

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century Volume 01 Prolegomena

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

Volume 01 Prolegomena

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

Volume 01 Prolegomena

Dr. Edward G. 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."

Edward G. Rice

Published by

Good Samaritan Baptist Church GSBaptistChurch.com

54 Main St.. Box 99, Dresden, NY 14441

<http://stores.lulu.com/GSBaptistChurch>

Cover Design and Photographs by:

Edward G. Rice

Principle Scripture Quotations are from the non-copyright

King James Authorized Version

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

Volume 01 Prolegomena

Download in pdf at www.GSBaptistChurch.com/theology

Table of Contents

<u>A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century Volume 01 Prolegomena</u>	
<u>Introduction.....</u>	<u>1</u>
Four Flaws in Previous Works.....	2
Why Baptists Use Only the Authorized King James Bible.....	4
The Issue of the Copyrights.....	5
The Four Superiorities of the Authorized Version.....	6
Copyright Bibles Must Be “Significantly Different”.....	7
The Thees and Thous of an Accurate Bible Translation.....	15
<u>Prolegomena.....</u>	<u>17</u>
Theology is for Everyone.....	20
Why Systematic?.....	22
Theology Is Not a Science.....	23
Theology Has Not Been Systematic.....	27
Consider the System In Systematic.....	31
Systematic Is Accomplished With Actual Systems.....	32
Systematically Based On a Solid Bible Doctrine.....	40
The New Improved Systematic Methodology.....	45
<u>Bibliography.....</u>	<u>47</u>

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 21st 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 21st 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.

A prolegomena for such a work as this is almost as great an undertaking as a work like this. While I add, modify and correct content in the volumes I must add, modify, and correct content in both the prolegomena and epilogue. As I face critique and correction I engage an ongoing struggle to capture in the right wording, to communicate in the right spirit, and to assemble in the proper prose what by intent captures the whole truth. As much as each of us is a work in progress, this prolegomena is a work in progress. The purpose here is to set out the justification and direction of the whole work, but as each of the other eleven volumes is completed this prolegomena should also contain a justification and summary of their individual accomplishments. The processes is spiraling toward a central point.

When I began work on my Ph.D. in 2014 I set a goal to finish this Systematic Theology for the 21st 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.

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

Volume 01 Prolegomena

Introduction

Greetings in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

*Man that is in honour, and understandeth not, is
like the beasts that perish. Psalm 49:20¹*

There is no Baptist Systematic Theology work in print today, i.e. there is no Systematic Theology work that has the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired word of God as its sole authority. There ought to be. There is a cause. Baptists, by definition, have the inerrant, infallible, inspired Holy Bible as their sole authority for all faith and practice. They should have a systematic theology book that does as well.

You are solicited to join in a five year theological journey which will end with a “Systematic Theology for the 21st Century.” The only fare is that you review the work as it is being assembled. All critiques will be welcomed and any born again believer is fully qualified to construct, and certainly to critique, such a work. A systematic theology is simply drawing a circle around the Holy Bible, and then rationally considering every principle, concept and thought that has been revealed to man by God. It shall be exhaustive, but in this venue, with your help, it need not be exhausting.

The reward for your participation will be a copy of the completed work. But that will barely compare with the benefit we each gain in assembling such a work.

Is there not a cause? 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. This year, 2013, seminary work at Louisiana Baptist Theological Seminary, under Dr. Steven Pettey, assigned me to read and analyze six volumes of “Systematic Theology” by Lewis

1 The Holy Bible

Sperry Chafer, the founder and previous president of Dallas Theological Seminary. Initial critique of this neo-evangelical, voluminous, wordy, often unorganized work, answered the question, “Is there not a cause?”² A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century is indeed a valid need. It cries out to be written and it is a work that I must needs endeavor.

Four Flaws in Previous Works

Immediately there are four principle flaws that need to be overhauled in previous works. Previous systematic theologies spend effort systematizing creeds, Roman dogma, philosophies, and “everything that man ever believed about God,” rather than the systematization of Bible revelation. Current “Systematic Theologies” follow the deceived definition of Dr. Chafer who states that a systematic theology is an unabridged organized rendition of everything ever believed about God. Where is the sole-authority of the Bible in that? For example, the Westminster confession of faith establishes that God unchangeably decreed every thing that comes to pass... EVERYTHING! And that God decreed it all before the foundation of the world! The Bible is emphatic that Abraham, with his bargaining, Moses, with his intercession, Nineveh, with its repentance, Joash, with his arrows, Hezekiah, with his prayer, and Jesus, with his whosoever(s), each directly changed what God was going to do. Also, IF prayer changes things, so can we! And so can God.

One would expect Charles Hodge (1797-1878) to bow to such a Westminster creed, he was a Presbyterian. But when Augustus Strong (1836-1921), an American Baptist minister and Theologian, supports Westminster over the Bible, and Henry C. Thiessen (1883 - 1947), 1947 President of Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, resoundingly supported Westminster over the Bible, and, finally, when Lewis Sperry Chafer, followed suit, it is time to re-write a systematic theology that presents what the Bible reveals over what the creeds state. Present systematic theology works are marred by what the Holy Catholic Church declared as truth. A Biblical one is direly needed.

2 The question is borrowed from a giant slayer. Reference 1Sam 17:29, “And David said, What have I now done? Is there not a cause?”

Secondly, previous systematic theologies spend effort defending philosophies of man and rationality of man rather than systematizing Bible revelation. All the previous listed theologians spend undo time and effort wrestling with the ontological and teleological proof that there is a God. The Bible spends no effort in such vain philosophies of man. Also, Thiessen, particularly, expends great effort defending the philosophical and Roman Catholic argument that man is only material and immaterial and NOT body, soul and spirit, i.e. a trichotomy in the image of God. In this error, he even calls Holy Scripture, just Paul's opinion.³ Chafer also makes reference to the dichotomy of man, but then later references his trichotomy; again Chafer has proven himself remarkably wordy, unclear, and inconsistent. He wanted to be all things to all denominations, even dispensational at times, but not at the expense of loosing the influential covenant theologians who taught at, and attended, Dallas Theological Seminary.

Thirdly all systematic theologies treated theology as a science. They tried to exalt it by calling it the “Queen of the Sciences”, but they still tried to discover truth by hypothesizing what it might be, exploring their hypothesis until it might be a theory about how God operates and thinks, and then supposing that, when their theory is believed by enough “scholars”, it was a discerned truth. That is how the scientific method discovers laws of natural science. That is the scientific method. It does not work on God who is Super-natural. Theology is not a science nor dare one use the scientific method to find the Truth of God. Once again, A Biblical Systematic Theology, with the Bible as its sole authority, was direly needed.

Lastly Thiessen and Chafer, by their own insistence, have no access to a verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible Holy Bible. They insist that nowhere in the world does such a Bible exist. Both base their systematic theologies on what textual critics, modern translators, and modern scholars thought God meant to say. A true theologian must base all theology on an inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Holy Bible; it is our sole authority. For Baptists it is the sole authority for all faith and practice, and although we do have a reliably written and translated into English Holy Bible, we do not have a reliably written

3 Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology* (Eerdmans, 1949), 226-227.

Systematic Theology in print. With this effort and your help we will get one in print, at least in eprint. Baptist Bible seminaries, colleges, institutes, and students deserve no less.

Visit www.GSBaptistChurch.com/theology to follow this effort's development.

Why Baptists Use Only the Authorized King James Bible

This section title needs to be extended to clarify a couple things; “Why True-To-Scripture Baptists Use Only the Authorized King James Bible - The ONLY Complete English Bible”, is the more inclusive title. With that clarified and with the previous insistence that this systematic theology be based solely on the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God we need to here briefly examine the multiple versions issue that will be more fully addressed in the Bibliology volume.

All modernists ecumenical Bibles completely leave out 20 verses that have always been in the Holy Bible. They say that Matt 17:21 is not supposed to be in the Bible. They take their pen knife and cut it out! Then they take their knife and cut out Matt 18:11, 23:14, Mark 7:16, 9:44 & 46, 11:26, 15:28, Luke 17:36, 23:17, John 5:4, Acts 8:37, 15:34, 24:7, 28:29, Rom 16:24, and 1 John 5:7, then they take Col 1:14 and cut out the clause "Through His Blood" because they think God did not mean to say that. For over nineteen hundred years believers have considered these 20 verses to be inspired, inerrant, infallible Scripture. **Modernist ecumenical scholars contend that no Bible in existence today is inspired.** Baptists will never agree with such folly. We use the ONLY complete English Bible with these verses still intact, the Authorized King James Bible.

There are 64,000 other reasons detailed in this short study. Many are misinformed about this crucial issue. Many partake in the modernist's diabolical attack against the KJB.⁴

The copyright New International Version New Testament has 64,000 fewer words than the King James Bible's New Testament!

4 See “The Defense of Twenty” by Pastor Ed Rice, Good Samaritan Baptist Church, 54 Main St., Dresden NY 14441
www.gsbaptistchurch.com/seminary/landmark/content/defense_twenty.pdf

Words that are certainly in the Greek New Testament have been completely eliminated. Baptists will not use the NIV⁵ or ESV⁶, holding instead to the complete and accurate authorized King James Bible.

Baptists, above all others, base all their faith and practice on only the words of the Holy Scriptures. When critical modernists mess with the words they are messing with our faith and practice. It is better to learn that 'thee' is the 2nd person singular of 'you' and 'thou' is its subjective case than to have a sinister textual critic mess with your faith and practice.

The Issue of the Copyrights.

If you use a modernist bible you should know that it has SIGNIFICANT DEVIATIONS from the HOLY BIBLE.

In order to secure a copyright on a new bible translation it must be demonstrated legally that there are SIGNIFICANT DEVIATIONS from any previous work, 64,000 of them! The race to get copyrights on so many SIGNIFICANT DEVIATIONS has been so intense that now the NIV is proposing a (per)version that changes God the Father to Mother God, just to secure another lucrative copyright on what used to be GOD'S uncopyrighted WORDS. Shame on Ecumenical Modernists. Stay away from their bibles and bad doctrine. Only their 64,000 SIGNIFICANT DEVIATIONS have allowed them to get several copyrights, but there is only one Holy Bible, and it has no copyright held by mere man.

Baptists believe that *“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works”* (2Tim 3:16) This was written about the copies of copies of copies. Modernist translators reject this truth.

5 NIV is a registered trademark of the New York Bible Society International, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, standing for “New International Version” and their ecumenical modernist copyright, all rights reserved, 1973 bible.

6 ESV is a registered trademark of the Crossway – Good News Publishers, Wheaton Illinois, standing for “English Standard Version” and their ecumenical, modernist, copyright, all rights reserved, 2001 bible.

Modernist ecumenical scholars contend that no Bible in existence today is inspired. They contend that only the original manuscripts were inspired, i.e. only what came from the apostle's pen! All these manuscripts are lost and consequently there is no inspired Word of God in existence. However, they think their excellent and revered 'textual criticism' will be able to restore the originals from the two oldest existing manuscripts from Alexandria Egypt. Both manuscripts came from the pen of Roman Catholic Church Fathers, Clement of Alexandria and Origen of Alexandria. Catholic Saint Origen is considered the Father of Textual Criticism and the Father of the Allegorical Method, whereby Scripture “conceals a secret hidden meaning that only the supremely spiritually astute can see and comprehend.” Baptists never have trusted Catholics, especially their textual criticism, and allegorical methods. Look what the ecumenical “scholars” did to the **WORDS OF GOD**:

Psalm 12:6 The <u>words</u> of the LORD are pure <u>words</u> : as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. (Holy Bible)	6 The promises of the LORD are promises that are pure, silver refined in a furnace on the ground, purified seven times. RSV
7 Thou shalt keep <u>them</u> , O LORD, thou shalt preserve <u>them</u> from this generation for ever. (The Holy Bible)	7 Do thou, O LORD, protect us , guard us ever from this generation. The RSV
Psalm 100:5 For the LORD is good; his mercy is everlasting; and his <u>truth</u> endureth to all generations. (The Holy Bible)	5 For the LORD is good; his steadfast love endures for ever, and his faithfulness to all generations. The RSV
Prov 22:12 ¶ The eyes of the LORD <u>preserve</u> knowledge, and he overthroweth the words of the transgressor. (The Holy Bible)	12 ¶ The eyes of the LORD keep watch over knowledge, but he overthrows the words of the faithless. The RSV

The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever Isaiah 40:8 (The Holy Bible)

The Four Superiorities of the Authorized Version:

The **Superior Texts** are manifest in the 20 verses mentioned previously which are ripped out of a modernist's Greek text. But there are myriad more examples. In Luke 22:2 the Bible says “Joseph and his mother” but their text errantly says “his father and his mother.” In 1Tim 3:16 the Bible says “God was manifest in the flesh” but their errant text says “He was manifest in the flesh.”

The **Superior Translators** are manifest in Mark 1:2 where the Bible says “As it is written in the prophets” but their translators, thinking they now know more than God's Word states, changed it to “As it is written in Isaiah the prophet.” In Eph 4:6 God declares: “One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all” while their translators twist it to say “one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all. ASV” That is pantheism!

The **Superior Technique** shows when with *formal equivalence* Jesus calls sin: “Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause.” Modernists using *dynamic equivalence* call a sin, “every one who is angry with his brother.” (They then rip out the whole last half of this verse completely!) (Matt 5:22) In 2Kings 10:15 the Bible says they “went to the city of the house of Baal” while their faulty dynamic equivalence technique says they “went into the inner room of the house of Baal” (RSV). Their techniques are faulty throughout.

The **Superior Theology** is seen in Eph 3:9 wherein “God, who created all things by Jesus Christ”, differs from their defective theology which rips out the “by Jesus Christ.” Or in Luke 2:22 the Bible speaks of Mary's purification, but the modernist theologian changes it to imply that Jesus needed purification too. The Only Begotten son of God did not need purification!

Copyright Bibles Must Be “Significantly Different”

It is meaningful to step back and look at the larger deception that is in place in the modern church. There are a hundred bible versions out there. Each version is copyright and must, by law, say something “significantly different” from any other copyright version, or from the public domain original King James translation. They cannot just say

the same thing in a different way, they must have a “significantly different” presentation of material. A hundred bible versions presenting a hundred versions of what God meant to say produces such a fractured authority that nobody really knows the answer to Pilate's question, “What is truth?” (John 18:38). Every one is thereby allowed to make up their own “interpretation” whereby their distinct personal version of a verse is as valid as anyone else's version.

Case in point, after Pilate's question, “What is truth?”, his next declaration, exactly translated from the Greek, was “*I find in him no fault at all*” (John 18:38b). But copyright requires that quote to change.

Perhaps he said, “I cannot find **anything wrong about** him.”? As copyright by James A.R. Moffatt D.D., D.LITT., in his 1950 "The Bible – A New Translation". All rights in this book are reserved. No part of the text may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission. But Dr. Moffatt was also thinking that Pilate asked “What does truth mean?”, instead of “What is truth?”

Or was it “I find **no fault** in him”? As copyright by the Lockman Foundation in California, in their 1958 The Amplified New Testament... All Rights Reserved. Reproduction of this Testament or any part thereof is expressly prohibited.

Or was it “I find **no guilt** in him”? As copyright by The Lockman Foundation, California in their 1960 NASB (NASB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for the New American Standard Version).

Or was it, “For my part, I find **no case against** him”, as copyright by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press in their 1961 NEB (NEB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for the New English Bible).

Or was it “I find **no crime** in him”? As copyright by the World Publishing Company in their 1962 RSV (RSV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for Revised Standard Version).

Or was it “I cannot find **any reason to condemn** him”, as copyright by the American Bible Society in their 1966 Good News Bible- Todays English Version.

Or was it “I find **no fault** in him at all”? As copyright by the Oxford University Press, Inc. in their 1967 NKJ (NKJ is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New King James). [Oxford University agreed not to change any underlying Greek in their New Testament translation, only to strip away all second person singular indicators (and make them all plural, you and your) and to remove all verb case indicators (believeth ... hath vs

Oxford's believes ... has). However, these changes could not secure a copyright on their New Testament. They got their copyright with all their "significant deviations" found in the Old Testament.]

Or was it "Speaking for myself, I find **no case** against this man"? As copyright by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in Washington D.C. in their 1970 NAB (NAB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New American Bible).

Or was it "I find **no basis for a charge against him**"? As copyright by the New York Bible Society International, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in their 1973 NIV (NIV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New International Version).

Or was it "I find **no fault** in him"? As copyright by the Watch Tower Bible And Tract Society of Pennsylvania and International Bible Students Association in their 1984 NWT (NWT is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New World Translation).[It is curious that the Watch Tower Society, that does not believe in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ nor the trinity of the Godhead, predominately change, with brazen boldness, what offends their faulty doctrines.]

Or was it "I don't find this man **guilty of anything**"? As copyright by the American Bible Society in their 1995 CEV (CEV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for Contemporary English Version).

Or was it "I find **no guilt** in him"? As copyright by Crossway in their 2001 ESV (ESV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for English Standard Version).

Many will read all these copyright renditions and repeat Hillary Rodham Clinton's line "What possible difference could it make anyhow!" They might continue, "Pilate found nothing wrong with the dude!" Two important observations on these multiple renditions. First, words are important. Many of the words added by theses translators are not represented at all in the Greek New Testament⁷. Further, the word used in the Greek, and consequently in the Authorized King James Bible, is exactly the word used to describe the Old Testament passover lamb and/or sin sacrifice which was to be without **fault** or blemish. But that exact word is carefully avoided by all modern versions. The wide variations in Pilate's modernized declaration certainly come from copyright considerations, but they also show a "fault" in them which is even more diabolical.

7 Even the corrupted Westcott and Hort Greek text, based on the corrupted Alexandrian Egypt manuscripts, copyright 1966, by The United Bible Societies of the USA, agrees with the Greek Received Text (The Textus Receptus) in this instance, in this verse.

The drive to sell copyright ecumenical bibles to everyone is the ultimate in diabolical subtleness for propagating Satan's line "Yea hath God said?" The previous modernist ecumenical mutilation of "*I find in him no fault at all*" was likely only driven by copyright considerations. Allow two more "case in point" considerations here.

The catholic church, from its roots, has works embedded in its salvation process. It might be Roman, Orthodox, or Episcopalian penance, Presbyterian infant baptism, Methodist methods or Pentecostal baptismal regeneration, there is always something added to belief before salvation is secured. John 3:36 states, "*He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.*" Herein, as throughout the Holy Bible, Salvation is solely based on faith (4102 πιστις *pistis* as a noun) i.e. what we believe (4100 πιστευω *pisteuo* exact same Greek word as a verb) and not based on works that we might do or obedience that we might render.

There are times when the fifty-seven highly skilled linguists, employed and paid by King James from 1603 through 1611, divided into six companies which met in cities of Cambridge, Westminster, and Oxford, as they, under the unction of the Holy Spirit of God, took seven years to translate God's inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Old Testament and New Testament books into an authorized Holy Bible which answered only to the original Hebrew and Greek, well there were times when the context of the text and the doctrine of the whole Bible determined how a word might be translated. Such is the case with the phrase "believeth not" in John 3:36. The Greek word used, (544 απειθεω *apeitheo*) literally means "not to allow one's self to be perused" and could thus be translated disobedient. The highly skilled linguists translating the Authorized Version knew in the context of salvation to translate it "believeth not" as they did eight other times (Acts 14:2, 17:5, 19:9, Rom 11:31, 15:31, Heb 3:18, 11, 31). These expert linguists only translated this Greek word "disobey" when the context called for it in four verses not dealing with soul-salvation (Rom 10:21, 1Pet 2:7,8, 3:20). Modernist ecumenical translators did not take this care.

How do ecumenical modernist bibles translate the "*believeth not*" phrase in their ecumenical friendly copyright versions?

Perhaps Jesus said, “**he who disobeys** the Son shall not see life”? As copyright by James A.R. Moffatt D.D., D.LITT., in his 1950 "The Bible – A New Translation". All rights in this book are reserved. No part of the text may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission.

Or was it “**he who does not obey** the Son shall not see life”? As copyright by The Lockman Foundation in California, in their 1960 NASB (NASB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for the New American Standard Version).

Or was it, “**he who disobeys** the Son shall not see that life”? As copyright by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press in their 1961 NEB (NEB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for the New English Bible).

Or was it “**he who does not obey** the Son shall not see life”? As copyright by the World Publishing Company in their 1962 RSV (RSV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for Revised Standard Version).

Or was it “**whoever disobeys** the Son, will not have life”? As copyright by the American Bible Society in their 1966 Good News Bible- Todays English Version.

Or was it “he who does not believe the Son shall not see life”? As copyright by the Oxford University Press, Inc. in their 1967 NKJ (NKJ is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New King James). [Oxford University agreed not to change any underlying Greek in their New Testament translation, only to strip away all second person singular indicators (and make them all plural, you and your) and to remove all verb case indicators (believeth ... hath vs Oxford's believes ... has). However, these changes could not secure a copyright on their New Testament. They got their copyright with all their “significant deviations” found in the Old Testament.]

Or was it “**whoever disobeys** the Son shall not see life”? As copyright by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in Washington D.C., in their 1970 NAB (NAB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New American Bible).

Or was it “**whoever rejects** the Son will not see life”? As copyright by the New York Bible Society International, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in their 1973 NIV (NIV is a registered trademark of the

same, standing for New International Version).

Or was it “**he that disobeys** the Son will not see life”? As copyright by the Watch Tower Bible And Tract Society of Pennsylvania and International Bible Students Association in their 1984 NWT (NWT is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New World Translation). [It is curious that the Watch Tower Society, that does not believe in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ nor the trinity of the Godhead, predominately change, with brazen boldness, what offends their faulty doctrines.]

Or was it “**no one who rejects him** will ever share in that life”? As copyright by the American Bible Society in their 1995 CEV (CEV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for Contemporary English Version).

Or was it “**whoever does not obey** the Son shall not see life”? As copyright by Crossway in their 2001 ESV (ESV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for English Standard Version).

These translations of the Greek may not be technically in error, but in the context of receiving “so great salvation” by faith and faith alone, when that is the context, they are grossly in error. In the Bible he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the son shall not see life. In 8 of 11 of these ecumenical modernist bibles it is not unbelief, but disobedience that sends a soul to hell and in 2 of the 11 it is not unbelief but rejection. Shame on those dollar driven, bible societies and more so shame on the Christians who gave up their Bibles without a fight.

Modernist ecumenical translators also use a corrupted Greek text as seen in the next case in point.

The catholic church, from its roots, has made salvation a process that is tied to works and growth. The catholic cannot be sure of their salvation as an instantaneous “born-again” completed event wherein one day they were headed to hell and the next they were headed to heaven. Consequently, what will be the leaning of the ecumenical modernist bibles on this new-birth concept? First Peter 2:2 states “*As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby:*” but modernists, via their corrupted Vaticanus and Sinaiticus Greek manuscripts from Alexandria Egypt, add to the Word of God to deny the instantaneous new birth, and make salvation a growing thing.

Look what their corrupted Greek text added to their ecumenical translations.

Perhaps, they suppose, Peter said, “Like newly born children, thirst for the pure, spiritual milk to make you **grow up into salvation**”? As copyright by James A.R. Moffatt D.D., D.LITT., in his 1950 "The Bible – A New Translation". All rights in this book are reserved. No part of the text may be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission.

Or was it “long for the pure milk of the word, that by it you may **grow in respect to salvation**”? As copyright by The Lockman Foundation in California, in their 1960 NASB (NASB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for the New American Standard Version).

Or was it, “Like the newborn infants you are, you must crave for pure milk (spiritual milk, I mean), so that you may thrive upon it to your soul's health”? As copyright by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press in their 1961 NEB (NEB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for the New English Bible).

Or was it “that by it you may **grow up to salvation**”? As copyright by the World Publishing Company in their 1962 RSV (RSV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for Revised Standard Version).

Or was it “Be like newborn babies, always thirsty for the pure spiritual milk, so that by drinking it you may **grow up and be saved**”? As copyright by the American Bible Society in their 1966 Good News Bible- Todays English Version.

Or was it “*as newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby*”? As copyright by the Oxford University Press, Inc. in their 1967 NKJ (NKJ is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New King James). [Oxford University agreed not to change any underlying Greek in their New Testament translation, only to strip away all second person singular indicators (and make them all plural, you and your) and to remove all verb case indicators (believeth ... hath vs Oxford's believes ... has). However, these changes could not secure a copyright on their New Testament. They got their copyright with all their “significant deviations” found in the Old Testament.]

Or was it “Be as eager for milk as newborn babies – pure milk of the spirit to make you **grow unto salvation**”? As copyright by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in Washington D.C. in their 1970 NAB (NAB is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New American Bible).

Or was it “Like newborn babies, crave pure spiritual milk, so that by it you may **grow up in your salvation**”? As copyright by the New York Bible Society International, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in their 1973 NIV (NIV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New International Version).

Or was it “as newborn infants, form a longing for the unadulterated milk belonging to the word, that through it you may **grow to salvation**”? As copyright by the Watch Tower Bible And Tract Society of Pennsylvania and International Bible Students Association in their 1984 NWT (NWT is a registered trademark of the same, standing for New World Translation). [It is curious that the Watch Tower Society, that does not believe in the deity of our Lord Jesus Christ nor the trinity of the Godhead, predominately change, with brazen boldness, what offends their faulty doctrines.]

Or was it “Be like newborn babies who are thirsty for the pure spiritual milk that will help you **grow and be saved**”? As copyright by the American Bible Society in their 1995 CEV (CEV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for Contemporary English Version).

Or was it “that by it you may **grow up into salvation**”? As copyright by Crossway in their 2001 ESV (ESV is a registered trademark of the same, standing for English Standard Version).

The Holy Bible never intimates that one can “grow to salvation.” It is a new birth, a conversion, a quickening that God does, not a process that man does. In Holy Bible salvation a soul is instantaneously converted, quickened, justified, indwelt, and baptized into Christ. That is not something one can “grow” or “grow up” to. In the ecumenical movement it is, but in the Holy Bible it is not. Their ecumenical modernist bibles are errant and dangerous.

Again, many will read all these copyright renditions and repeat Hillary Rodham Clinton's line “What possible difference could it make anyhow!” Words are important, not to be added or omitted from God's Word. Manuscripts from Alexandria Egypt, where Holy Roman

Catholic Saint Origen became the Father of Bible criticism, and the Father of the Roman Catholic's allegorical method, should not determine what is in or not in our Bible. And when there are multiple versions which must, by copyright law, have significant deviations from all other versions there is no final authority. Christians wandering from this version to that, none knowing exactly what the Holy Bible says about anything, makes the whole lump, even the soiled evangelicals, absolutely apostate, i.e they have abandoned and left what was once believed. The local church needs an absolute authority, found, for English speaking peoples, in the Authorized King James Bible.

A young Christian had heard in Sunday School that the world and the Devil so hated God's word that they would confiscate and destroy every copy. "It would happen in his life time!" he was told. He took and hid his Sunday School award Bible up in his attic and said, "They will never take away my Holy Bible!"

When he was all grown and a junior in seminary he became troubled when an old Baptist preacher gave him a flier that listed the twenty verses ripped out of modernist bibles. When he looked, he found that those verses were not in his Bible. The Bible student scoured through his whole seminary looking for a King James Authorized Bible to see what they said and found none on the premises. He took a bus to his father's old house, climbed up into the attic, and retrieved his old Sunday School award Bible, and there were all twenty of those verses. He made this profound observation, "The Devil never did come and confiscate our Bibles, Christians just forsook them and turned them over for new modernist versions that do not reflect the infallible, inerrant, verbally inspired Words of God."

The truth in that scenario is more fully substantiated in the Bibliology section of this Systematic Theology, but rehearse here the subtle power of this diabolical deception. Ecumenical bibles do indeed change doctrine. Baptists, true Baptists, only use the Authorized King James Bible.

The Thees and Thous of an Accurate Bible Translation

Ecumenical modernists have argued that the 'thee's and 'thou's ought to be removed from the Bible because they have no place in

'modern' English, but I (not me) don't think it is right for me (not I) to take away accuracy and change these insightful second person singular pronouns which carefully indicate the objective, nominative, and possessive parts of speech in accurately detailed written literature. Dost thou? Dost (second person singular present tense of do), thou (second person singular nominative personal pronoun)?

If you can learn where to use the first person singular pronouns I, me, my and mine, and their plural counterparts, we, us, our and ours, like most of us (not we) did in kindergarten, don't be hasty to give up on the important speech indicators of thou, thee, thine and thy as used in an accurately translated Holy Bible.

These second person singular pronouns were not translated into the King James Authorized English Bible because English people spoke like that back then. Actually people began to speak like that back then because the Bible taught them how to read. Today it would be good if we let the Bible teach us how to speak rather than letting our sloven use of language pollute the written words of God, as the ecumenical modernists did, ... and do. The Hebrew and Greek languages, from which our English Bible is translated, have much more exacting indicators for pronouns and parts of speech, for who is speaking and to whom. We have lost some of this accuracy in translating to the old well structured English language, and paramount to all of it by going to the copyright modernist's bible that uses the PLURAL pronoun for every second person SINGULAR reference in the whole Bible. Learn a little English, learn a lot of Bible.

Baptists especially, who have traditionally used every word of this old verbally inspired book to form, frame and defend their every faith and practice, have no business abandoning a single pronoun to an ecumenical modernist looking for their lucrative copyright license. Shame on YOU (2nd person singular???) and shame on YOUALL (2nd person plural???) for buying their (3rd person plural possessive) NIV, ASV, NEB, NASB, NWB, ... etc., et al. I (not me) will be using an accurate KJB for me (not I) and my house. God likes it that way.

thou (thou) *pron.* Used to indicate the one being addressed, especially in a literary, liturgical, or devotional context. [Middle English, from Old English *thū*, second person nominative sing. personal pron.. See **tu-** below.]

thee (th^u) *pron.* The objective case of **thou**. **1. a.** Used as the direct object of a verb. **b.** Used as the indirect object of a verb. **2.** Used as the object of a preposition. **3.** Used in the nominative as well as the objective case, especially by members of the Society of Friends.

thine (th^un) *pron.* (used with a sing. or pl. verb). **1.** Used to indicate the one or ones belonging to thee. **--thine** *adj.* A possessive form of **thou**. Used instead of *thy* before an initial vowel or *h*: "*The presidential candidates are practicing the first rule of warfare: know thine enemy*" (Eleanor Clift). [Middle English, from Old English *th^u h*. See **tu-** below.]

thy (th^u) *adj.* The possessive form of **thou**. Used as a modifier before a noun. [Middle English, variant of *thin*, *thine*, from Old English *th^u h*. See **tu-** below.]

tu-. Important derivatives are: *thee, thou, thine, thy*.

tu-. Second person singular pronoun; you, thou. **1.** Lengthened form **t^u* (accusative **te*, **tege*). (THEE), THOU, from Old English *th^u* (accusative *thec*, *th^u*), thou, from Germanic **th^u* (accusative **theke*). **2.** Suffixed extended form **t(w)ei-no-*. THINE, THY, from Old English *th^u h*, *thine*, from Germanic **th^u haz*. [Pokorny *tu-* 1097.]

One should not use a modernist ecumenical copyright bible because they don't like thee nor thou, ye nor hast. The uncompromised accuracy of the old English is well worth the efforts of the diligent Bible student. It is far better than a modernist telling us what they think God meant to say in their copyright versions.

Much more will be addressed about the accuracy and preservation of the Holy Bible in the Bibliology sections.

Prolegomena

This endeavor is to mark out the Systematic Theology for the 21st

century. Who needs to study theology systematically? God supposes that we all do, and Dr. Walter Allan Yoho words that succinctly.

If you recently graduated with honors – *Congratulations!*
If you were recently voted most valuable player on your basketball team – *That's great!* If you were recently awarded a big salary increase – *Good for you!* But none of these things is worth getting too excited about. No, there is one thing, only one, that should get a man or a woman really excited.⁸

Thus saith the LORD, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the LORD which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the LORD.

Jeremiah 9:23-24

The thing that impresses God the most about any given individual is how much that individual is impressed with God. Indeed, it is a tragedy of enormous extent “that he should be so little in our thoughts who sparkles in everything which presents itself to our eyes.”⁹ But, oh, how our Dear Lord loves to honor and bless that individual that delights himself in the Lord and is altogether taken up with his God!¹⁰

Then shalt thou delight thyself in the LORD; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.

Isaiah 58:14

8 Walter Allan Yoho, “YAHWEH The Greatness of God,” Volume 1 of 3, FBCPublications.com, 2010,71

9 Cited by Walter Allen Yoho, Stephen Charnock, *The existence and Attributes of God*. I. Grand Rapids, MI:Baker Book House, Reprint, 1979, 168-169.

10 Ibid. Yoho, 72

That one needs to study God is instinctive in our nature. That one should do it systematically is required by the immensity of the subject. The wise preacher has said:

I the Preacher was king over Israel in Jerusalem. And I gave my heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven: this sore travail hath God given to the sons of man to be exercised therewith.... And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly: I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit. For in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow.... I have seen the travail, which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised in it. He hath made every thing beautiful in his time: also he hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end.

Eccl 1:12,17-18, 3:10-11

The Systematic Theology for the 21st century needs a Prolegomena. Prolegomena is a preliminary discussion, especially a formal essay introducing a work of considerable length or complexity. Prolegomena comes from the Greek, “*Prolegein*” – meaning to say before hand.¹¹ Such an introduction essay to a systematic theology, is necessary here to set some pre-conditions, to scope out the formidable task, and, in this instance especially, to redefine the “system” in “systematic” and differentiate this effort from the many other works of this nature.

Theology is the compounding of two words, “*theos*” for God, and “*ology*” for a verbose, exhaustively researched, consideration of, a meditation on, a discussion about, and a communication of, its topic. Theology is thus an exhaustively covered presentation of everything that could be known about God and everything that God has done.

¹¹ The American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd edition 1994 Soft Key International, s.v. *Prolegomena*

Knowing everything under the sun is a pretty daunting task.

The travail given to man by God is to seek and search out all things that are done under heaven. (Eccl. 1:13, 3:10). All rational minds are to be exercised in this travail. By God's grace and his wisdom this impossible travail turns into joy, when our relationship with him is made right through the new-birth¹² in our Lord Jesus Christ. A systematic theology is a supreme culmination of that joy. The systematic gathering, categorizing, and analyzing of everything that God has revealed to man could indeed be a great travail. It is a task that can naught be completed, and, because it is the finite grappling with the infinite, it can not be fully successful. It is, however, the exertion given to the sons of men, and one dare not slack from its calling. Every effort is herein made to cause this exhaustive task to be less of a "sore travail" and more of a "no greater joy."

I have seen the travail, which God hath given to the sons of men, to be exercised in it. He hath made everything beautiful in his time: Also he hath set the world in their heart, so that no man can find out the work that God maketh from the beginning to the end... I have no greater joy than to hear that my children walk in truth.

Ecc. 3:10, 3John 1:4

Theology is for Everyone

Every rational thinking human is developing a theology. God created humans with that inborn propensity. In its basest form theology is man's *musings* about God. God implanted such musing in every rational mind. What think ye of God the creator? What think ye of Christ? What think ye of sin? What think ye of the fall of Lucifer? What think ye of "So great Salvation?"

*Hear, O Israel; the LORD our God is one LORD;
and thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine
heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And*

¹² John 3:16-18, 36, 5:24, Rom 3:10, 23, 5:8, 12, 18, 6:23, 10:9-13, i.e. *The Romans Road to Heaven*.

these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou settist in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way: and when thou liest down and when thou risest up (Deut. 6:4-7).

What think ye of God? What think ye of His Words? In a less raw form, theology must be more than musing about God, it must take on a more organized pattern and a more thorough consideration of God centered things.

The organization of this systematic theology follows the traditional structure listed below.

Vol. 01 Prolegomena	Vol. 07 Hamartiology
Vol. 02 Bibliology	Vol. 08 Soteriology
Vol. 03 Theology	Vol. 09 Ecclesiology
Vol. 04 Christology	Vol. 10 Angelology
Vol. 05 Pneumatology	Vol. 11 Eschatology
Vol. 06 Anthropology	Vol. 12 Epilogue

A Christian, being one who has individually confessed and accepted the atoning blood of Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, for their saving, has a quickened, corrected, and personal relationship with the LORD God and Creator. They also have a charge from him that they carefully develop a theology. A theology, again, is a musing about, a consideration of, and an analysis of, (*ology*) everything that can be known of God (*Theos*), and of everything that God has done in this his universe. An unregenerate mind is self centered, rebellious, Christ less, and ergo, God less. His pursuit of theology will turn to self worship, (i.e. evolution as it promotes the self made man) and/or creature worship, (worshiping the creature, i.e. stars, images, idols, animals, humans, angels, et al.) more than Creator worship (Rom 1:10). The quickened mind of the born again believer, however, is enlightened and guided away from a self centered theology, into a God centered, Holy Spirit directed theology. But, theology is still the travail assigned to every rational mind. Carefully organizing one's musing about God, when done skillfully, with method

and thoroughness, should be called systematic.

Why Systematic?

“Systematic” actually speaks toward the organizational method for the development of a theology. A systematic theology will be such in three particulars. First, it must be systematically holistic. There is to be nothing in particular left out. There is to be a stepping back and a consideration of the larger picture, as it were, and this review is to ask, “Is there anything not fully considered?”

Second, for a theology to be systematic, it needs a systematic method of consideration for each of its parts. A Bible doctrine work provides due consideration of every major theme taught in the Bible. A systematic theology must exceed Bible doctrine in that it must also methodically give due consideration to what the Bible does not teach, even what God has not revealed. Man has developed some beliefs about God which are not found nor supported in the Bible. Rational philosophy and irrational religions have come to bare on what one believes about God, man, and the Bible. These sources insert deception in one's theology; deception which must be systematically routed out. A Biblical theology must have the Holy Bible as its sole source of truth, non-Biblical sources must fall outside of the system of consideration.

Lastly, for a theology to be systematic, it needs to pursue a solid analytical method, rather than the scientific method which has been relied on in past systematic theologies. A scientific method cannot fulfill a truly systematic purpose. In a truly systematic method a circle or sphere encompasses the whole system to be considered. Parts, participants, and other systems outside of this sphere of consideration, must be fenced out of consideration by a strong, conscious border.

Ergo, for some systematic theologies, the sphere contains everything ever believed about God, but to produce a Biblical theology that sphere need only contain everything revealed to man by God in the Holy Bible: Distinctly clarified, God's written word is IN, and the vision of a 500 foot high Jesus that Oral Roberts saw is NOT IN; nor the Golden Tables of law that Joseph Smith allegedly received from an angel in Palmyra, New York. Notice in drawing a border around a system, certain things are purposely, and consciously left out. It will be

seen that this last particular of a systematic theology, that of defining the system under consideration, is crucial, and recognizing the pieces which must fall outside of the system has been the downfall of previous works. A good theology will thus be holistic, methodical and a closed system, with the Bible as its sole authority. Thus a good theology is a systematic theology, and a controlled systematic theology is a good theology.

This Systematic Theology for the 21st Century is undertaken because it is unprecedented. In this author's fifty three years as a born again believer, (1960 – 2013), and thirty years as a theologian, there has not been found a systematic theology work that has been thoroughly Biblical, thoroughly Baptist and thoroughly systematic. A thoroughly Biblical systematic theology not only contends for an inerrant, infallible, plenary, verbally inspired Holy Bible, it discards confessions, orthodoxies, and traditions which over step that Bible as sole authority. A thoroughly Baptist Systematic Theology contends for the perpetuity of a right and righteous remnant. This remnant holds the rightly divided word of truth, understood in a historical, grammatical, literal manner, as the word of truth that reveals God's dispensational truths. It also contends that Roman Catholic doctrine has always been wrong and the tentacles of Roman Catholic error have rooted in the whole of Protestant doctrine like leaven. Baptists are not, and never have been Protestants.¹³

A thoroughly systematic, systematic theology is holistic, methodical, and carefully bounded in a system of truth. There are other tremendous works of systematic theology and thorough coverages of Bible doctrines. This one is meant to stand alone in these three hallmarks, Biblical, Baptist, and Systematic. Careful definition of the latter will ensure the previous two hallmarks.

Theology Is Not a Science

Previous theologies have been built as if theology were a science. A scientific method starts with a hypothesis which it twists and refines through experimentation until it holds enough merit to advance to a theory. Theologians have considered theories reliable enough to place in their science based systematic theologies. In the scientific method,

13 John Christian, Baptist History Vol 1

after a theory receives more extensive testing and refinement, it becomes a law. As an engineer this author loves and respects the scientific method. Kepler used it expertly to derive the laws of planetary motion. As a theologian this author insists that the scientific method has no place in deriving the "Thus saith the LORD" kind of truth which a true theologian is looking for.

The eminent Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, a theological genius, falls into this trap of theory making. Chafer's Volume IV of Systematic Theology contains 250 pages of his Ecclesiology, and 190 pages of his Eschatology but it includes much material not related to either topic at all. Such inexcusable lacking organization is the result of both an overall poor organizational practice and an inadequate definition of a systematic theology in general. 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."¹⁴ This author 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, men such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, on equal grounds with Holy Scripture. In writing his eight volumes of 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 record, truths that are then given systematic analysis wherein they can debunk the theoretical conjectures of previous philosophers and theologians.

In his fourth volume Dr. Chafer needs both a strong organization of the truth about the Church, the Church age, and the end times and then a relentless attack of the Reformed Theologian's Covenant Theology, Replacement Theology, and Catholicism of the Church. Chafer's lacking organization and discipline make such a success unachievable. Chafer's unsystematic system and flawed organization of material brings about a very flawed doctrine, i.e. a flawed doctrine

14 from www.ChristianBook.com book promotion paragraph quoting Dr. Chafer's promotion of his "Systematic Theology" (Accessed Dec 2013).

in a flawed approach which it conceals in exaggerated verbosity.

Pilot asked Jesus "What is Truth?" In my statistics class I taught that truth is discovered by four primary means, only one has proven reliable. Philosophy says "I think therefore I am." In their field one thinks, reasons, deduces and believes, expecting he has therein discovered truth. Then, in the turn of the last century scientists formalized the scientific method, and used it in founding natural laws operating in our universe. In this method a hypothesis is tested, refined, and observed into a theory, which is tested, refined, and observed into a natural law. Leading theologians pounced on this, and considered theology as "the queen of the sciences." They filled their systematic theology books with theories that they documented into laws expecting that they had discovered the truths about God. But science is only an able tool to lead and surmise the truth about natural laws, not supernatural laws.

Philosophy is an essential and useful tool but it cannot decipher infallible truth. Science has proven irreplaceable at determining some natural laws, but it cannot begin to categorize the supernatural, and it is by no means infallible. In his lifetime the Father of Systematic Theologies, Charles Hodge, saw the scientific method become the mainstay of all systematic study. He incorporated it into his systematic theology, not perceiving this horrid shortfall. Perhaps a statistical analysis of studies and surveys can determine infallible truth.

Statistics had an ugly beginning. It had trouble overcoming its nemesis, "Figures don't lie, but liars figure." The surveys and studies, the analysis and presentation of averages and standard deviations, could surely lead to truth. But consider how statisticians and politicians readily misleads people into some grandiose untruths. In statistics a majority believing something is supposed to derive the truth. If the survey says, "All men are liars," how much should one trust the survey of all men. Statistical analysis might have a place in categorizing the contributions and side effects of certain drugs, but statistical analysis is never reliable in determining absolute truth.

Know that philosophy and science do the same misleading. For philosophy rationally comprehending something makes it a personal truth. One need only mention Christian Science founder Mary Baker Glover Eddy's idea that this world is "only in the mind" to alert the

dangers of philosophy. Now we have come to where science has elevated the spontaneous generation of life to a teachable truth, and “scientists” even teach as truth the insane idea that “survival of the fittest” had changed beagle dogs into Clydesdale horses, and lizards into bald eagles. Thus science-so-called¹⁵ cannot discern truth. Ergo these forms of discriminating truth have their notable flaws.

The forth method of discerning truth is the “Thus saith the LORD” method. This is not the religious method. Indeed a religion's source of their truth is generally some ugly combination of the previous three mentions. Even in Dr. Chafer's Systematic Theology this “Thus saith the LORD” method too often takes a back seat to religion and survey. One would expect that a section on Ecclesiology would begin with God's notable definition of the Church and its formation. Instead Dr. Chafer first philosophizes about angels, Jews, Gentiles and Christians. He then gives the scientific method a spin and presents theories that have been advanced. He then has the audacity to present a statistical survey of who believes what. Organizing theology systematically requires that a baseline of truth be established up front. That base line must proceed with a “Thus saith the LORD” as its sole source. All other methods are fraught with blunder. Dr. Chafer's eight volumes make up example “A” in that blundering.

An approach which “collects and systematically arranges, compares, exhibits and defends all facts concerning God and his works from any and every source,” is a fool's path. Systematically such an approach is theological malpractice. To be Biblical and Systematic there must be a sole source. Lack of organization and direction is serious, but a total miss-organization of the “system” in “systematic”, coupled with a strong reliance on extra Biblical sources make Chafer's eight volumes inexcusable.

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+ denominations that he is pandering to. He is the epitome of neoevangelicalism as herein defined. I would not discredit Dr. Chafer's genius, sincerity, or integrity, only his methodology.

15 1Ti 6:20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of **science falsely so called**:

Theology Has Not Been Systematic

A thorough analysis is systematic only because it has thoroughly and systematically analyzed a system. This truth has been so maligned by theologians, and is so crucial for a successful systematic theology, that it needs to be given a thorough clarification in this prolegomena. Any analysis and especially one so crucial as a theology, must needs be systematic to be effective and thorough. A theology can only be systematic when there is a defined system under consideration. Failure to perceive this fact has been the downfall of previous “systematic” theologies.

Charles Hodge (1797-1878), from Princeton Theological Seminary, may be considered the Father of the Published Systematic Theologies. He was very genius, a very gifted communicator, and very Presbyterian. Such a Father of the Published Systematic Theologies made two glaring errors in his prolegomena, and consequently in his published work. Charles Hodge considered theology a science which must follow a scientific method, just like the other sciences. Charles Hodge also loosely compassed a border around his theology, i.e. his system under consideration, which attempted to capture everything ever known, ever observed, and ever believed about God, and all His works. Consider why these are indeed untenable errors for an effective and efficient systematic theology.

Theology is long considered a science, like Biology, Archaeology, Astronomy and Physics, and oftentimes, by those wishing to more ennoble it, theology is called “the Queen of the Sciences.” But theology is not a science at all, and dare not follow a scientific method. There is no science or scientific method which allows for an inerrant, infallible, plenary, verbally inspired, authoritative source as a final authority, yeah, as its sole authority. Biblical theology does, indeed it must.

The scientific method and any resulting science which is framed by its tenants is based on hypothesizing about observations and then extensively testing the hypothesis. This scientific method, actually formalized on Charles Hodge's 50th birthday, involves five steps: 1) Formulation of the question about an observed phenomena, 2) Formulating a hypothesis which conjectures its answer, 3) Predicting

the logical consequences of the hypothesis, 4) Testing to see if the real world behaves as predicted by the hypothesis and, finally, 5) Analyzing the results of the real world experiment in order to refine the hypothesis. Now after a hypothesis has been extensively tested and widely and generally accepted, with no evidence to dispute it, it may be generalized and summarized into a theory. After a theory has been extensively tested and widely and generally accepted, with no evidence to dispute it, and no exceptions to be found, it may be generalized and summarized as a law. Does this seem like a sound way to determine theology? I trow not.

Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), German mathematician, astronomer and astrologer, used this very method for constituting the laws of planetary motion, but what we know about God, in our theology, has absolutely nothing to do with observing, questioning, hypothesizing, theorizing and constituting laws. Charles Hodge erred when he attempted to fit the scientific method into his theology development, and that glaring error has found root in systematic theologies right up to Geisler's 2002 extensive publication.¹⁶ The error is manifest in Hodge's first serious topic of consideration;¹⁷ Hodge makes his first argument the proof of the existence of God. The Holy Bible, which he has conjectured to be his sole source and sole authority for theology, is herein set aside. The Holy Bible takes one on no such philosophical adventure. It is Charles Hodge's treatment of theology as just another of the natural sciences which causes him to employ techniques found in philosophy and in the scientific method. Likewise, following the *Father of Published Systematic Theologies*, this 'proof of the existence of God' is the first coverage of Augustus Strong's 1907 Baptist work of Systematic Theology,¹⁸ as it is Henry Clarence Thiessen's 1949 Baptist work of systematic theology.¹⁹ It is given coverage in Lewis Sperry Chafer's 1948 verbose six volumes of

16 Normal L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology in One Volume*, Bethany House, 2002, 3, 4, 5, 11

17 Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology: Volume I*, Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, 1

18 Augustus H. Strong, *Systematic Theology: Three Volumes in I*, Philadelphia, Valley Forge PA, The Judson Press, 1907

19 Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949

neoevangelical work of *Systematic Theology*,²⁰ and even in Geisler's 21st century evangelical effort.²¹

The Holy Bible extends no effort towards the proof of God's existence. He is the "I AM." Further, it is revealed in inerrant, infallible language that every human born into this world knows of his eternal Godhead, and is without excuse (Romans 1). Even further, it is revealed in that inerrant, infallible communicate that His Only Begotten Son, his Anointed One, the Christ, is the light that lighteth every man. There is no scientific hypothesis about His existence, a hypothesis which is carefully brought to the fruition and proof by a scientific method, because theology is not a science. Science and its methods support mans groping for greater knowledge, theology dare not do that groping like other sciences must. Theology is a process of collaborating and organizing declared truth, not a science of exploring, on a quest for scientifically confirmed truth.

Charles Hodge, genius and communications master, opened a course of study which laid aside the inerrant, infallible sole source of theology and picked up the philosophy book. He, and all systematic theology books which followed his outline, pursue the ontological argument for the existence of God. "I think therefore I am," as a profound statement, may find a sound home in a philosophy book, but it, and its presumed author, have no place in a theology book. Likewise a teleological a posteriori argument, which "proves" the existence of God, is nothing more than philosophical fodder for scholars showing how knowledge puffeth up. It has no place in a Biblical systematic theology book. Further, supposing "a power which produces intelligence and rational thought might lack an intelligence and rational thinking" is such a profound tom-foolery that it should not even be considered in a good philosophy book.²² Hodge, and those following his theological footsteps, give this teleological argument due consideration in a systematic theology book which they suppose should follow a scientific method, because they suppose that theology

20 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol 1-6*, Dallas Seminary Press, 1948

21 Geisler, *Systematic Theology in One Volume*.

22 No critique of Hodge's use of philosophical cosmological argument or philosophical moral argument need be considered here, his careful following of scientific method for these arguments is just plain errant.

is just another of the sciences. Theology is not a science, and should never stoop to a scientific method to try to prove the existence of God, or to “prove” anything else that has been revealed to man by an infallible, inerrant source.

Science is “The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of phenomena,”²³ and a theologian dare not call the study of his God and Creator anything resembling such a definition. Science is, “such activities restricted to a class of natural phenomena,” and a theologian dare not call his supernatural God only a natural phenomena. Science is, “such activities applied to an object of inquiry or study,” and a theologian dare not call his infinite God and Creator just an object nor employ “such activities” in his travail to know/understand all things under heaven. Science is, “methodological activity, discipline, or study: An activity that appears to require study and method: and knowledge, especially that gained through experience,” and the theologian dare not lean on any of these secondary definitions to capture what he must capture from an inerrant, infallible, plenary, verbally inspired written revelation authored by his infinite Creator. Theology is not a science, and it cannot be captured in its entrapment.

The scientific method is “The principles and empirical processes of discovery and demonstration considered characteristic of or necessary for scientific investigation, generally involving the observation of phenomena, the formulation of a hypothesis concerning the phenomena, experimentation to demonstrate the truth or falseness of the hypothesis, and a conclusion that validates or modifies the hypothesis.”²⁴ Their method is excellently suited for mans comprehension of all of God's creation, (Would that it were followed by the humanists with their wild hypothesis that breeding dogs together long enough will produce a Clydesdale horse, or that copulating lizards eventually hatch out a bald eagle!) but the scientific method has no place in theology.

Theology must needs be exploring, categorizing, comprehending and understanding the God who reveals himself, and in so doing it is far above the natural phenomena that mere science explores. When the

23 American Heritage Dictionary, s.v. *science*

24 American Heritage Dictionary, s.v. *scientific method*

theologian resorts to science and scientific method in his task, he does theology a great disservice; as has Hodge, Strong, Thiessen, Chafer and Geisler. When one has an inerrant, infallible, plenary, verbally inspired sole source of truth, which these theologians affirm (Thiessen and Chafer only affirm that we once upon a time had it, but lost it due to incompetent copyists, Geisler affirms that we only have 90% of the text left²⁵ but should trust what we have anyway, while modernist textual critics try to reassemble the rest), there is little need for a scientific method which strives to deduce what truth is, and no justification for categorizing theology as a science which must rely on such methods.

Consider the System In Systematic

An insurmountable disservice has been done to theology by those who have not properly enveloped the system under consideration. Systematic, in the sense of a systematic theology, must include more than a planned ordered procedure of investigation, it needs to include a definition of the system which is to be considered. Charles Hodge, the *Father of the Published Systematic Theologies* thought to use the methods of science to explore and reason out all that could be known about God. It has been seen that the methods of science are suited for exploring all natural phenomena of God's creation, but are not at all suited for exploring the uncaused cause of all that phenomena. It must now be considered that Hodge's definition of exactly what was to be explored was far too broad and inclusive. Hodge attempted to document everything that has ever been believed about God since the coming of Christ, the manifestation of God. In this broad sweeping gesture, for it never was a clear definition, Hodge must include all the philosophies of man, all the teachings of the Roman Mother Church, all the humanist and atheist perspectives and their discussions about how many angels might dance on the head of a pin. This failure to scope his systematic theology, failure to narrow down and accurately define his approach to so daunting a task, is what has given theology a daunting shudder for most Christians, and caused systematic theology to leave a bad taste in the mouth of even the most honest preacher.

²⁵ Geisler, *Systematic Theology*, 177

Conventional theologians have tried to compensate for this failure by inappropriately dividing a “Practical Theology” and a “Biblical Theology” from this more foreboding “Systematic Theology.” Such divisions are artificial and damaging. They imply that practical theology is not Biblical theology, that Biblical theology is not practical. They imply that neither can be systematic. Properly, yeah, even systematically, considering the errors in Hodges approach can embolden a far better approach. A systems analysis approach to theology must replace the failed philosophical and scientific method's approach. Such an analytical method can restore theology to a valid position of being practical, Biblical and systematic.

Systematic Is Accomplished With Actual Systems

With a system analyst an overwhelmingly complex system²⁶ is subdivided into smaller systems. The analyst draws a line, or border around each system, and explores the interacting interdependence of just this one system under his consideration. This is a powerful and versatile tool for analysis of very complex systems, and the complexity of this one, theology, is infinite, ergo there is no more suited methodology for its comprehension. Consider some finite illustrations of its success.

The automobile is a reasonably complex system and its complexity has advanced annually in recent years. The exhaust system is a tiny element of the more complex engine system, which is part of the drive system which is an integral part to the automobile. The exhaust system has a muffler which is an element in a sound muffling system and a catalytic converter which is part of an emissions control system. Each group of interacting, interrelated or interdependent elements forming a complex whole is a system in itself and these systems combine and interact to form a system called the automobile. The automobile is part of a larger system called the transportation system. To use an automobile you do not need to know that platinum is a catalyst for the chemical reaction which breaks down engine emissions. That may only be consoling knowledge when you have to

26 American Heritage Dictionary, s.v. *system*, A group of interacting, interrelated, or interdependent elements forming a complex whole.

open your wallet to replace a catalytic converter, or when you want to know why it is against the law to buy a used one. (The latter law being part of a crime prevention system.) On a very physical level one can thus comprehend what a system is and how a systematic analysis is necessary for comprehension, design, and troubleshooting of an automobile. Rational beings are rational because they can take another step towards abstraction. Let us therefore do just that.

Biology is the study of all living things. Plants are living things and the study of plants is called Botany. Entomology is the study of insects. There are certain defined boundaries for when a living thing is considered a plant and when it is categorized as an insect. A mosquito is an insect with an intricately designed system for extracting blood from a mammal when plant's liquids are not satisfying. A mammal is a class of warm blooded vertebrate animals characterized by a covering of hair on the skin and the production of milk to nourish its young. One need not labor the fact that although they may be called "ologies," these are all systems with interacting inter-related or inter-dependent elements forming a complex whole.

Biology is a defined bordered system which fits into an even larger system of study. Biology, the study of living things, is not really the study of all living things. It has a border or restriction which prevents the study of angels under this category. Borders and restrictions are good and necessary in categorizing the studies of our interacting systems. With that much understanding in place one can approach theology with a system analysis methodology and redefine the whole realm of Systematic Theology. That re-definition is prudent and necessary. Charles Hodge, opened an overwhelming flood gate when he included in his systematic theology, input from Orpheus and Homer because they were called Greek Theologians²⁷, and when he referenced the genius of Aristotle just because Aristotle classed the sciences as physics, mathematics and theology and wrote about nature, numbers and that which concerns God.²⁸

It is necessary that Biblical theology consider the Holy Bible as its sole authority and sole source for truth. Draw a circle around Aristotle and other geniuses and call it Philosophical theology, encircle Saint

27 Hodge, *Systematic Theology Vol 1*, 34 (of 682 pages soft copy).

28 Ibid, 34.

Augustine and his Roman Catholic Church and call it Roman Catholic theology, encircle John Calvin and the Westminster confession and call it Presbyterian Theology, encircle Charles Darwin and humanist manifestos and call it humanist theology. et al.. All these are separate systems with borders interconnections and interactions, but they are outside of the purview of a systematic analysis of all that God has revealed about himself in Holy Scripture.

Each of these circles must be considered systems in themselves. They are purposely separated from each other like the insect is separated from the plant and the mammal. They may each undergo their own systematic analysis, and they each have various interacting, interrelated and interdependent elements. Carefully defining these separate systems is essential for understanding the effect they might have on a truly Biblical Systematic Theology.

Charles Hodge as a *Father of Published Systematic Theologies* set a precedence for considering theology as a science, and for incorporating all that was ever believed about God. His use of Philosophy, introduced the immaterial and material dichotomy of man, instead of the Bible's trichotomy, his use of Saint Augustine introduced the catholicness of the church instead of the Bible's emphasis on the local church, his use of Roman theology introduced penance, priest, and clergy, the Westminster Confession, decrees, predestination of souls, and fatalism; indeed all who followed in Hodge's footsteps, Strong, Thiessen, Chafer, and Geisler, gave inclusiveness greater consideration than Biblical exclusiveness. When Geisler wrote his 21st century systematic theology his goal was to systematically capture all that is believed by evangelicals; Nicene Creed, neoevangelicalism, theistic-evolution and all. Such an all encompassing theme takes up every bit of 1,664 pages and advances Hodges' myth that a systematic theology must incorporate everything that reasonable minds have ever believed about God. That is error.

A systematic theology which uses the Holy Bible for its sole source and uses a system analysis approach instead of a scientific method can isolate itself from the effects of philosophy, Catholicism, Reformed theology, neoevangelicalism, theistic evolutionist, et al. Such a task is accomplished by using great care in how the systems are bounded. Where in time past it was considered that all these systems

overlapped, certainly reformed theology and Roman theology both had some Bible theology, and perhaps Reformer had more than Rome, even so, it was not deemed essential to make each a wholly separated system. All interactions and interrelationships between these systems need to be interfaced as inputs or outputs and system borders need to be kept secure. This isolation of separate systems is an essential key for this type of systematic analysis.

In times past a huge system of Christian belief was captured by encircling a myriad of overlapping belief systems and truth was supposedly captured by testing various hypothesis by a scientific method. Such a process was flawed and has failed. It was ever testing and hypothesizing and never coming to the truth. Using a system analysis methodology isolates each system of belief behind clear borders, allows only guarded and understood interrelations, and allows our focus on any of the individual systems. Herein the system which shall capture that focus will be called Biblical Theology.

A system called Biblical Theology, with a function of generating its very name, is isolated from all other systems of theology and contains, enveloped in a sphere, as it were, the 66 books²⁹ written by forty-four Hebrew authors over a period of 1592³⁰ years, and called the Holy Bible, the Bible, the Holy Scriptures, the Scripture, the Word of God and the Words of God. God, through the psalmist in Psalm 119:1-8 (the Aleph octet of this tremendous Hebrew acrostic), captures “his word” (vr 9) in seven descriptors, calling it - the law, his testimonies, his ways, thy precepts, thy statutes, thy commandments, and thy righteous judgments (each octet thereafter uses these seven descriptors, seven per octave, an awesome study in itself).

Consider, for a moment, what else should be in this system. Let us, eliminating the obvious, eliminate the teachings of Aristotle, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Westminster Confession of Faith, and John Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion. These will not be herein found making up Biblical theology. One need not slander any of these, but one needs to isolate them from our Biblical Theology. These may be isolated into their own separated systems, systems with

29 There will follow a full justification for the allowance of these 66 books.

30 The Pentateuch was written at Sinai in 1492 B.C. (memorable date) and The Revelation of Jesus Christ in 100 A.D.

controlled, supervised interfaces.

Should an infinite God be enclosed in this system called Biblical Theology? The system is indeed finite and cannot contain the infinite. But consider the desire to capture all of God that the finite mind can possibly grasp, and consider that that whole realm of possibility is already in this system, it is all captured in the Holy Bible.

*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.*

Deut 29:29

Should the influence of the Holy Spirit of God be in our system called Biblical Theology? No. Consider carefully this answer. In a system analysis methodology elements recognized in the system must be isolated as a separate operating system, i.e. a subsystem, which performs a function pertinent to the larger system.

Consider, for example, the automobile exhaust system. It performs three functions, it conducts exhaust gas to the rear, it muffles the sound of the engine exhaust, and it cleans up some exhausted emissions. Certainly the piping system in charge of conducting gas does some muffling. Certainly the catalytic converter muffles some as well, but each subsystem in this system has a separate function to perform and gets isolated into its own system. Their interrelationship and interactions are marked by defined and controlled interfaces. There are indeed three separate functions in the exhaust system.

In our system called Biblical Theology, there is only one function, organizing revealed truth. If the Holy Spirit or more specifically the influence of the Holy Spirit is considered an element in this system he must be recognized as a separate subsystem which comes to bear on that revealed truth. In doing so one must consider that, allegedly, the Holy Spirit revealed a 500 foot image of Jesus to Oral Roberts. It is thus obvious that the Holy Spirit shall not be considered as a separate system operating within the system of Biblical Theology. Any work and influence that the Holy Spirit of God does must be done within the 66 books of the Words of God. And thus saith the Scripture:

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 16:13

For the revelation of truth which belongs in a Biblical Theology, the Holy Spirit of God must not be a separate operating agency. He shall only work in the confines of the revealed Word of God.

Should the rational mind of man be an element, i.e. a subsystem, inside of our system called Biblical Theology? If one carefully followed the reasoning just developed about the Holy Spirit the easy answer is, No. And thus saith the Scripture: “*Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth*” (2Tim 2:15). For the revelation of truth which belongs in a Biblical Theology, the rational mind of man must not be a separate operating agency, it shall only work in the confines of the revealed Word of God.

It is curious that theologians who want to use profound philosophies as a source of wisdom, never use God's chosen philosophers. They will reference Socrates (469-399 BC), Plato (428-348 BC), Aristotle (384-322 BC), even Mani³¹ (216-274 AD), but God included two exceptional philosophy books in his 66 book communication, Job and Ecclesiastes. Philosophy is the pursuit of wisdom by purely intellectual means. This emphasis on logical reasoning rather than the empirical reasoning, done in science, is not more capable of deducing theological truth than is science. Both negate the inerrant, infallible, plenary, verbally inspired Word of God as the sole source of theological truth. Indeed it is the exclusion of phenomenological observation (science) and rationalism (philosophy) which drives the theology student to require his sole source in the first place.

Although philosophy will not achieve a theology, one's theology should not be void of logical reasoning. God's philosopher Job, spends forty two chapters philosophizing about man being justified before a

31 Ibid., 236.

Holy God. God's philosopher, Solomon, spends twelve chapters philosophizing about the vanity of man. Both are clearly philosophy books. Both are frustrated in finding truth, until God steps in. In Job he steps in with a staunch rebuke, in Ecclesiastes with a plan for life. Such is the sole value of philosophy in developing theology. Man is totally reliant on God to lead us into truth. Jesus said it thus: "I am the... truth,... no man cometh to the Fathers but by me" (John 14:6).

It is clarified then that there is only one element operating inside of our system called Biblical Theology, and that element is the Holy Bible. The function of our system is to organize every thing that can be known about God and about all His works. The beauty of this Systematic Theology is that it is to develop a theology which has the inerrant, infallible, plenary, verbally inspired Holy Bible as its sole source. The strength of this Systematic Theology is that it purports an ability to separate itself from the influences of the Roman Catholic Church, the Westminster Confession, Saint Augustine of Hippo, Saint Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, the Humanist Manifesto, et al.

Two weakness of this Systematic Theology come to mind. First, as just clarified, the Holy Spirit of God and the rational mind of man must be functionally operating inside of the system, but they have been refused a position as an operating subsystem of the system. This may be more of an analytical decision than a weakness, but it will require some consideration during the development of theology. A second weakness of this Systematic Theology is that it is very foreign to all previous methodologies for building what has come to be called systematic theology. This too is more of a necessary analytical decision than a weakness, but it will require a redefining of how one does theology, and that redefining will not be accepted by some traditionalists. Dr. Chafer spends considerable time analyzing theories about God and how God does things. This systematic theology need not examine any theories, because it does not treat theology as a science.

How many angels might dance on the head of a pin will be given every consideration that the Holy Bible gives to the question, none. The system excludes man's philosophical reasoning as a source of truth.

One final consideration about this improved systematic

methodology has to do with the interacting, interrelating and inner dependency of the systems it defines. There is, for example, a necessary output and input interface defined between the Reformed Theology system, and our Biblical Theology system. For this consideration our larger system will be all that is to be considered truth, but Covenant Theology does have an adverse influence on how some interpret the Bible and at times due consideration of this misleading should be examined. Some outside systems considered for this interaction might be 1) other "Systematic Theologies," a system called 2) Roman Catholic Theology, a system called 3) Reformed Theology, and a system called 4) Evangelical Theology (Perhaps included just to recognize the extensive documentation effort of Norman L. Geisler).

As minimal as it might be, there is an output from Biblical Theology which is input to Roman Catholic Theology. Is there an output from Roman Catholic Theology which serves as an input to Biblical Theology? I trow not! The purpose of this systematic development is to keep our Biblical Theology separate from all influences of the Roman Catholic Church.

Likewise there is an output from Biblical Theology which is input to Reformed Theology, perhaps noticeably larger than the one to Rome. Is there an output from Reformed Theology which is input to Biblical Theology? Again, No. Such a connection is purposely severed. Likewise, again, Biblical Theology outputs to Evangelical Theology. Likewise its input from Biblical Theology is perceptibly larger than Reformed Theology's. But, alas, again, output from Evangelical Theology must not find its way to be input to our Biblical Theology. Ergo, all output from other systems which might act as input to Biblical Theology are purposely and conscientiously severed.

Consider that there is an output from Roman Catholic Theology that serves as input to Reformed Theology, and another inputting stuff into Evangelical Theology. Consider also that Roman Catholic Theology has mutated because of input from Reformed Theology, and likewise, from the output of Evangelical Theology. It is adequate to be conscious of all this dynamic while being wholly focused on the system called Biblical Theology.

Also consider that there is a sound rule in Bible Hermeneutics (the

Art of Bible Interpretation) which states that each interpretation should be compared with what man has always believed about a text. It is called the Rule of Orthodoxy. This is still a sound rule and is fitting for one's development of theology, when it is limited to being a rule of reasonableness and not a rule of absolutes. In this context of a systematic development of a Biblical Theology a Rule of Orthodoxy is not to be elevated to a position where it might supply input of truth to our system. A Rule of Orthodoxy might, however, find some application in the rational mind which is studying to shew itself approved unto God. Even in that application great care must be exercised that such "orthodoxy" not find an input avenue into Biblical Theology. It is still essential that Biblical Theology have a sole source in Holy Scripture.

Systematically Based On a Solid Bible Doctrine

A systematic theology must, at its basest level, be solid and thorough in Bible doctrines, and this one shall rely extensively on Dr. Cambron's excellent *Bible Doctrines* book. There is no truer, or more thorough, published, Baptist, and Biblical doctrine than that of Dr. Mark G. Cambron.³² His teachings on Theology at Tennessee Temple Bible School thoroughly lay the foundation for this systematic theology. His book, *Bible Doctrines*³³ will, with the permission of the Cambron Institute³⁴, be given in block quotes throughout this effort. The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for this systematic theology.³⁵ It will be given in its entirety in the

32 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

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

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

35 This author cannot recommend or condone the use of any of the modernist ecumenical copyright bibles, all of which brazenly disregard the inerrancy and

block quotes throughout this work.

Below is the Title page, the Forward and the Preface of that exceptional book. [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 1-9, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 1- 5.]

BIBLE DOCTRINES

Beliefs That Matter

by

MARK G. CAMBRON, D.D.

*Dean of Tennesse Temple Bible School
Chattanooga, Tennessee*

Introduction by Herbert Lockyer, D.D.

Zondervan Publishing House
Grand Rapids, Michigan

infallibility of the verbally inspired Holy Bible by utilizing the Westcott and Hort Bible criticism, textual criticism and critical text as their source. It is noted and reproved in the Bibliology section of this work that Dr. Cambron's Bible Doctrines book recommends using the R.V., instead of the Holy Bible, 41 times for 54 Bible verses. These are each clarified in foot notes in this work.

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century

Bible Doctrines
Copyright 1954 by
Zondervan Publishing House
Grand Rapids, Michigan

First Printing 1954
Second Printing 1961
Third Printing 1963
Forth Printing 1965
Fifth Printing 1966
Sixth Printing 1967
Seventh Printing 1969
Eighth Printing 1970

Printed in the United States of America

The book is readily available online through
<http://www.thecambroinstitute.org>

2

FOREWORD

Paul distinguished between the simplicities of the Word and its more profound truths. When writing to the Corinthians he said, “I have fed you with milk, and not with meat” (I Cor. 3:2). Certainly, newborn babes in Christ thrive on the sincere milk of the Word. With spiritual development, however, the meat of Scripture is masticated.

One wonders whether the prevalent carnality among religious people would have been prevented if only they had consistently listened to doctrinal preaching in their churches.

We fear that much of the present-day preaching is not only simple but superficial. The surface of the Bible is skimmed, but its depths are ignored.

How grateful to the Lord we are for fundamental seminaries and Bible institutes all over the land, in which young people are taught to handle the great doctrines of the Word! The Tennessee Temple Bible School is one of the outstanding training schools of this kind in the land, and is fortunate in having a gifted teacher like Dr. Mark G. Cambron as its Dean. Dr. Cambron’s monumental work, *Bible Doctrines*, reveals how he has launched out into the deep of God’s Word, and is able to present, in a clear and concise manner, those glorious doctrines of which God in Christ is Author, Matter and End.

We bespeak for *Bible Doctrines* a wide circulation among pastors, students and Christian workers in this and other lands! DR. HERBERT LOCKYER, D.D., LL.D.

3

PREFACE

“God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you” (Rom. 6:17). “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and 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” (II Tim. 3:16,17).

The crying need of the Church today is the knowledge of the Word of God. The Church is cold, indifferent to the one purpose for

which God has left it here — and that purpose is to win the lost to Christ. But it seems that some of God’s choicest leaders are falling into the different isms of today; the cause: the lack of the knowledge of the *doctrines* of God’s Word. God’s children are backsliding into sin; the cause: the lack of the knowledge of the *doctrines* of the Word of God. Christians must feed upon the Word of God to grow thereby. Thus, the Truth of God will act upon Christian lives and conduct.

The fact that man will not heed sound doctrine is a sign of the times — a sign that Christ is soon coming. “Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1).

There is not a field of service anywhere but which demands of its pastors and ministers the right dividing of the Word of Truth. Souls are saved, yet these souls depend upon the Word for growth. The *Truth* will shape them, and *error* will misshape them. There is a vast difference between a person holding the Truth, and the Truth holding the person.

Therefore, in the study of the doctrines of the Scripture, may the student pray that not only shall he *know* the doctrines, but that they shall become a reality to his soul and spirit.

4

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THEOLOGY	z11 4
(The Doctrine of God)	
II. CHRISTOLOGY	z57 40
(The Doctrine of Christ)	
III. PNEUMATOLOGY	z114 86
(The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit)	
IV. ANTHROPOLOGY	z155 116
(The Doctrine of Man)	
V. HAMARTIOLOGY	z175 134
(The Doctrine of Sin)	
VI. SOTERIOLOGY	z188 145
(The Doctrine of Salvation)	
VII. ECCLESIOLOGY	z211 169
(The Doctrine of the Church)	
VIII. ANGELOLOGY	z229 185
(The Doctrine of Angels)	
IX. ESCHATOLOGY	z249 203
(The Doctrine of Last Things)	

Note: This concludes this block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* preface. (The referenced page numbers starting with “z” are from Zondervan's 1954 printed copy.)

The New Improved Systematic Methodology

A systematic theology's methodology must break down the larger very complex system into its subsystems and then analyze the most meaningful subsystem individually under its own merit. The system that is under consideration for a Biblical systematic theology is every truth that has been revealed in the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God. Set aside and block from consideration what has been theorized by scholars, what philosophy supposes, and what is statistically believed by most people. Truth about Jehovah God cannot be found by scientific method, rational philosophy, or statistical analysis. God has revealed himself, and a thorough study of that revelation leads to the Truth that surpasses science of nature, philosophy of man, and the statistics of what man believes.

The Father of Systematic Theologies, Charles Hodge, supposed that theology was a science and theorized that the scientific method, used to explore the natural sciences, would work just fine on the Supernatural. It did not. “Scholars” hypothesizing and theorizing about Roman Church doctrine, supposing that they will thereby find “Truth,” has been the antithesis of a Biblical systematic theology. It leaves “scholars” theorizing about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, while the harm they've done to systematic theology is almost irreparable.

Chafer's desire that his theology would be an unabridged thorough exploration of “everything ever believed about God” has tarnished the field with two other dangerous methods. The proof of God and the Truth of God cannot be found in a quote of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle or Mani. Philosophy rattles around in the brain of man trying to discover Truth and forgets that God's ways are not man's ways, nor God's thoughts, man's thoughts (Isa 55:8-9). Only the revelation of God leads to the Truth of God.

Chafer's “everything ever believed about God” strategy leaves the theologian wallowing in doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, the Westminster Confession, Saint Augustine of Hippo, Saint Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, the Humanist Manifesto, et al. The strength of this

21st Century Biblical Systematic Theology is that it purports an ability to separate itself from the influences of Egypt and Rome, it does not rely on philosophy, and it does not treat things of God as mere science, full of theories about things, it uses only the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God as its source of all truth. God reveals himself to man in a completed book.

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

This premise, this systematic methodology based solely on God's Word, is the basis for the development, documentation, and publication of this Systematic Theology for the 21st Century. It will unite Biblical Theology and Practical Theology with a true Systematic Theology. It is a different approach than has ere been documented for theology. It hails from the halls of the systems engineer and systems analyst. It is holistic. It is prudent that it be the premise for every theology. It is presented here as a tool, that the student of God might:

Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their word will eat as doth a canker.

2Timothy 2:15-17

God bless you as you make your theology systematic.

Bibliography

The Holy Bible

New American Standard Version (NASV), 1973 Revision, copyright by The Lockman Foundation, 1960,1962,1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, and 19732, La Habra, Calif, with all rights reserved.

Greek Bible, 1550- Textus Receptus, Online Bible Foundation, 12 Birkfield Place, Carluke, Lanarkshire, Scotland, M184PZ, 15-2006

Greek Bible, 1881 Wescott Hort Greek Text, Online Bible Foundation, 12 Birkfield Place, Carluke, Lanarkshire, Scotland, M184PZ, 15-2006. [This work is no friend of the Authorized King James Bible, favoring the minority critical text and denying the existence of the inspired Holy Bible.]

Aland, Kurt, Aland, Barbara “The Greek New Testament” Fourth Revised Edition, United Bible Society, 1966, 1968, 1975, 1983, 1993, 1994, 1998. [This work is no friend of the Authorized King James Bible, favoring the minority critical text and denying the existence of the inspired Holy Bible.]

Anderson, “Annals of the English Bible”, as quoted by David Cloud in www.wayoflife.org/articles/johnwycliffe.htm (Accessed April 2010).

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.]

Black, David Alan, & Dockery, David S., “New Testament Criticism and Interpretation” Zibdervan Publishing Housem, 1991. [This compromising book on NT criticism was required reading at Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, Landsdale Pa, after Dr.

Jordon's control was overthrown by an influx of Bob Jones graduates.]

Bradley, Evangelist Bill, "Pruified Seven Times, The Miracle of the English Bible", Landmark Baptist Press, Haines City FL, 2001.

Burgon, John William, "The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels" Burgon, John William (1813-1888 AD), Miller, Edward (1825-1901 AD) (Editor), Publisher: Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, Publication History: Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co. 1896 AD, Rights: Public Domain, Date Created: 2006-05-13, (Accessed at <http://www.ccel.org> 11/07/07).

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>.

Catholic Encyclopedia, The, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen>, (Accessed Feb 2008). [Roman Catholic Church doctrine filters each entry of this encyclopedia and its 'facts' are thereby always suspect.]

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 and found him compromised and neoevangelical.]

- 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
www.pbministries.org/History/JohnT.Christian/vol1/ or <http://www.reformedreader.org/history/christian/ahob1/ahobp.htm>.
- Cloud, David W., "JOHN WYCLIFFE AND THE FIRST ENGLISH BIBLE" Copyright 1996, Way of Life Literature, Oak Harbor, www.wayoflife.org/articles/johnwycliffe.htm, (Accessed Feb 2008).
- Cross Pollen, e-mail: thornroot@juno.com, 2001, from http://www.accucros.com/thornbush/pollen/plenary_verbal_inspiration.htm , Last Revised: December 28, 2001 (Accessed December 2007).
- Dollar, George W., *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, Bob Jones University Press, 1973.
- Duffy, Kevin, "Who Were the Celts?", Barnes & Nobel Books, New York, 1996
- Eadie, John, "The English Bible", 1876 as quoted by David Cloud in www.wayoflife.org/articles/johnwycliffe.htm (Accessed March 2008)
- Edgeworth, Arv, "Truth and Science Newsletter", Wed , 26 March, 2008, www.truthandscience.net (Accessed March 2008).
- Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI, 1985.
- Eusebiu Pamphilus, "The Ecclesiastical History of Euseius Pamphilus", pp160 as quoted in BI-300 Inspiration of Scripture I, Syllabus, Landmark Baptist College, Haines City, FL.
- Finney, Charles G., *Power from On High*, Christian Literature Crusade, public domain, from www.ccel.org/ccel/finney/power.html (Accessed March 2008)
- Gaussen, 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, Converted to pdf format by Robert I Bradshaw, August 2004. <http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk> (Accessed Dec 2007).

- 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/systematictheolo01hodge, [Charles Hodge, 1797-1878, Presbyterian Minister, Princeton Theologian and called *The Father of the Printed Systematic Theology*.]
- Larkin, Clarence. *The Spirit World*, Published by the Clarence Larkin Estate, 1921, Cosimo, 2005
- Metzger, B.M., “*A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament*” (London: United Bible Societies, 1975). [This work is no friend of the Authorized King James Bible, favoring the minority critical text and denying the existence of the inspired Holy Bible.]
- 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/systematictheolo01miley>. [John Miley (1813-1895), Methodist Theologian.]
- Miller, Edward, “A Guide to Textual Criticism of the New Testament”, Dean Burgon Society Press, Collingswood NJ, 1886.
- Mounce, William D., “Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar”, Zondervan, 2003.
- Noble, Terence P., “WYCLIFFE’S NEW TESTAMENT Translated by JOHN WYCLIFFE and JOHN PURVEY”, Published by Terence P. Noble, August 2001 by Terence P. Noble from <http://www.ibiblio.org/tnoble> (Accessed Feb 2008).

- Paisley, Ian R.K., "My Plea For The Old Sword", 1997, Ambassador Productions Ltd., Belfast, Northern Ireland.
- Rice, Edward G., *The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*, Public Domain,
www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf,
www.lulu.com/shop/pastor-edward-rice/the-357-magnum-errors-of-modernists-critical-texts/paperback/product-5586759.html
- Robertson, A.T., "The Minister and His Greek N.T." Zondervan, 2003.
- 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.
- . *The Scofield Study Bible*, Oxford University Press, 1909, 1917.
- Scrivener, Frederick Henry, *Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament Vol I*, Oxford, London, George Bell & Sons, Your Street Covent Garden and New York , 1894, 4th Edition edited by Rev. Edward Millar, M.A. Christian Classics Ethereal Library, Public Domain (Accessed at <http://www.ccel.org> 11/07/07).
- 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], [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.

Stringer, Phil, Dr. "BI-300 Inspiration of Scripture I, Syllabus", Landmark Baptist College, Haines City, FL 33844

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

Strouse, Dr. Thomas M., "*THE LORD GOD HATH SPOKEN: A GUIDE TO BIBLIOLOGY*", Tabernacle Baptist Theological Press, VA, 1992.

----- "*Charity...Rejoiceth in the Truth: A Critique of Schnaiter and Tagliapietra's Bible Preservation and the Providence of God* ", www.biblefortoday.org (Accessed 1/22/2008), www.deanburgonsociety.org/Preservation/charity.htm (Accessed 9/2/2017).

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.

Tidwell, J.B., *Thinking Straight About the Bible, or Is the Bible the Word of God*, 1935, from Southern Baptists Site www.sbc.net/aboutus/heritage/tidwell.asp (Accessed 11/01/07). [J.B. Tidwell, Chairman, Bible Department, Baylor University, (1910-1946).]

Virkler, Henry A., "*Hermeneutics – Principles and Processes of Biblical Interpretation*", 2nd Edition, Baker Academic, 1991 [An LBU BI-500 Hermeneutics text in 2011 which exalted the critical text, rejected inerrancy, infallibility, and verbal inspiration of Scripture, and dangerously esteemed the RSV above the KJB.]

Waite, Pastor D.A., Th.D., Ph.D., "*Defending the King James Bible*", 3rd Edition, The Bible for Today Press, Collingswood NJ, 1992 & 2002.

Webster, Noah, *Noah Webster's 1828 Dictionary of American English*,

- public domain, 1828, software sourced through www.theword.net Version 5.0.0, Costas Stergiou, 2015.
- Wilkinson, Benjamin G., *Our Authorized Bible Vindicated*, 1930, (Wilkinson was SDA (follower of Ellen White) who wrote an excellent popular history of the textual lines.) as quoted in BI-300 Inspiration of Scripture Syllabus.
- 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.]
- Zwingli, Huldrych, *On the Education of Youth*, Zwingli and Bullinger, The Library of Christian Classics: Ichthus Edition.

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 community colleges near his church.

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 21st 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).