christian house, the Church house, and the commercial house of business, and the White House of government. Where one has an ability to sway the world back to God's ways he should. The ways and commands of Christ are rejected by the world, yea the world is in an absolute rebellion against them, they actively hate them, and Him. Our Lord Jesus said it would be that way. Sadly, it is the same in the apostate church to often called the "Christian

---

172 Do not be afraid of the "ye"s in the Holy Bible. They are the simply the first person plural pronoun differentiated from the first person singular pronoun "thee." Just learn to pronounce every "y" pronoun with a "you-all" in mind.

Church." A "Church" that refuses to acknowledge and adopt the Bible truths about the role of women is to be labeled "apostate," and a believer is to follow Christ's command to "come out from among them and be ye separate" (2Cor 6:17). When pressed by society to work with or for the woman which are errantly put into leadership, a believer must make a decision. The decision is highlighted by Solomon between Proverbs 26:4 and 26:5. If you cannot remain in the situation and uphold Romans 12:18, "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men," if you are becoming a belligerent, hard to work with, i.e. an "I am right and you are wrong" pompous idiot, you should repent, or leave and live where you can put on Christ and be a Christian. There is no singular right answer that fits every situation. In the military I have often worked with, and for, women. There are some who are just ignorant of everything Godly. Some may be pompous and ungodly while others may know God's role and while in a leadership role, make a pretense to conform.

These considerations of the Biblical role of women are presented here because it exemplifies the Charismatic-Pentecostal-Tongues movement's brazen disregard of Bible truth. Where modernists allow political correctness to subvert these Scriptures, Charismatics allow "the spirit which moves them" to subvert the Scriptures and Christ's commands.

## **Chapter 5 Other Systematic Theologies on Pneumatology**

### **Charles Hodge's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology**

Charles Hodge (1797-1878), from Princeton Theological Seminary, may be considered "The Father of the Published Systematic Theology." He was genius, a gifted communicator, and very Presbyterian. He worded a very "Reformed Theology." Even so he made two glaring errors in his approach to theology and consequently, these effect his pneumatology. Charles Hodge considered theology a science that must follow a scientific method, just like the other sciences. Thus, for Hodge, theology does not have the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God as its sole source. Instead, theology, following a scientific method, has its source in the hypothesis of men, which is developed and tested

into theory, which is developed and tested into “all we know about God,” i.e. the truth from “scientific law”. That is the scientific method. True theology starts with the truth, and only debates about how these things can be. We are not theorizing to find truth, the Lord Jesus Christ is truth (John 14:6) Hodge's means of developing theology as a science was very popular in the 19<sup>th</sup> century because the scientific method was formalized and exalted as infallible at the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. This systematic error is frequent in published systematic theologies of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They weigh in about various theories and strive to select the most promising ones, trying to discover truth.

Secondly, Hodge relied on the counsels, creeds, and edicts of the Holy Roman Catholic. He trusted their refining and development of these scientific theories about theology. This is again, a common source of error for all Protestant theology, and particularly all Reformed Theology. (Protestants in general are broken into two major camps which divide along beliefs of Calvinism or Arminianism. Recall that Baptists are not Protestants, and dare not divide between these camps, remaining, instead, as strict Biblicists on the matters of election and predestination.)

Roman doctrine is, obviously, what Reformers were reforming, and what Protestants were protesting. It is seen in Hodge's development of theology, that they never did abandon the systematic errors of the Roman Catholic Church. Most of these errors were just encased in a wordy rationalism which, using the scientific method, were developed into Reformed Theology. These source errors bleed into Hodge's pneumatology with particularly brazen and well documented clarity.

In his Volume 1, Chapter VIII “The Holy Spirit,” Section 3, “History of the Doctrine Concerning the Holy Spirit,” Hodge develops a scenario where the doctrine of the Holy Ghost started as “what was revealed on the surface of Scripture, and what was involved in the religious experience of all Christians.”<sup>173</sup> Hodge thus describes an initial “shallow doctrine” of the Holy Ghost which was present in an “Ante-Nicene” period (literally “before Nicene”). Hodge asserts the belief in “this shallow doctrine,” as he calls it, was captured in their repetition of

---

173 Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*: Volume I, Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, Hardback- Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940, 564 (of 682 pages in soft copy).

the apostolic benediction. He is saying that the Apostles had no sound doctrine of the Holy Spirit of God! Yet, these are the very Apostles which are called out in the Bible as the foundation of all Bible doctrine!<sup>174</sup> Hodge goes on and accuses them of “great obscurity, indistinctness, and inconsistency of statement, especially in reference to the nature and office of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>175</sup>

Hodge asserts that this inconsistency and obscurity was to be expected because the Scriptures are, in his words, “unclear, confusing and contradictory in this doctrine of the Holy Ghost.” The doctrine of the Holy Ghost was then salvaged and founded, according to Hodge, by the Council of Nice, in A.D. 325 and then the council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. These Roman Catholic councils, according to Hodge, first “framed a satisfactory statement of the Scriptural doctrine on this subject.”<sup>176</sup> These Roman Catholic councils, according to Hodge, repaired the “Creed of the Apostles,” which he implies came from the Apostles themselves. It did not. Here, documented in his own hand, is Charles Hodge's credo of where true doctrine originates. According to him, it is not from the Scriptures, and it is not from the Apostles, but it is from the councils, creeds, and edicts of the Empirical Roman Catholic Church. This dangerous thinking permeates the methods of Reformed Theologians.

Little more needs to be said about Hodge's development of the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. While these referenced councils were developing Charles Hodge's favored doctrine of the Holy Spirit of God, their authority, the Holy Roman Catholic Church, was persecuting, exiling, and executing Montanists, Novationists, Paterines<sup>177</sup>, Donatists and other excommunicated believers.<sup>178</sup> Hodge says of this Roman Catholic Doctrine:

These creeds are Catholic, adopted by the whole

---

174 1 Cor 3:10-11, Eph 2:20, Rev 21:14

175 Ibid., Hodge, 564

176 Ibid., 565

177 James Milton Carroll, *The Trail of Blood*, 1932, open source, public domain, from <https://archive.org/details/TheTrailOfBlood> , 12.

178 John T. Christian, *A History of the Baptists*, Vol 1, public domain, first published in 1922, The Baptist Bible Institute, New Orleans, Louisiana, soft copy [http://www.pbministries.org/History/John\\_T.\\_Christian/vol1/](http://www.pbministries.org/History/John_T._Christian/vol1/) , 3 (of 286 pages in soft copy).

Church. Since they were framed there has been no diversity of faith on this subject among those recognized as Christians.

Those who, since the Council of Constantinople have denied the common Church doctrine, whether Socinians, Arians, or Sabellians, regard the Holy Spirit not as a creature, but as the power of God, i.e., the manifested divine efficiency. The modern philosophical theologians of Germany do not differ essentially from this view. De Wette, for example, says, that the Spirit is God as revealed and operative in nature; Schleiermacher says the term designates God as operative in the Church, i.e., "der Gemeingeist der Kirche." This, however, is only a name. God with Schleiermacher is only the unity of the causality manifested in the world. That causality viewed in Christ we may call Son, and viewed in the Church we may call the Spirit. God is merely cause, and man a fleeting effect. Happily Schleiermacher's theology and Schleiermacher's religion were as different as the speculations and the every day faith of the idealist.<sup>179</sup>

In essence, other than this insight into Hodge's systematic error in his *Systematic Theology*, he adds no significant insight to Cambron's well developed and Biblical Doctrine of the Holy Ghost. For completeness, the chapter outline Hodge developed is shown below.

Hodge's Chapter VIII. The Holy Spirit.

§ 1. His Nature 522

--His Personality.

--Proof of his Personality.

--Divinity of the Holy Spirit 527

§ 2. Office of the Holy Spirit

--1. In Nature;

--2. In the Work of Redemption.

--The Revealer of all Divine Truth.

--Applies to Men the Benefits of the Redemption of Christ 532

§ 3. History of the Doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit 532

---

<sup>179</sup> Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*: Volume I, 565 (of 682 pages in soft copy).



## **Augustus H. Strong's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology**

Augustus H. Strong, 1836-1921, was a Yale graduate who taught theology at Rochester Theological Seminary for forty years and became the first president of the Northern Baptist Convention. In title he was a Baptist, but in conviction he was contaminated by both reformed theology and evolutionary Darwinism. His systematic theology has a tremendous depth and scope but his motivation in writing it depicts the grave danger in reading it. Strong strives to mold a traditional reformed emphasis and an evolutionary critical scholarship into the distinctive Baptist conviction. This dangerous combination of reformed theology and atheistic evolution blended into Baptist-Bible doctrine permeates every avenue of his work. As a result the pneumatology, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, is only addressed indirectly under the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that is under his heading, “The Nature, Decrees, and Works of God.”

There is, thus, little to be gained in exploring what A.H. Strong discusses about the Holy Spirit of God. The doctrine of the trinity is detailed specifically in Cambron's “Doctrine of God,” addressed previously in this effort. A.H. Strong, who goes to great depth with clarity, and writes so well that he is the preferred reading of this author, does clarify the Holy Spirit's standing in the God head with the following description:

In the nature of the one God there are three eternal distinctions which are represented to us under the figure of persons, and these three are equal. This tripersonality of the Godhead is exclusively a truth of revelation. It is clearly, though not formally, made known in the New Testament, and intimations of it may be found in the Old.

The doctrine of the Trinity may be expressed in the six following statements: 1. In Scripture there are three who are recognized as God. 2. These three are so described in Scripture

that we are compelled to conceive of them as distinct persons. 3. This tripersonality of the divine nature is not merely economic and temporal, but is immanent and eternal. 4. This tripersonality is not tritheism; for while there are three persons, there is but one essence. 5. The three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, are equal. 6. Inscrutable yet not self-contradictory, this doctrine furnishes the key to all other doctrines.—These statements we proceed now to prove and to elucidate.<sup>180</sup>

A.H. Strong, unlike Hodge, recognizes that the doctrine of the Holy Ghost comes directly from the Apostles and the Bible, not from the Roman councils, creeds and edicts. He calls out Tertullian and Montanists as solidifiers of Apostolic doctrines, while Hodge, following the wording of the Roman Catholic Church, calls them mystics.<sup>181</sup> Strong goes on to clarify the attributes of the trinity as follows:

Reason shows us the Unity of God; only revelation shows us the Trinity of God, thus filling out the indefinite outlines of this unity and vivifying' it. The term "Trinity" is not found in Scripture, although the conception it expresses is Scriptural. The invention of the term is ascribed to Tertullian. The Montanists first defined the personality of the Spirit, and first formulated the doctrine of the Trinity. The term 'Trinity' is not a metaphysical one. It is only a designation of four facts: (1) the Father is God; (2) the Son is God; (3) the Spirit is God; (4) there is but one God.<sup>182</sup>

A.H. Strong further attests that the Holy Spirit is recognized as God and that he is the distinct Person in the the trinity. Each of the assertions is well documented with Scriptures, as is Strong's norm. He uses the following outlines in these assertions:

\* The Holy Spirit is recognized as God.

---

180 Augustus H. Strong, *Systematic Theology: Three Volumes in 1*, Philadelphia, Valley Forge PA, The Judson Press, 1907, 35th printing 1993, 322.

181 Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology: Volume I*, 85 (of 682 pages in soft copy).

182 Ibid., Strong, 322

( a ) He is spoken of as God; ( b ) the attributes of God are ascribed to him, such as life, truth, love, holiness, eternity, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence; ( c ) he does the works of God, such as creation, regeneration, resurrection; ( d ) he receives honor due only to God; ( e ) he is associated with God on a footing of equality, both in the formula of baptism and in the apostolic benedictions....

\* The Holy Spirit is a person.

A. Designations proper to personality are given him....

B. His name is mentioned in immediate connection with other persons, and in such a way as to imply his own personality...

C. He performs acts proper to personality...

D. He is affected as a person by the acts of others...

E. He manifests himself in visible form as distinct from the Father and the Son, yet in direct connection with personal acts performed by them...

F. This ascription to the Spirit of a personal subsistence distinct from that of the Father and of the Son cannot be explained as personification.

The systematic theology of A.H. Strong is excellently developed and documented extensively with Scripture. His overriding purpose, to meld reformed theology and evolutionary scholarship into Baptist's Bible doctrine may, at times disappear into subtlety, but it is always present and always dangerous. His superb delineating of doctrine into digestible thought should only be enjoyed when conscious of this underlying systematic error.

### **Charles Finney's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology**

“Power from On High” by Charles G. Finney (1792-1875) was quoted earlier because of his emphasis and documentation on the filling of the Holy Ghost. However, his Systematic Theology [1878] is predominantly a moral dissertation by a verbose lawyer and covers nothing on pneumatology. Its 83 lectures filling over 1,000 pages does eloquently clarify several errors of John Calvin, but is otherwise

laborious reading. The description of this voluminous effort is given below:

Charles Finney (1792-1875) was an American Presbyterian preacher known for his revival services and extemporaneous preaching. Systematic Theology is a collection of the lectures Finney gave at Oberlin College. They were later published in this volume for distribution to the British public. Finney is known as a heretic in many Christian circles, and Systematic Theology receives no lack of criticism. His theology of self-sanctification worries many staunch Calvinists, and Systematic Theology perpetuates the Calvinist/Armenian debate. But the lectures are well thought out and address diverse subjects - moral law, love, government, depravity, atonement, justification, sanctification, election, perseverance of the saints, and many others. Finney is revered by many and scorned by others, but his Systematic Theology is a masterpiece of religious text and should be treasured. Important for both debate and development of faith, this collection is unique and spirited.<sup>183</sup>

Other than his work already quoted Charles Finney's Systematic Theology adds nothing to a study of pneumatology, and little to the structured field of systematic theology in general.

### **Henry Clarence Thiessen's 1949 "Baptist" Pneumatology**

Henry Clarence Thiessen (1885-1947) taught his "Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology" which was published in 1949. Little is written about Thiessen's background. John MacArthur's Master's College history annals record him as the fourth president of the Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary. It was after Thiessen's death in 1947 that the seminary matriculated into the neo-evangelical Master's College under John MacArthur, but the seeds of that matriculation are evident in Thiessen's lectures.

Three systematic flaws of Thiessen must be held in background while critiquing his Pneumatology. First he did not use the Holy Bible

---

183 By Abby Zwart Christian Classics Ethereal Library (CCEL) Staff Writer from <http://www.ccel.org>

as his sole or even primary source of theology. He holds that theology is just another “science” and one must use the scientific method. He thus uses theories and proofs to establish the truths he deems to be doctrine. In fact, Thiessen even denies the existence of an inspired, inerrant, infallible Holy Bible. He solidifies this errant doctrine thus:

Inspiration is affirmed only of the autographs of the Scriptures, not of any of the versions, whether ancient or modern, nor any of the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, nor of any critical texts known. All these are either known to be faulty in some particulars, or are not certainly known to be free from all error.<sup>184</sup>

That “all Scripture texts lack God's preservation and are thus faulty” is a misguided ruse. Thiessen continues in this ruse to express a faith in ecumenical critics of the bible who may eventually restore some approximate similitude of the very words which God failed to preserve for our present generation. Like all neo-evangelicals Thiessen makes a pretense that although God failed to accurately preserve his very words “textual critics tell us that the number of words that are still in doubt, whether in the Old Testament or in the New, is very small, and that no doctrine is affected by this situation.”<sup>185</sup> Thus, for Thiessen, the foundation is completely crumbled and uncertain but the building seems to remain intact. That is not a good system for a systematic theology.

Every lecture of Henry Clarence Thiessen is affected by his steadfast belief in this “situation.” He therein does not use the Holy Scriptures as his sole source or even his primary source of theology. By his own testimony the Bible he holds in his hands is not the inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God. Everything in his 574 pages of published Systematic Theology must be weighed because of this systematic shortfall of Dr. Thiessen. But there is another systematic flaw in Thiessen's theology.

By inference a reformed theologian is always a reformed Augustinian theologian. Augustinian's philosophy, which constructed the Roman Catholic Church, is what the reformers were reforming, and

---

<sup>184</sup> Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949, 107.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, 107

Thiessen's second systematic flaw is that he was more a reformer than a Baptist. Roman Catholic Saint Augustine framed the doctrine that God has decreed, and God knows for certain, everything that ever is to happen in the universe. That is Augustinian doctrine, but it is not Bible doctrine. Any theologian who makes the concerted effort of rationalizing Roman Catholic Saint Augustine's doctrine of decrees into some rendition of a Bible doctrine is a reformer of theology and thus properly labeled a defender of reformed theology.

In force-fitting Augustinian doctrine into his theology Thiessen makes this audacious declaration:

Some hold that prayer can have not real effect upon God, since he has already decreed just what He will do in every instance. But that is an extreme position. 'Ye have not, because ye ask not' (Jas. 4:2) must not be left out of account. The facts seem to be this, that God does some things only in answer to prayer; He does some other things without one's praying; and He does some things contrary to the prayers made. In His foreknowledge, again, He has taken all these things into account, and in His providence He works them out in accordance with His own purpose and plan. If we do not pray for the things that we might get by prayer, we do not get them. If He wants some things done for which no one prays, He will do them without anyone's praying. If we pray for things contrary to His will, He refuses to grant them. Thus there is perfect harmony between the foreknowledge, decrees, and providence of God.<sup>186</sup>

There is no harmony between the Augustinian doctrine of decrees and the revelation of God in his Holy Word. No matter how much verbiage a theologian uses to rationalize the two views, Augustine's doctrines do not fit into God's doctrines. Those who repeatedly try to reconcile Augustinian doctrines into God's Word are reformed theologians attempting to reform what should have been discarded long ago.

Thiessen's third systematic flaw is directly connected to the first

---

186 Ibid., "The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule", closing paragraph, 187-188.

two, but is it so illuminating that it is included here as a separate entity. The inerrant, infallible, inspired Word of God is clear and emphatic that man is made in the image and likeness of God, that God is a triune being, and that man is a trichotomy, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Henry Clarence Thiessen declares that man is only material and immaterial, a dichotomy, just like the ancient Greek philosophers said, ergo the Roman Catholic Church adopted this dichotomy of man as their doctrine. In order to hold on to this Roman Catholic dogma, Dr. Thiessen not only rejects the Scriptures that reference body, soul, and spirit as separate entities<sup>187</sup>, he attributes 1Thes 5:23<sup>188</sup> as nothing more than what Paul "seems to think."<sup>189</sup> Dr. Thiessen has already denied the inerrancy, infallibility, and inspiration of the Bible he holds in his hands, he defends Roman Catholic and Reformed Roman Catholic doctrines of decrees, and now, in defense of a Roman Catholic dogma, he calls Holy Scripture just a matter of Paul's opinion! These three systematic flaws in Dr. Thiessen's lectures make the work, on a whole, very suspect and not reliable for use as a systematic theology. His Pneumatology suffers with these flaws.

### *Thiessen's Pneumatology*

Like Baptist theologian A. H. Strong before him, Baptist theologian Thiessen has no section of his systematic theology addressing Pneumatology, or the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. Instead, like Strong, he reveals his undue reformed theology leanings when he buries any doctrine of the Holy Ghost in his coverage of the decrees of God, and the trinity of God, the former getting most of the emphasis.

Thiessen only briefly covers the personality of the Holy Spirit in a section under his "Proof that there are three that are recognized as God.." <sup>190</sup> Therein he never uses the title Holy Ghost, and prefers the

---

187 1Sa 1:15, Job 7:11, Isa 10:18, 26:9, 42:1, 51:23, Da 7:25, Mic 6:7, Mt 10:28, 12:18, 1Co 5:3 6:20, 7:34, 15:45, Eph 4:4, 1Th 5:23, Heb 4:12, Jas 2:26

188 1Thes 5:23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

189 Ibid., "The Trichotomous theory", 227

190 Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949, 144

renderings of the A.S.V.<sup>191</sup> His systematic flaws are further evident in a section he titles “The means employed in the exercise of Divine Providence.” Therein he attributes the Holy Spirit of God a “special agent” employed in God's providential dealings.<sup>192</sup> These misgivings mark a dangerous precedence in using Thiessen's limited lectures on the Holy Spirit of God.

When a theologian is entangled in the error of reformed theology wherein God decrees who gets saved and who burns in hell, that error permeates every area of his theology. Here it mars Thiessen's brief discourse on Pneumatology.

### *Thiessen's Little Value Added*

Thiessen's *Lectures in Systematic Theology* adds nothing to a discourse on Pneumatology. His commentary rehearses A. H. Strong's discourse but does not attain the depth of Strong. His rejection and denial of God's preservation of inerrancy, infallibility, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures make his writings a liability more than an asset. One need not read more of Thiessen's lectures on Pneumatology.

## **Lewis Sperry Chafer's Systematic Theology Touching Pneumatology**

Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871 – 1952) wrote eight volumes of Systematic Theology, and Volume VI is 298 pages called Pneumatology. Consider first that Dr. Chafer and his theology were not as fundamental as is regularly supposed. He was the founding president of Dallas Theological Seminary and long-time editor of *Bibliotheca Sacra*. His

---

<sup>191</sup> ASV is the registered trademark of Thomas Nelson & Sons and symbolizes the bible which was copyrighted and published by Thomas Nelson & Sons in 1901. In 1928, the International Council of Religious Education (the body that later merged with the Federal Council of Churches to form the National Council of Churches) acquired the copyright from Nelson and copyrighted the ASV in 1929. Even quoting Thiessen, this author cannot recommend or condone the use of any of the modernist ecumenical copyright bibles, all of which brazenly disregard the inerrancy and infallibility of the verbally inspired Holy Bible by utilizing the Westcott and Hort Bible criticism, textual criticism and critical text as their source.

<sup>192</sup> Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, 186



Seminary had the motto “Teach Truth, Love Well” and was representative of 70+ denominations. Dr. Chafer was called a fundamentalist but a militant fundamentalist could not be representative of 70+ denominations. As song leader under C.I. Scofield he became a gifted teacher for the newly formed World's Christian Fundamentals Association (WCFA). And in 1924 his Evangelical Theological College, which became Dallas Theological Seminary, was called fundamental.<sup>193</sup> However, evangelicals became neoevangelicals when they scoffed at the fundamental separatist position and refused the fundamentalist's militant attitude. Dr. Chafer never scoffed, but he never separated either. Dr. Chafer never mocked militants, but he never became one, and he never camped with any. Instead he coddled to 70+ denominations and the neoevangelicals which lived there.

Chafer displays two primary goals in writing his systematic theology. First he was intent on reaching the Presbyterian Denomination with a dispensational doctrine which would hold to a Biblical premillennial return of Christ. This would necessarily debunk their long held Covenant Theology and its underlying Replacement Theology.

Secondly, Chafer strives to write an “unabridged” systematic theology. Dr. Chafer contends that a Systematic theology is “the collecting, systematically arranging, comparing, exhibiting, and defending of all facts concerning God and His works from any and every source.”<sup>194</sup> It was stated previously that in making such a brash definition Chafer unwittingly puts philosophers such as Aristotle and Plato, and Roman Catholics such as Saint Augustine and Saint Aquinas, and Protestants, who persecuted Baptists, i.e. men such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, on equal grounds with Holy Scripture. In writing his eight volumes on Systematic Theology he repeatedly makes this blunder. A Systematic Theology is not to be an unabridged rendition of everything ever believed about God, as Chafer has boasted, it is to be a systematic organization of each truth that God has revealed in his inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired record. These truths are to debunk the theoretical conjectures of previous philosophers and theologians. Chafer uses none of this authority against Presbyterian error or the errors of the 70+ denominations he represents.

---

193 Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 160

194 from [www.ChristianBook.com](http://www.ChristianBook.com) book promotion accessed Dec 2013

The first of these systematic purposes effects Chafer's pneumatology because he is careful to tiptoe around the 70+ denominations he is representing. In so doing he holds onto much of Presbyterian's Calvinism. However his second purpose, writing an "unabridged theology," causes a systematic flaw which shows up in every avenue of his theology. "Unabridged" means uncondensed. In balancing the huge volume of "everything ever believed about God" Dr. Chafer never captures a systematic organization of any Bible doctrine. His voluminous effort is marked by sentences, paragraphs, and whole sections which have little redeeming value. His theology includes an overage of quotes of other 'theologians', and a famine of quoted or expounded Holy Scripture. In light of these drawbacks, little value can be extracted from Chafer's verbose 300 pages of pneumatology.

In what this author has labeled "a horrid preface to a profound subject," Dr. Chafer presents four excuses for man's ignorance of the Holy Spirit of God. 1) Bad teachers, 2) the Holy Spirit is not an object of faith, 3) the Holy Spirit has no direct declarations, and 4) the Holy Spirit is impersonal. It is curious that these are indeed excuses, an excuse being once defined like bologna, a thin skin of truth stuffed with all kinds of byproducts. He states "If the teacher is given to neglect, ignorance, and error respecting any point of doctrine, the pupil could hardly be expected to correct these impressions."<sup>195</sup> In actuality it is the role of the Holy Ghost to defeat false teachers and to lead one into truth. Dr. Chafer denigrates the personality of the Holy Spirit, in the very volume where he must substantiate the Bible's portrayal of the Holy Spirit as a person with a personality! Thus Chafer does not begin pneumatology well.

In Chapter III Chafer does, however, expand the examination of types and symbols of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Cambren listed "The Emblems of the Holy Spirit" as a) the Dove, b) Water, c) Oil, d) Wind, e) Fire, and f) Clothing. Chafer expands the explanations of these and attempts to add Earnest, Seal, and Abraham's Servant to the list. Although these may not be emblems per se, he does give a profound insight concerning types:

Though the Bible abounds with metaphors, similes,  
symbols, types, parables, allegories, and emblems – a

---

<sup>195</sup> Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, Volume 6, pg. 4.

sevenfold classification of its figures of speech – it is needful to remember that behind every form of utterance there is a reality of truth, which truth must not be underestimated because of the form in which it is presented. All these varied forms of speech which the Bible employs are directly chosen and utilized by God the Holy Spirit. They in no way represent mere literary notions of men. It is of more than passing interest that the Holy Spirit Himself is presented under various types and symbols. The types and symbols which anticipate and describe the Second Person have been realized or fulfilled in concrete, visible form through His incarnation; but the Person and work of the Third Person remains in that obscurity which the invisible and therefore intangible ever involves. Since acquaintance with the Holy Spirit must depend so largely on what is said rather than upon what is seen or felt, attention should be given to every intimation. Though a number of secondary symbols obtain in Scripture, the listing given here will be restricted to the following which are well marked or major unveilings of the Holy Spirit.<sup>196</sup>

For those who have time for an unabridged coverage of everything ever believed about the Holy Spirit Chafer's volume six might be considered an asset. But a systematic theology being a condensation and organization of God's revealed truths, is quite the opposite of his unabridged effort.

## **Chapter 6 Pneumatology Conclusion**

The Holy Ghost, as a person of the trinity, plays a significant role in God's relation with humanity. A holistic study of his person and that role is the purpose of pneumatology. In John 16 the Lord Jesus Christ expounds the role of the Holy Ghost for the New Testament believer. He declares that when he goes away he will send “another Comforter” which is the Holy Spirit of God. Thus the Holy Ghost will henceforth be the one who will 1) reprove the world of sin, righteousness and

---

196 Ibid 47.

judgment, 2) guide believers into all truth, and 3) be the new “Comforter” which consoles, identifies ones best interests, and becomes our representative, leader, and friend. These roles were fulfilled by God in the Old Testament, by Christ when he ministered in the flesh, and now are assigned to the Holy Ghost under the title “Comforter.” The doctrine surrounding the Holy Ghost is vast but well outlined herein; the role of the Holy Ghost is misunderstood and misrepresented in the era of modernism; and the true filling of the Holy Ghost is dearth in fundamentalism. Pneumatology is worthy of additional study.

## Bibliography

### The Holy Bible

Bancroft, Emery H., *Elemental Theology*, 1932, Baptist Bible Seminary, 1945, 1960, Zondervan 1977, [In 1932 Emery H. Bancroft became the first Dean of Baptist Bible Seminary, Johnson City, NY and published his text for his course *Elemental Theology*. In 1968 the Seminary relocated to Clark Summit PA. In 1970 this author attended Practical Bible Training School on the Johnson City campus and studied Bancroft's text. In 1999 – 2000 this author attended Baptist Bible Seminary to take Greek (NT502 and NT503) via a 3 hour commute from Hammondsport NY to Clark Summit PA, and was reintroduced to Bancroft's exceptional work.]

Cambron, Mark G. *Bible Doctrines*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1954, [Independent Baptist, Professor and Dean, Tennessee Temple Bible School-College-Seminary, 1948-1959, serving with Dr. Lee Roberson (1909-2007) the founder of Tennessee Temple University in 1946], [*Bible Doctrines, Beliefs That Matter* is available at <http://thecambroninstitute.org/library/Bible%20Doctrines.pdf> and <https://heritagebbc.com/bible-doctrines-class-complete/> ].

Carroll, James Milton, *The Trail of Blood*, 1932, open source, public domain, from <https://archive.org/details/TheTrailOfBlood>.

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.[Lewis Sperry Chafer was an American theologian. He founded and served as the first president of Dallas Theological Seminary, and was an influential founding member of modern Christian Dispensationalism. Born: February 27, 1871, Rock Creek, Died: August 22, 1952, Seattle, Education: Oberlin College, Wheaton College. For

my Doctorate of Philosophy in Theological Studies through LBTS, I was tasked to analyze all six volumes of his Systematic Theology]

*Satan*, 1909, Free ebooks - Project Gutenberg, 2004,  
<http://www.gutenberg.org> accessed 06/01/2013

Christian, John T., *A History of the Baptists*, Vol 1&2, The Baptist Bible Institute, New Orleans, Louisiana, first published in 1922, public domain, soft copy

[http://www.pbministries.org/History/John T. Christian/vol1/](http://www.pbministries.org/History/John%20T.%20Christian/vol1/)  
or

<http://www.reformedreader.org/history/christian/ahob1/ahobp.htm>.

Dollar, George W., *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, Bob Jones University Press, 1973.

Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI, 1985.

Finney, Charles G., *Power from On High*, Christian Literature Crusade, public domain, from  
<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/finney/power.html>

Gausson, L., *Theopneustia – The plenary Inspiration of The Holy Scriptures deduced from Internal Evidence, and the Testimonies of Nature, History and Science*, David Scott's translation, Chicago, The Bible Institute Colportage ASS'N., 1840.

Geisler, Norman L, *Systematic Theology in One Volume*, Bethany House, 2002, 3, 4, 5, 11 [Geisler, also a neoevangelical, sharply contrasts with Lewis Sperry Chafer in that Geisler 1) admits what he is, neoevangelical, 2) admits what he is attempting, a compilation of evangelical theologies, 3) shows superb organization and structure of thought, 4) contains

## Bibliography

depth, and 5) is a masterful communicator. This author cannot endorse all that Geisler believes to be true, but can endorse that he seems to capture all that has been believed by conservative evangelicals.]

Hodge, Charles, *Systematic Theology: Volume I-IV*, Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, Hardback- Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940, Christian Classics Ethereal Library, <http://www.ccel.org>, public domain. [The Internet Archive [www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01hodg](http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01hodg)], [Charles Hodge, 1797-1878, Presbyterian Minister, Princeton Theologian].

Larkin, Clarence. *The Spirit World*, Published by the Clarence Larkin Estate, 1921, Cosimo, 2005

Miley, John, *Systematic Theology* Vol. 1 & 2, The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, New York: Eaton and Mains, 1894, The Internet Archive <http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01mile>, [John Miley (1813-1895, Methodist Theologian)].

Rice, Edward G., *The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*, Public Domain, <http://www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf>, <http://www.lulu.com/shop/pastor-edward-rice/the-357-magnum-errors-of-modernists-critical-texts/paperback/product-5586759.html>

Ryrie, Charles C., *Basic Theology*. Victor Books, Wheaton, Illinois, 1981.

Schaff, Philip. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Three volumes, 1877, reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977.

----- . *History of the Christian Church*. Third edition, revised in eight volumes, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing

Company, 1910.

Schofield, C. I., *Prophecy Made Plain*, Photolithoprinted by Grand Rapids Book Manufacturers, Grand Rapids, MI, 1967.

Shedd, William G. T., *Dogmatic Theology*, Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, Charles Scribner & Sons, 1888. [The Internet Archive [www.archive.org/details/dogmatictheology01sheduoft](http://www.archive.org/details/dogmatictheology01sheduoft)], [William G.T. Shedd, 1820-1894, Old School Presbyterian & Reformed Theologian].

----- Calvinism: Pure and Mixed, A Defense of the Westminster Standards. 1893, reprint, Edinburgh, UK: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1986.

----- Commentary on Romans. 1879, reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1980.

Strong, Augustus H., *Systematic Theology: Three Volumes in 1*, Philadelphia, Valley Forge PA, The Judson Press, 1907, 35<sup>th</sup> printing 1993. [Augustus H. Strong, 1836-1921, American Baptist Pastor & Theologian].

Thiessen, Henry Clarence, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949. [Henry Clarence Thiessen, ? -1947, President of Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, later renamed John MacArthur's The Master's College].

*Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Revised by Vernon D. Doerksen, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 2006.

Waite, D.A.. *Defending the King James Bible*. The Bible For Today Press, 1992 & 2002.



## Bibliography

Yoho, Walter Allan, *YAHWEH The Greatness of God*, Volume 1 thru 3, FBCPublications.com, 2010. [Dr. Yoho teaches theology at Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary 717 Whitehurst Landing Rd. Virginia Beach VA 23464 under Pastor. James Baker. We met after our military-hop to Norfolk VA on our return from Mazara Del Vallo, Italy in May 2016. I have been enthralled with his three volumes of theology since that meeting.]

## About the Author

Pastor Ed Rice is a retired USAF Systems Engineer surrendered to be a Baptist Preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Saved in 1960 at the age of eight he grew up tutored in the Scriptures through Tuscorora Baptist Church in Addison NY, where he married his high-school sweetheart Beverly Cook Rice. Drafted into the military off of the dairy farm in 1972, Ed and Bev Rice raised 3 boys while serving as a Missile Technician in the USAF. After completing a USAF AECP bootstrap program he graduated from Ohio State University with a degree in electrical engineering and was commissioned in the USAF where he served until 1995 as a systems engineer and weapons integration specialist at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, and Rome Laboratories, Rome NY. He finished his Masters degree in Electrical Engineering through The Air Force Institute of Technology in 1990.

After being commissioned as a USAF officer in 1982 he pursued his systems engineering work in several classified research and development programs. While moving around the USA in his twenty three year military career he was a youth pastor and associate pastor in Independent Baptist Churches near his station. In 1995 he became Captain Rice, USAF retired, and surrendered to be a Baptist Pastor.

In 1998 he took the senior pastorate at Good Samaritan Baptist Church, in Dresden, New York where he pursued his theological studies at Louisiana Baptist Theological Seminary. At LBU Pastor Rice received his second masters degree in 2013, and his PhD in 2017. His son Michael is US Army retired living near Fort Hood Texas, Shane is an Independent Baptist Missionary pastoring Chiesa Biblica Battista, Mazara Del Vallo, Italy, and Matthew is serving our Lord Jesus Christ near Hamilton NY. Capt Rice has spent seven years teaching math and science with the ABeka Christian High School Curriculum, and seven years teaching college mathematics, a love of his life, at both Corning Community College, and Elmira College.

Dr. Rice's staunch belief in the preserved accuracy of the inspired Scriptures and his extensive background in systems engineering make him uniquely qualified to assemble "A Systematic Theology for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century."

## **Personal Testimony of Pastor Edward Rice.**

I was saved in 1960 at the age of eight. My father and mother were saved and founding members of Fellowship Baptist Church in Gang Mills New York. In 1958 my dad, Levi O. Rice, an agnostic, was invited by Cecil Palm to be a founding member of that church; both of my parents were born-again-saved two weeks later. My mother, Doris was converted from Roman Catholicism, and became a Christian. She stopped her Roman penance and practiced Bible repentance, stopped praying to Mary and called upon the Lord Jesus Christ to save her. She was thus converted from Roman Catholicism to the Lord Jesus Christ. Everyone needs converted from something. Mom and Dad were now born again, and two years later I was saved in revival services with Evangelist Dale and Opel Linbaugh. Opel cut the flannel graph burden of sin off little Christian's back in her Pilgrim's Progress presentation, and I was born-again-saved before it hit the basement floor. In 1995 I retired from the USAF as a systems engineer and became an ordained Baptist Preacher of the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt 18:3). Being converted is quite like a new birth, Jesus said so. If you have not been converted you should trust Christ today, and you must tell him that that is your intent. (see Romans 10:9-13).