

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century – Vol 4 Christology

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century –
Vol 4 Christology

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century –

Vol 4 Christology

Dr. Edward Rice

Copyright: Creative Commons Attribution 2.0

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

Edward G. Rice

Published by

Good Samaritan Baptist Church GSBaptistChurch.com

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

<https://www.lulu.com/spotlight/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 – Vol 4
 Christology – The Doctrine of Christ
 by Dr. Edward Rice
 Download pdf at www.GSBaptistChurch.com/theology

Table of Contents

[Volume 4 Christology - The Doctrine of Christ1](#)
[Chapter 1 – Christology Introduction..... 1](#)
[Chapter 2 Christology in Bible Doctrine.5](#)
[Cambron's Ch II Christology \(The Doctrine of Christ\).....6](#)
[I. Names and Titles of Christ.....7](#)
 A. Jesus.7
 B. Christ. 11
 C. Messiah. 12
 D. Lord. 12
 E. Jesus Christ. 14
 F. Christ Jesus. 14
 G. The Lord Jesus Christ. 14
 H. I Am. 14
 I. The Son of God. 15
 J. The Son of Man. 15
 K. The Son of Abraham. 16
 L. The Son of David. 16
 M. The Son of the Highest. 17
 N. Second Man. 17
 O. Last Adam. 17
 P. The Word. 17
 Q. Emmanuel. 17
 R. Saviour. 18
 S. Rabbi. 18
 T. Rabboni. 18
 U. Master. 18
[Chapter 3 – Christ The “I AM” and Modernist Deletions.....19](#)
[The “I AM” references of Christ19](#)
[The Modernist bibles vs Names of Christ.....26](#)
[Chapter 4 – The Incarnation of Christ.....29](#)
[Cambron's Christology Section II. The Incarnation of Christ.....29](#)

A. The Fact of the Incarnation.	30
B. The Manner of the Incarnation.	31
C. The Objections to the Incarnation.	34
D. The Objects of the Incarnation.	37
E. The Perpetuity of the Incarnation.	40
F. The Proofs of the Incarnation.	41
<u>The Wolves Without Attack.....</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>The Wolves Within Attack.....</u>	<u>43</u>
<u>Chapter 5 – The Two Natures of Christ – Cambron's Section III.....</u>	<u>45</u>
A. The Humanity of Christ.	46
B. The Deity of Christ.	50
C. The Blending of the Two Natures in One Person.	56
D. Errors Concerning the Two Natures of Christ.	56
<u>Chapter 6 - Christ's Human Limitations and Kenosis.</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>Chapter 7 – The Death of Christ – Cambron's Section IV.....</u>	<u>71</u>
A. The Fact of the Death.	71
B. The Form of the Death.	72
C. Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Death.	73
D. Scriptural Names of Christ’s Death.	75
E. The Objectives of the Death.	76
F. The Extent of the Death.	77
G. The Results of the Death.	78
<u>Chapter 8 – The Resurrection of Christ – Cambron's Section V.</u>	<u>81</u>
A. The Importance of the Resurrection.	81
B. The Meaning of the Resurrection.	83
C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Resurrection. ...	83
D. The Proofs of the Resurrection.	85
E. The Result of the Resurrection.	88
<u>Chapter 9 – The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ –</u>	
<u>Cambron's Section VI.....</u>	<u>91</u>
A. The Meaning of the Ascension and Enthronement.	91
B. The Message of the Ascension and Enthronement.	92
C. The Nature of the Ascension and Enthronement.	93
D. The Necessity of the Ascension and Enthronement.	93
E. The Purpose of the Ascension and Enthronement.	94
F. The Results of the Ascension and Enthronement.	95
<u>Chapter 10 – Critique of other Systematic Theology Christology</u>	
<u>Works.....</u>	<u>97</u>
<u>Critique of John Miley's 1892 Methodist Christology.....</u>	<u>97</u>

Miley's Chap V. Leading Errors In Christology.	99
Answering Miley – Kenosis Does Harmonize Scripture.....	118
<u>Critique of Charles Hodge's 1878 Presbyterian Christology.....</u>	<u>121</u>
<u>Critique of Augustus Strong's 1907 “Baptist” Christology.....</u>	<u>122</u>
<u>Critique of Thiessen's 1949 “Baptist” Christology.....</u>	<u>127</u>
Thiessen's Christology	130
Thiessen's Little Value Added	131
<u>Critique of Chafer's 1948 Christology.....</u>	<u>131</u>
Dr Chafer's Introduction to The Pre-incarnate Christ.....	136
Dr Chafer's seven fold divisions of Christology.....	137
<u>Dr. Chafer's "The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate".....</u>	<u>142</u>
<u>+Critique of Geisler's 2002 Christology.....</u>	<u>144</u>
<u>Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ.....</u>	<u>147</u>
<u>Chapter 12 – Christology Conclusion.....</u>	<u>157</u>
<u>Bibliography.....</u>	<u>158</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.

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

When I began work on my Ph.D. in 2014 I set a goal to finish this Systematic Theology for the 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 these volumes fully capture at least that.

Book I Vol 01 Prolegomena - Vol 02 Bibliology
Book II Vol 03 Theology - Vol 04 Christology - Vol 05 Pneumatology
Book III Vol 06 Anthropology - Vol 07 Hamartiology - Vol 08 Soteriology
Book IV Vol 09 Ecclesiology - Vol 10 Angelology
Book V Vol 11 Eschatology - Vol 12 Epilogue

Volume 4 Christology - The Doctrine of Christ

Chapter 1 – Christology Introduction

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

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

Hebrews 1:1-4¹

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

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

1 The Holy Bible

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

Hebrews 5:11-14, 6:1a

[Emphasis added by author]

The most central theme of a thorough systematic theology is the doctrine of Christ. In segregating systems of the key '*ologies*'² of the whole revelation of God for a thorough analysis, it is Christology which interfaces with every other system. It is indeed central. In order of our topic coverage, it may rank in third place, behind Bibliology, and Theology Proper, but it is prima-facie the principle and central doctrine of God's whole revelation. Bibliology sets the foundation for all Bible doctrine, and Theology Proper presides as a grand overview of all Bible theology, but Christology is the central key to all theology and all doctrine. Whatever is to be gleaned from a discourse on Pneumatology, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and certainly all Anthropology, Hamartiology, Soteriology, studying the doctrine of man, sin, and salvation, must find its root in a discourse on the redeemer of mankind, the Christ. Ecclesiology and Eschatology, the doctrine of His Church and the doctrine of last things, yea, even ones Angelology, the study of His angels, springs with rapture from the study of the person of the Christ. It is, therefore, needful to dwell here, on the person of the Christ, and make it a true "*ology*."

A systematic theology must first have as its foundation a true and rich Bible doctrine. From that foundation a discourse must systematically analyze such doctrine, keeping it pure from its detractors, and evaluating its fit into the larger arena of theology.

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

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

Chapter 2 Christology in Bible Doctrine.

Bible Doctrine differs from systematic theology only in its level of thoroughness. Consequently, a sound Bible Doctrine book makes for a good foundation for a Biblical systematic theology. A good systematic theology does not separate itself from practical theology nor Biblical theology, nor exegetical theology, and ergo it cannot separate from a good Bible based Bible doctrine exposé. There is no truer, or more thorough, published, Baptist, and Biblical doctrine than that of Dr. Mark G. Cambron.¹ His teachings on Bible Doctrine at Tennessee Temple Bible School thoroughly lay the foundation for this systematic theology. His book, *Bible Doctrines*² is, with the permission of the Cambron Institute,³ given in block quotes throughout this effort. The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for most of this Systematic Theology.⁴

Believing in the verbal inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and believing that every single word is directly chosen by God, it is necessary to preserve and defend the doctrine extracted from

-
- 1 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
 - 2 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 60-69
 - 3 The Cambron Institute, 35890 Maplegrove Road, Willoughby, Oh 44094
 - 4 It is noted here and amply reproved in the Bibliology section of this work, that it is fallacy for Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book to recommend using the R.V., instead of the Holy Bible, 41 times for 54 Bible verses. Dr. Cambron's unfortunate preference for the Revised Standard version of the Bible stems from his shortsightedness about how far Satan would take, and how effectively Satan would use, the "Bible Critics," the "Bible Correctors," the "Textual Critics," and the "Copyright Mongers" of the modernist ecumenical ilk.

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

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

Chapter II Christology - The Doctrine of Christ [pg42]

CHRISTOLOGY (The Doctrine of Christ)

OUTLINE FOR CHAPTER II

I. Names and Titles of Christ.

- | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| A. Jesus. | B. Christ. | C. Messiah. |
| D. Lord. | E. Jesus Christ. | F. Christ Jesus. |
| G. The Lord Jesus Christ. | H. I Am. | I. The Son of God. |
| J. The Son of Man. | K. The Son of Abraham. | L. The Son of David. |
| M. Son of the Highest. | N. Second Man. | O. Last Adam. |
| P. The Word. | Q. Emmanuel. | R. Saviour. |
| S. Rabbi. | T. Rabboni. | U. Master. |

II. The Incarnation of Christ.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| A. The Fact of the Incarnation. | B. The Manner of the Incarnation. |
| C. The Objections to the Incarnation. | D. The Objects of the Incarnation. |
| E. The Perpetuity of the Incarnation. | F. The Proofs of the Incarnation. |

III. The Two Natures of Christ.

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| A. The Humanity of Christ. | B. The Deity of Christ. |
| C. The Blending of the Two Natures Into One Person. | |
| D. The Errors Concerning the Two Natures. | |

IV. The Death of Christ.

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| A. The Fact of the Death. | B. The Form of the Death. |
| C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Death. | |
| D. The Scriptural Names of the Death. | |
| E. The Objectives of the Death. | F. The Extent of the Death. |
| G. The Results of the Death. | |

V. The Resurrection of Christ.

- A. The Importance of the Resurrection.
- B. The Meaning of the Resurrection.
- C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Resurrection.
- D. The Proofs of the Resurrection.
- E. The Result of the Resurrection.

VI. The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ.

- A. The Meaning of the Ascension and Enthronement.
- B. The Message of the Ascension and Enthronement.
- C. The Nature of the Ascension and Enthronement.
- D. The Necessity of the Ascension and Enthronement.
- E. The Purpose of the Ascension and Enthronement.
- F. The Results of the Ascension and Enthronement.

[pg44]

Chapter II Christology

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

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

I. Names and Titles of Christ.

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

A. Jesus.

The name *Jesus* is found in the Four Gospels 612 times, and

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

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

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

Again we emphasize the fact that the name *Jesus* is prominent in the Gospels, while the name *Christ* is mentioned more in the Epistles. The name *Jesus* was more prominent *before* salvation was made and completed, while the name *Christ* is prominent *after* the work of salvation was finished. A Christian is not a person who believes in *Jesus* — the whole world believes there’s a Jesus — but a Christian is one who believes in the LORD [pg46] Jesus Christ. He is Lord! With this knowledge, that a person is saved by declaring Jesus as Lord (Rom. 10:9, R.V.⁵), and believing that God hath raised Him from the dead (and we know by I Corinthians 15:1-3 that the Gospel is the death, burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ as the sinner’s Substitute), we state that there is very little “gospel” in the Four Gospels. The Four Gospels give very little of the doctrine of salvation for sinners; only in the last few chapters of each Gospel is the death, burial and resurrection of Christ recorded. Hence, the name *Jesus* is predominant.

The Epistles are the writings which bring out so clearly the

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

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

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

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

Men of the world, the demons of Satan, all addressed Him as Jesus, but never as Lord. Christian Science, Universalism and Unitarianism believe in a Jesus, but they claim that He cannot

save, for they state that there is no sin to be saved from. Every false system of religion has the Lord Jesus Christ as the Object of its attack. Every false system reasons away sin; and in doing so, the need of a Saviour is ruled out. It says that Jesus died a needless death; and in doing that, He did not know what He was doing; in doing that, He must not have been the Son of God, for God knows all things. Do you not see that every attack upon the Son of God, Jesus our Lord, whether it be in regard to His blood, His resurrection, His substitutionary sacrifice or His second coming, is nothing but a subtle assault upon the *deity* of Christ. [pg47]

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

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

To believers He is Lord. We should never use adjectives with Him. He is not the Blessed Jesus, the Sweet Jesus, although

He is all that; He is the Lord Jesus Christ! When we pray, we should pray in Christ's name, not in Jesus' name.

B. Christ.

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

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

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

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

3. *Christ Has Been Anointed King.* "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the *throne* of his

father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his *kingdom* there shall be no end” (Luke 1:31-33).

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

C. *Messiah*.

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

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

D. *Lord*.

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

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

As stated above, the title “Lord” also includes another name for God, and that is LORD or Jehovah, and we know this by the way it is used in the New Testament. The New Testament quotes from the Old Testament Scriptures, using the word “Lord,” while the Old Testament word is “LORD,” or “Jehovah”: “Jesus said unto him, It is written again, ^[pg49] Thou shalt not tempt the Lord [Old Testament: Jehovah] thy God” (Matt. 4:7). In this verse it is also seen that *Elohim* (God) is ascribed to the Lord, who is the Lord Jesus Christ.

In salvation we must acknowledge that Jesus Christ is Jehovah, God, and Master: “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as *Lord* [Jehovah, God, Master — all three], and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved” (Rom. 10:9, A.R.V.⁶).

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

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

6 Ibid.

E. Jesus Christ.

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

F. Christ Jesus.

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

G. The Lord Jesus Christ.

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

H. I Am.

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

The Lord Jesus called Himself the great I AM when He was in Gethsemane. As the crowd came with lanterns, torches and weapons, the Lord went forth to meet them, asking, “Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I

am...” (John 18:4, 5). But, you may add, the Scriptures say, “I am he,” not merely, “I am.” To this we reply, Look at the word “he”; it is in italics, and all italicized words have been supplied by the translators and can therefore be left out.⁷ The Lord Jesus actually said, “I am.” When the Lord announced that He was the great I am, what did they do? “As soon then as he had said unto them, I am, they went backward, and fell to the ground” (John 18:6). Still another portion of the Word bears out the fact that Christ Jesus was the great I Am. “Jesus saith unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58). “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9).

I. The Son of God.

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

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

J. The Son of Man.

This seems to be the favorite title of the Lord, the one by which He called Himself time and again: “Jesus said unto him, Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of

7 Dr. Cambron here oversimplifies an accepted explanation that is generally not true. It is not true that KJB italic words may be left out. They were carefully added by fifty-seven expert linguists in order to faithfully capture the exacting Greek and Hebrew variances that do not readily flow into our cumbersome English language. The information these italic words add are not to be just discarded without thinking.

man hath not where to lay his head” (Luke 9:58).

This is the Millennial title of Christ. Wherever it is recorded, it is used in connection with ^[pg51] the coming kingdom reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. Even in the Old Testament the same thing holds true. Some may take issue with this, stating that Ezekiel takes upon himself that same title, the son of man. However, we refer the reader to the passages where it is used; there the coming Millennial Kingdom is in view. For example, in Ezekiel 37 is the prophecy of the Valley of Dry Bones, the whole house of Israel, which shall come to life again when the Lord prophecies unto them to return to the Land of Palestine; that will be the Millennium.

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

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

K. The Son of Abraham.

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

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

L. The Son of David.

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

M. *The Son of the Highest.*

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

N. *Second Man.*

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

O. *Last Adam.*

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

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

P. *The Word.*

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

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

Q. *Emmanuel.*

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

R. Saviour.

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

S. Rabbi.

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

T. Rabboni.

This is the same as the word “rabbi,” meaning Teacher, but comes from the Chaldean. “Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rabboni; which is to say, Master” (John 20:16).

U. Master.

“When the Pharisees saw it, they said unto his disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?” (Matt. 9:11). The meaning here is “Instructor.” The idea of Owner is not here implied, as in the word “Lord” (Adonai). The world today recognizes that Jesus is a great Master (Instructor), but will not own Him as Lord. The Lord Jesus is not merely our Instructor: He is our God, our Jehovah, our Lord! [pg53] [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.⁸ The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

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

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

The “I AM” references of Christ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ex 8:22 And I will sever in that day the land of Goshen, in

which my people dwell, that no swarms of flies shall be there; **to the end thou mayest know that I am the LORD in the midst of the earth.**

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

Ex 12:12 For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: **I am the LORD.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ex 31:13 Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying,

Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that **I am the LORD that doth sanctify you.**

It needs pointed out here that in the Hebrew tongue there is a very similar ring to “I AM” and the personal name of God “Jehovah” (generally shown with all caps as “LORD” in the King James Bible). Even without knowing Hebrew this similarity can be seen in the Hebrew lettering for the two expressions: "I AM" = אהיה (*haw-yaw*) and "the LORD:" = יהוה (*yeh-ho-vaw*) Remember, for Hebrews, the latter of these, the personal name of God, was so hallowed that it was not spoken out loud in conversation; extreme care being taken to not use the name of the LORD in vain.

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

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

It is used eight (8) times in the history books, only two (2)

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

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

Thrice Matthew/Mark records the "I Am the" title:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Re 2:8 And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write; These things saith **the first and the last,** which was dead, and is alive;

Re 21:6 And he said unto me, It is done. **I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end.** I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely.

Re 22:13 **I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.**

Isa 41:4 Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? **I the LORD, the first, and with the last; I am he.**

Isa 44:6 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; **I am the first, and I am the last;** and beside me there is no God.

Isa 48:12 Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; **I am the first, I also am the last.**

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

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

Joh 6:35 And Jesus said unto them, **I am the bread of life:** he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

Joh 6:41 The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, **I am the bread which came down from heaven.**

Joh 6:51 **I am the living bread** which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Joh 8:12 Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, **I am the light of the world:** he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 1) I am the bread of life: 6:35
 I am the bread which came down from heaven 6:41
 I am the living bread 6:51
- 2) I am the light of the world 8:12
 I am the light of the world. As long as I am in the world 9:5
- 3) I am the door of the sheep. 10:7
 I am the door: by me if any man enter in 10:9
- 4) I am the good shepherd: 10:11
 I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep 10:14
- 5) I am the resurrection, and the life 11:25
- 6) I am the way, the truth, and the life: 14:6
- 7) I am the true vine 15:1
 I am the vine, ye are the branches: 15:5

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

The Modernist bibles vs Names of Christ

Little more needs to be said to explain these names for Christ, however, it is important for a systematic theology to disclose some alterations to this list. The ecumenical Bible correctors brazenly attack this list of the names of Christ. Three

hundred and fifty seven (357) gross errors that are incorporated into all modernist English Bibles, can be found in this authors book "*The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*"¹ These errors are finding root in all modern English Bible translations. They are also present in every other language that these Bible correctors touch. In this wholesale attack on the Words of God, they leave off 127 of the names of Christ we just considered! They completely omitted them from their modernist bibles.

The Westcott and Hort critical Greek text relies extensively on the Alexandrian manuscripts, Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (Aleph). All modernist, protestant, ecumenical bibles from all of the Bible societies, rely exclusively on the Westcott and Hort critical Greek text, which was incorporated in the Nestles Greek Text². In concert, these modernist, calling themselves textual critics, and feigning to repair God's botched up preservation of Scripture, have stripped the name "*Jesus*" out of the Holy Bible 47 times. They have stripped the name "*Christ*" out of the Holy Bible 37 times. They have stripped the name "*Lord*" out of the Holy Bible 20 times. Twice they had the audacity to strip out the whole compound name, "*Lord Jesus Christ*"! (Col 1:2 & 1Thes 1:1). Once they eliminated the name "*Son of man*" from their "corrected bibles" (Matt 25:13).

The attack on God's Words by ecumenical textual critics is brought to a most striking focus in the examination of these 127 listed atrocities where they leave out name of the Lord Jesus Christ. If, in examination of your non-English Bible, you find one of these gross departures from the received text, you can be certain that ecumenical textual critics, modernists for certain, have had their hand in its translation process. These lists may be edited into

-
- 1 Edward Rice, *The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts*, Public Domain, www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf, www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch
 - 2 Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, Allen Wikgren, *The Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*, Fourth Revised Edition, copyright United Bible Societies, U.S.A., 1966, 1968, 1975, 1983, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, D-Stuttgart 1993, 1994, 1998

most Bible search engines and a comparison can be made between your Bible and the Greek Received Text or the King James Bible Text. Since it causes such an awakening to the ecumenical textual critics tactics, the verse lists of the errantly eliminated names of our Lord Jesus Christ are repeated below.

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

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

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

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

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

An explanation of the reasoning of the ecumenical textual critic and a thorough documentation of all 357 gross errors is available in this author's 2006 book *"The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts"*.³

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

3 Edward Rice, *"The 357 Magnum Errors of the Modernist's Critical Texts"*, Public Domain, www.gsbaptistchurch.com/baptist/bible/texterror.pdf, www.lulu.com/spotlight/GSBaptistChurch

Chapter 4 – The Incarnation of Christ.

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

John 1:1-3,14

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

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

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

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

The word “incarnation” comes from the Latin word meaning

enfleshment; thus, when we speak of the incarnation of Christ Jesus, the Son of God, we mean the “enfleshment” of God — God manifest in the flesh.

A. The Fact of the Incarnation.

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

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

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

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

B. The Manner of the Incarnation.

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

1. *As Testified By Matthew.*

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

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

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

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

Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: and knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS.”

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

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

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

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

d. *In the Expressions of “the Young Child and His Mother.”* Four times is this statement made (Matt. 2:11, 13, 14, 20); never does it say, “your wife and your child.” In connection with this we note another statement: “When they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt; and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: and was there until

the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.” (Matt. 2:13-15). *My Son. Not Joseph’s, but God’s!*

2. *As Testified by Luke.*

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

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

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

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

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

Was this the praise to Mary? No!

d. *In the Song of Mary.* “Mary said, My soul doth magnify

the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my *Saviour*..." (Luke 1:46-55). This was not a song of a woman that had conceived and was to bear in shame; it was a song filled with joy and praise to God, who had selected her to bring forth the Messiah.

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

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

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

C. The Objections to the Incarnation.

Many of the enemies of God are within the body of professed believers — those who claim to be Christians, but deny the virgin birth of Christ. Someone may ask: "When a person is to be saved, does he have to believe in the virgin birth of Christ to be saved? Is this one doctrine which one must believe and understand to be saved?" Let us answer by asking this: "Do you believe that it is possible for a saved person not to believe in the virgin birth of Christ?" Of course not! All saved, born-again saints of God will believe that our Saviour was virgin born. The only thing that a lost

person has to do to be saved is to repent of his sins and trust Christ as his Saviour, believing that He died for his sins and that He rose again from the dead. Saved people will believe in the virgin birth of our Lord.

Those who say they are Christians, and deny the virgin birth, are mere “professors” and not “possessors.” These enemies within, and those without the professing Church, object to the virgin birth by the following arguments:

1. *The Scholarship of the Day is Against It.* This statement is not true, but it would not matter much if it were, for we know that “the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be” (Rom. 8:7). The unconverted heart [pg57] knows not God nor of the things of God; and, of course, it would not believe in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ.

Unregenerated scholars may not accept this divine truth, but there are great minds of this world sitting upon the chairs of learning in our leading colleges and universities — saved men - who believe and testify to the virgin birth of Jesus. Really, a person is not indeed educated until he believes God and His Word: “The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge” (Pro. 1:7).

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

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

us of things Jesus Christ did which no other man could ever do.

b. *But There is the Testimony of John.* “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth” (John 1:1, 14). Indeed this is not the record of a mere man, but the Son of Man, the Son of God, God Himself!

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

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

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

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

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

c. *The Te Deum Laudamus.* This was an ancient hymn

preserved by the Church, which proved that the Early Church believed in the virgin birth of Christ.

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

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

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

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

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

D. The Objects of the Incarnation.

What were the purposes of the virgin birth?

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

2. *To Fulfill Prophecy.*

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

b. *The Virgin as an Example.* “The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.” (Is. 7:14). This Scripture means exactly what we mean.

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

4. *To Sacrifice For Our Sins.* “Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin” (I John 3:5). “It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. . . . Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither

hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10:4, 5, 8-10). “Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures” (I Cor. 15:1-4).

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

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

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

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

Jesus” (Heb. 2:17; 3:1).

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

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

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

E. The Perpetuity of the Incarnation.

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

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

2. *Is Essential To Our Lord’s High Priesthood.* “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted” (Heb. 2: 14-18). “And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death: but this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to

make intercession for them. For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he [pg61] offered up himself. For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore" (Heb. 7:23-28). "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24). "Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Heb. 12:2).

3. *Is Essential To Our Lord's Return and Millennium Reign.*

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

F. The Proofs of the Incarnation.

The proofs of the incarnation are centered in Christ Himself!

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

2. *Such As His Resurrection*. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept" (I Cor. 15:20). Would He have been raised from the dead had He not been the incarnate Son of God? Of course not.¹ [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.² The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

The Wolves Without Attack

Those that would deny the incarnation are wolves, but they have set aside their sheep's clothing. "*Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: (but) he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also*" (1John 2:22-23). Such deniers are often labeled as a "cult", "a religion or religious sect generally considered to be extremist or false, with its followers often living in an unconventional manner under the guidance of an authoritarian, charismatic leader."³ Such a title is aptly applied to both Joseph Smith (1805 – 1844), the founder of the Mormon religion, and Charles Taze Russell (1852 – 1916), the founder of the JW religion. Each had a beginning in "Christianity" and came to a place where they set aside their sheep's clothing and denied the incarnation. The Apostle John says of these "*They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.*" (2:19) Ellen G. White (1827 – 1915), the founder of the Seventh Day Adventist, is characterized a cult because of her false teachings about the means of salvation and the advents of Christ, but she, in doctrine, never denied the incarnation. She, and the SDA, do, however, deny the power and efficacy of the incarnation of Christ. The are

1 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 69-81, www.thecambroninstitute.org 54-62.

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

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

aptly called a cult.

Other religions which deny the incarnation are not categorized as cults because they never donned the sheep's clothing. False religions, which make no pretense of believing the Holy Bible, are labeled as false religions, not as Christian cults. Indian Hinduism and its three reformations, Jainism, Buddhism, and Sikhism; Oriental Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism, Persiana Zoroastrianism, and Islam⁴, all these deny the incarnation of Christ, but they deny the label "Christian" as well. Christianity is not a religion, it is a relationship, a relationship based on the incarnation of Christ. The real attack on the doctrine of the incarnation comes from within.

The Wolves Within Attack

The far more subtle and dangerous wolf is the one still wearing the sheep's clothing. The American Baptist Churches (USA) and its larger enterprise the Baptist World Alliance (BWA), an ecumenical alliance founded in 1905, does not deny the Virgin Birth of Christ, nor the incarnation, they just refuse to acknowledge that it is a doctrine. Their intent is to "Let the Spirit unite us, and not let doctrine divide us." For the American Baptist Association, ecumenical inclusiveness is more important than doctrine. Ergo they have said "The virgin birth is only recorded in two of the four gospels, so it is only 50-50 whether one believes it or not."⁵ These are false teachers that remain among us, and although they do not deny the incarnation of Christ, they will not preach the incarnation of Christ. Christ warns us "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves" (Matt 7:15). The incarnation of Christ is a cardinal Christian doctrine. Fundamentalists of the early 20th century considered it a fundamental of the faith.

4 Edward G. Rice, *The Non-Christian Religions*, E.G.Rice Publications, 2012, www.lulu.com,

www.gsbaptistchurch.com/seminary/lbts/non_christian_relgions_man.pdf

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

It needs to be said again that the Holy Bible is to be the sole authority for our Christology. What the philosopher says, and what the Roman historical perspectives say are dangerous and always detract from a pure Bible source. The danger is illustrated via Stephen J. Wellum, PhD, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, professor of Christian theology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, who published his 2016 book, “God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ.” In his flyleaf he says that he “lays out a systematic summary of Christology from philosophical, biblical, and historical perspectives.”⁶ Fred G. Zaspel, Author and Pastor of a Reformed Baptist Church endorses Wellum's treatment saying it is marked by “a close acquaintance with the centuries of discussion surrounding it,” and Michael Horton, Professor of Systematic Theology at Westminster Seminary California, concurs that “Wellum engages a wide range of issues and conversation partners. Consolidating the gains of evangelical Christological reflection... as well as philosophical, systematic, and historical theology.”⁷ Although he adds some insights about the two natures of Christ, Wellum must be treated as a hostile witness here, because he does not hold the inerrant Word as his sole authority or even the final authority: he includes phrases such as “Scripture and church tradition teach that the incarnation is not a temporary act but a permanent one,” and again “to reconcile with Scripture and the historical confessions,” and just as troubling he makes statements such as “Christianity would never have been born...” With these shortcomings Wellum's description of Christ's veilings is not given further citation here, but his writings on the two natures in Christ is considered in more detail in a later chapter.

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

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

7 Ibid.

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

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

III The Two Natures of Christ.

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

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

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

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

Among the people there was division caused by this

question, Who is He? “Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth, this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was? So there was a division among the people because of him” (John 7:40-43). See also John 9:17, 18; 10: 9-20; Luke 5: 21.

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

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

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

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

A. The Humanity of Christ.

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

1. *He was Perfectly Human.* By this we mean that our Lord, though He has been from all time and eternity, yet when He became flesh, He possessed a perfect human body, [pg63] soul and

spirit. Man, we know, has a body, soul and spirit: “The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (I Thess. 5:23).

a. *His Human Physical Body.* Yes, the Lord Jesus, in His humanity, possessed a *body*: “For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial” (Matt. 26:12; see also Hebrews 10:5); a *soul*: “Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour” (John 12:27; see also Matthew 26:38); and a *spirit*: “Immediately when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts” (Mark 2:8; see also Luke 23:46; Luke 10:21).

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

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

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

e. *His Human Limitation.* Being God, the Son of God became man, and when He did, He limited Himself to the realm of the human. Thus, He possessed human limitations, which were sinless infirmities. As we thus speak, let us not confuse infirmity with sin. He had human infirmities, but no sin. He *hungered* (“When he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred” — Matt. 4:2); He *thirsted* (“After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst” — John 19:28); He became *weary* (“Now Jacob’s well was there. Jesus therefore, being *wearied* with his journey, sat thus on the well: and it was about the sixth hour” — John 4:6); He *slept* (“Behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, insomuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep”— Matt. 8:24). See Matthew 26:36-40, for these verses describe in full the testing of Christ in the garden such as only a human being can endure.

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

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

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

2. *He is the Perfect Human.*

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

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

have forged a Jesus.

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

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

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

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

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

That age-old question may now be raised: “Could the Lord

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

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

b. *As He Transcends All Limitations of Time.* He is for all time. His teachings are not out-of-date. They are up-to-date! The books of our colleges and universities are not over ten years old; they are ever changing. But His words stand sure.

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

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

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

B. The Deity of Christ.

1. *Divine Predictions.* “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy foot-stool” (Ps. 110:1); “Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth

unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” (Mic. 5:2). See also Isaiah 7:14; 9:8; Jeremiah 23:6; and Genesis 3:15.

2. *Divine Names.*

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

b. *He is Called the Son of God.* This implies sameness with God. “Devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ” (Luke 4:41); “Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live” (John 5:25); “For what the law could not [pg66] do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh” (Rom. 8:3). Look up these other Scriptures: Mark 1:1; Matthew 27:40, 43; John 19:7; 10:36; 11:4.

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

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

3. *Divine Equality.* “Now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was” (John 17:5); “He that seeth me seeth him that sent me” (John 12:45); “Being in the form of God, [Christ Jesus] thought it

not robbery to be equal with God” (Phil. 2: 6a); “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9).

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

5. *Divine Worship.* Worship belongs only to God. Christ received true worship. Therefore, Christ is God! “There came wise men . . . saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. . . . And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down and worshipped him: and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense, and myrrh” (Matt. 2:2, 11). The wise men did not come to worship Mary, but Christ Jesus. In later years he accepted worship: “They that were in the ship came and worshipped him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God” (Matt. 14:33). See also Matthew 9:18; Luke 24:52. If Christ had not been God, then this worship would have been idolatry. It is God’s command that the Son should be worshiped. “And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him” (Heb. 1:6). “That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him” (John 5:23). This is true of all ages, that Christians have worshiped Christ as God. Born-again men would not have been satisfied with the worshiping of the mere man. [pg67]

6. *Divine Attributes.*

a. *Omnipotence.* “Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth” (Matt. 28:18). He has power over *death*: “Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me

shall never die. Believest thou this?” (John 11:25, 26). He has power over *nature*: “By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist” (Col. 1:16, 17). He has power over *demons*: “They were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power he commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out” (Luke 4:36).

b. *Omniscience*. “Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God” (John 16:30). “He [Peter] said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep” (John 21:17c). See also Matthew 9:4; 12:25; Luke 6:8; 9:47; 10:22; John 1:48, 49; John 4:16-19; Mark 2:8.

This one question of the doctors of Jerusalem proves the omniscience of the Lord Jesus: “How knoweth this man letters, never having learned?” (John 7:15). This leads us to know that Christ was never taught by man. He needed no schooling, nor tutors. His disciples sat at His feet — at whose feet did He sit? At no one’s! Paul was a student of Gamaliel — who taught Jesus? No one! Christ said, “Learn of me” — when did He ever say, “Teach me”? Never! We are sometimes advised to go to a higher authority, but to what authority did He go? To none other, for He had all authority. When did Jesus ever say, “I don’t remember, I will have to look it up?” Never! He was never caught off guard. In Mark 12:13 we have these words: “And they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and of the Herodians to catch him in his words.” They tried to trap Him in His words, but He was all wise and put His persecutors into confusion.

(1) *How He Taught*.

(a) *With Simplicity*. His illustrations were made on the spot. He drew them from life itself. He had no need of a filing system.

(b) *With Authority*. You never heard the Lord say, “We may as well suppose” (See Matthew 7:29; Mark 1:22).

(2) *What He Taught*.

(a) *Doctrine*. What He taught is not popular today. The modernists substitute ethics for doctrine; they believe in salvation by ethical living.

(b) *Ethics*. Christ certainly did teach ethics, but doctrine was first. Ethics must have doctrine for its foundation.

c. *Omni-sapience*¹. “In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.” (Col. 2:3).

d. *Omnipresence*. “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world” (Matt. 28:20). “No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven” (John 3:13).

e. *Immutability*. “They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but [pg68] thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail” (Heb. 1:11, 12). “This man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood” (Heb. 7:24). “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever” (Heb. 13:8). Jesus may change His position, but His Person never changes.

f. *Everlastingness*. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God” (John 1:1, 2). “Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting” (Mic. 5:2). “Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am” (John 8:58). “Fear not; I am the first and the last” (Rev. 1:17c).

g. *holiness*. “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth” (I Peter 2:22). “Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin” (I John 3:5). See also Hebrews 7:26.

h. *Love*. Paul prays that the Ephesians may be able “to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God” (Eph. 3:19).

1 Sapience def. “Ability to apply knowledge, experience, understanding or common sense and insight.” WordNet Database, 2006, Princeton University.

(1) *It is Spontaneous.*

(2) *It is Eternal.*

(3) *It is Infinite.*

(4) *It is Inexhaustible.*

(5) *It is Invincible.* See Ephesians 5:25; Revelation 1:5.

i. *Righteousness and Justice.* “Ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer, to be granted unto you” (Acts 3:14).

7. *Divine Offices.*

a. *Creation.* All creation is by the act of God; Christ created: therefore, Christ is God. “Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands” (Heb. 1:10). See John 1:3; Colossians 1:16; Ephesians 3:9; John 1:10.

b. *Preservation.* “Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb. 1:3). “He is before all things, and by him all things consist” — all things hang together (Col. 1: 17).

c. *Pardon.* “He said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven” (Luke 7:48). See also Mark 2:5- 10.

d. *Resurrection.* “This is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of him that sent me, that everyone which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day” (John 6:39, 40).

e. *Transformation.* “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is” (I John 3:2). See also Philippians 3:21 (R.V.²).

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

f. *Judgment*. “The Father judgest no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son” (John 5:22). See also Acts 17:31; Matthew 16:27; Matthew 25:31; Romans 2:16; 14:10; II Corinthians 5:10; Revelation 22:12.

g. *Salvation*. “I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall ^[pg69] any man pluck them out of my hand” (John 10:28). See also John 5:25; 6:47; 10:10; 17:2.

C. The Blending of the Two Natures in One Person.

Man cannot understand it. This is one proof that the Bible is the Word of God, for if man had written the Bible he would have left the two natures of Christ out of it. These are infinite facts, and God does not seek to explain, but makes a simple declaration of fact; Christ possessed a human nature and a divine nature — both are complete. It is not Scriptural to say Christ is God and man; rather, He is the God-Man. A type of His dual nature can be found in the boards of the tabernacle. The boards were of wood and gold — one board, with two materials; not two boards. The wood never became gold, and the gold never became wood. Christ had but one personality, not two. Two natures, with one personality.

We try to make John 1:14 read, “The Word became a man”; but it says, “The Word was made flesh.”

If we make Christ have two personalities, then we make the Godhead a Foursome instead of a Trinity.

D. Errors Concerning the Two Natures of Christ.

1. *Ebionitism*. This error was prevalent during the first century of the Christian Church. It denied the deity of Christ. It stated that Christ had a relationship with God after His baptism.

2. *Corinthianism*. This was most popular during the days of the Apostle John.

According to this error, Christ possessed no deity until He was baptized.

3. *Docetism*. This error found its way into the Church during the latter part of the second century. It maintained that Christ did not possess a human body. He had a body, He had a celestial body.

Thus Docetism denied Christ's humanity. Such error is the "spirit of anti-Christ" (I John 4:1-3).

4. *Arianism*. This error denied the divine nature of Christ. Arianism maintained that there was a time when the Son never existed, that God lived and then begat His Son after Him. Thus it denied Christ's pre-existence.

5. *Apollinarianism*. This error maintained that Christ possessed an incomplete human body. The Apollinarians reasoned: sin is sown in the soul of all men; God had no sin; therefore Christ had no soul; therefore He had an incomplete body.

6. *Nestorianism*. Nestorians took the two natures of Christ and made two persons out of them. That is, God came and dwelt in a perfect man; therefore God was in Christ, instead of Christ being God. [pg70]

7. *Eutychianism*. The Eutychians took the two natures of Christ and ran them together and made one new nature.

8. *Monotheletism*. This error consisted of the belief that Christ had two natures, but only one will.

9. *Unitarianism*. The Unitarians deny the Trinity. Thus they deny the deity of Christ altogether.

10. *Christian Science*. This belief is a denial of the humanity of Christ.

11. *Millennial Dawnism*. This belief denies the personal existence of our Lord Jesus Christ.³ [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.⁴ The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

Broadening a solid Bible Doctrines work into a systematic theology involves stepping back and taking in the larger picture and examining more fully the interfaces between each individual doctrine, exposing the areas where the doctrine has met its fiercest opposition, and analyzing what other works of systematic theology have done with the Bible doctrine. In Dr. Cambron's

3 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 81-93

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

coverage of the two natures of Christ, little more need be said. The interfaces of Christology with the other doctrines, and the comparison of other systematic theology works will be advanced at the close of this section. The errors concerning the two natures of Christ are herein well documented by Dr. Cambron but additional consideration might be given to the question, Are Christ's Human Limitations Permanent?

Chapter 6 - Christ's Human Limitations and Kenosis.

Christ incarnate was as much human as if he were not God, and as much God, as if he were not human; that common statement about the two natures of Christ solicits considerable discussion. It is often considered that one or the other nature can be somehow, and somewhat, veiled by the other. This consideration is explored in depth by Steven J. Wellum¹, author of “God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ,” however as previously mentioned Dr. Wellum does not consider the infallible, inerrant, inspired Holy Bible, his sole authority. We, thus, only use his work as a sounding board to ask some questions and gain some understanding about the inner workings Christ's dual nature. Why? That we may better know Christ, and better know man. And to explore how much “finiteness” Christ may have attained for thirty-three years and may have retained in his resurrected body.

Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus

1 Stephen J. Wellum (PhD, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School) is professor of Christian theology at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, and editor of the Southern Baptist Journal of Theology. Stephen lives in Louisville, Kentucky, with his wife, Karen, and their five children. He is aptly criticized in this work for not using the Holy Bible as his sole source for his theology.

Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Philippians 2:5b-11

It is incomprehensible that a member of the Godhead, our Lord Jesus Christ, “*made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men*” (Phil 2:7). The infinite God took on some measure of finiteness in order to do this. Does the resurrected Christ then retain some of that finiteness that he had when he became flesh? The Greek word κενωω – *kenoo*, Strong’s# <2758>, is used in this verse and means “to empty, or make empty, or to make void.” It is used four other times in the Bible, Rom 4:14, 1Cor 1:17, 9:15, 2Cor 9:3 and, significantly, for us here, Phil 2:7.² “*But made <2758> himself of no reputation <2758>, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:...*” (Phil 2:7). Consequently the words *kenoo*, *kenosis*, and *kenotic* often come up in the discussion of what-all Christ did set aside to become finite, and now we consider what finiteness he carried back to glory in his glorified body. There are two predominate views of the two natures in Christ; the *kenosis* view of Christ’s incarnation fits the Scriptures better than any classic or orthodox view.

The classic view (classic Catholic if you will, generally orthodox) is that both natures occupied Jesus and he could selectively choose which nature he would occupy. This is wrought with split-personality problems, and conflicting natures driving conflict and consternation in the person of Christ. The more Biblical view is the *kenotic* view that Christ set aside some of his

2 *Romans 4:14 For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void <2758>, and the promise made of none effect:...1 Corinthians 1:17 For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect <2758>.... 9:15 But I have used none of these things: neither have I written these things, that it should be so done unto me: for it were better for me to die, than that any man should make <2758> my glorying void <2758>.... 2 Corinthians 9:3 Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain <2758> in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready:... Philippians 2:7 But made <2758> himself of no reputation <2758>, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:*

divine attributes in order to be made in the likeness of men, and that the Father would one day, “*glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was*” (John 17:5).

Ironically, the *kenotic* view is considered an error in Christology by Methodist John Miley. The 19th century Methodist scholar and theologian dismisses the *kenosis* view of Christ's incarnation for three reasons 1) it is not the orthodox view, 2) it does not fit with the orthodox view, and 3) it is destructive to the orthodox view. Again, the *kenotic* view he objects to, fits the Scriptures better than any classic or orthodox view. A more complete analysis of his opposition is included in chapter 10 of this work. The serious student of theology might study his opposition to this idea, it predominately deals with the orthodox confusion about the formation of the soul and an artificial (but orthodox) insistence that two separate natures dwelt separately and yet in complete union in Jesus Christ.

Consider first three attributes of God that were logically set aside when he took on the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men. Omnipresence is not possible in a finite body. As much as Christ Jesus got hungry, got thirsty, and got tired in his finite body, he also lost the ability to be in more than one place at one time. Even this truth needs to be carefully considered. I have heard preachers of the gospel of Jesus Christ use a clause of John 3:13, “*the Son of man which is in heaven,*” to try and justify that he retained his omnipresence. It helps our finite understanding to consider that Christ retained “membership” in the Triune Godhead, and was thus one with the Father and one with the Spirit and could freely “tap into” these attributes of the Father and Spirit. But just the same, in the body that he occupied he had to set aside the attribute of omnipresence. This is more than semantics and not a trivial pursuit; it guards against error, and gives a deeper consideration of the miracle of the incarnation wherein the two natures were enfolded into one body, one mind, and one personality. The exercise of exploring how this union works is thus part of the “*sore travail given to the sons of men who would give their heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things*”

that are done under heaven” (Eccl 1:13). For a member of the triune Godhead to be God in the flesh, his attribute of omnipresence had to be set aside.

Second, consider God's attribute of omnipotence. That Jesus did not retain omnipotence is best understood by looking at an infant in a crib. They are wholly dependent on parents. That seed of woman robed in flesh did not flee to Egypt on his own accord, he depended on Joseph to get him there because he, in his young present state, was not omnipotent. He was instead presently dependent. It was part of making himself of no reputation.

Thirdly, consider God's attribute of omniscience. That Jesus was not omniscient will likely raise some eyebrows and possibly foil some longtime understandings, but consider it just the same. It is best understood by again examining the infant in a crib. Then consider, did Jesus then grow into or mature into his omniscience? Did he grow into or mature into his omnipotence? Did he grow into or mature into his omnipresence? The thesis here is that he did not grow back into these attributes of God, he laid them aside to be made in the likeness of man, and he was then reinstated with these attributes when he was glorified, i.e. when the Father would *“glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was”* (John 17:5). We might also herein consider the question, did he retained some measure of his finiteness even in his resurrected and glorified body? But first, let us give full consideration that these attributes were set aside so that God, in our Lord Jesus Christ, could be made flesh and dwell among us.

What Jesus knew, learned, and understood was already touched upon by Dr. Cambron. He was not taught by man but instead he, having no sin nature to interfere with his development, was taught by the Holy Spirit and God who had a free rein to teach him all things. Remember Dr. Cambron's emphasis on the fact that Christ did not have our sin nature when he came from the seed of woman, i.e. he did not have a propensity to do evil that is present in the seed of man. An overriding principle to apply here is that Jesus in the flesh, did nothing that is impossible for mere man to do. Nothing. Man cannot be omnipotent and/or omniscient of his

own accord, but he can be so “tapped in” to God that these attributes are available to him. Stephen Wellum says, “sometimes Jesus denied himself the exercise of his divine might and energies for the sake of the mission. At other times,... he exercised those energies.”³ But I contend that Jesus, while in the flesh, set these attributes completely aside and operated completely in the confines of finite man. It is more than semantics, such an understanding solidifies the tremendous miracle done in the incarnation, helping us to better understand what he did and what we can do. Wellum's classic approach is fraught with split-personality problems, the *kenotic* approach has but one problem, that Christ, for a season, when the fullness of time was come, temporarily, set aside these attributes of God and was made flesh. The latter constitutes a problem only in our finite understanding, but seems to align completely with Holy Scripture. It also disrupts the theologian's little cliché that “Jesus (in the flesh) was as much God as if he were not man” but we don't mind overthrowing man's clichés for the sake of Bible truths.

Consider how the classic approach has leaked into our thinking because many have not made this differentiation. Some, as mentioned, go out on a limb with a clause of John 3:13, “*the Son of man which is in heaven,*” to try and justify that he retained his omnipresence. Some consider that the things Jesus did were only possible because he was God, and thus omnipotent, they thus give little regard that the things he did were done in the power of the Spirit, and that we might, with faith as a grain of mustard seed, fulfill John 14:12, “*Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.*” And even more have heard it said, “Of course Jesus knew what they were thinking, he was God, he was omniscient” (Matt 9:4, 12:25, Luke 6:8⁴). We

3 Stephen J. Wellum, “God the Son Incarnate: The Doctrine of Christ,” a Crossway blog post of an excerpt from his book, <https://www.crossway.org/blog/2016/11/are-christs-human-limitations-permanent/> (accessed 11/12/2016)

4 *Mt 9:4 And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts? ... Mt 12:25 And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and*

contend here that the things Jesus did in the flesh he did in the flesh, and that we, who believe on him, have ability to do the works of God in the same way (John 14:12).

The greatest struggle in letting go of the Roman Catholic model about the two natures of Christ comes in this latter argument; they suppose that Jesus was omniscient and could thus perceive and do things that you or I do not have power to do. Again our thesis here is that Jesus operated in his earthly ministry in the flesh, after setting aside the attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience. Such an understanding magnifies what Jesus did in his earthly ministry, allows greater consideration of the works believers can presently do, and fully aligns with Holy Scripture. Look anew at the verses wrongly used to support a omniscient-Jesus viewpoint.

In Matthew 9:4 “*And Jesus **knowing their thoughts** said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?*” and 12:25, “*And Jesus **knew their thoughts**, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation...*” and Mark 2:8, “*And immediately when Jesus **perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves**, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts?*” and again Luke 6:8 “*But **he knew their thoughts**, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst...*” and again 9:47 “*And Jesus, **perceiving the thought of their heart**, took a child, and set him by him,...*”

In each of these verses “knowing thoughts”, and “perceiving thoughts” did not need to be accomplished with omniscience. I know what your thinking, but each of these instances might have been accomplished with the power of the Spirit of the living God fully dwelling in Jesus. We might also have that type of perception if we would abide in Christ and have a complete filling of the Holy Spirit of God.

In Luke 10:22, “*All things are delivered to me of my Father: and no man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the*

every city or house divided against itself shall not stand:... Lu 6:8 But he knew their thoughts, and said to the man which had the withered hand, Rise up, and stand forth in the midst. And he arose and stood forth.

Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him...” we see an admission that Jesus only new things that were delivered to him of his Father. And in John 1:48 and 49, “*Nathanael saith unto him, Whence knowest thou me? Jesus answered and said unto him, Before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee. Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel...*” it is likely that Nathanael was praying under that fig tree, (even more likely that he was praying for the arrival of the Messiah), and, if Jesus did not see him in person, then the Holy Spirit of God showed the Son of God what Nathanael was doing under that fig tree. Such insights were not uncommon in Old Testament prophets, cf 1Kings.14:5.⁵

Also consider John 4:16-19 and the woman at the well who perceived that Jesus was a prophet because he told her of her past, these things could have been revealed to Jesus by the Father without Jesus being omniscient. Samuel knew that three men would give Saul two loaves of bread (1Samuel 10:3-4) and he was not omniscient. Ahijah knew that the wife of King Jeroboam was at his door (1King 14:6) and he was not omniscient. So to Elijah the Tishbite new to meet Ahaziah's messengers before they got to the god of Ekron (2Kings 1:2-3), and Elisha knew what Gehazi had taken from Naaman (2Kings 55:25). If God did it for his prophets he can surely reveal things to his only begotten Son, while he was in flesh and blood, without him being omniscient.

Also consider that when a grieved Peter said of the resurrected Christ “*Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee*” (John 21:17), that he was speaking to the resurrected Christ. But just the same “*Lord, thou knowest all things*” might be said of Jesus because he was one with the Father, and not indicate a full-on presence of omniscience.

Dr. Camron examined John 7:15 “*And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?*” to explore how Jesus learned from the Holy Spirit not from man. And

5 1Kng.14:5 *And the LORD said unto Ahijah, Behold, the wife of Jeroboam cometh to ask a thing of thee for her son; for he is sick: thus and thus shalt thou say unto her: for it shall be, when she cometh in, that she shall feign herself to be another woman.*

in John 16:30, “*Now are we sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee: by this we believe that thou camest forth from God...*” it is easily conceived that he knew all things by the power of the Holy Spirit that so filled him. And it may be true that Jesus never said, “I don’t remember, I will have to look it up?” but all this could have been the case without Jesus holding omniscience. Before being glorified in his resurrected body it is most likely that Jesus Christ did not have omnipresence, omnipotence, or omniscience, he had set them aside to be made a little lower than the angels (Psalm 8:5, Hebrews 2:7, 9).

That Christ Jesus set aside some of the attributes of God in order to be made in the likeness of men does not make him less God, nor does it detract from his divinity. It does help us understand some underlying Scriptures about his incarnation and the union of two natures into one personality. It is more Biblical than supposing the classical Catholic approach with its dual personality problems. Now all that remains is an examination of when these attributes were reaffirmed in Christ.

Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.. Matthew 28:16-20

In these verses “All power” and “with you always” seem to speak of the omnipotence and omnipresence of the Christ in his resurrected and glorified body. Colossians 1:17-20 indicate that Christ was indeed placed back into a position of full glory.

And he is before all things, and by him all things

consist. And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. Colossians 1:17-20

This restoration fits exactly with what Jesus prayed for in John 17:5, “*And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*”

Catholic theologians and their Protestant descendants debate when a soul is formed, where it comes from, and how it gets original sin. They follow the philosopher's model that man is both material and immaterial but reject the Bible teaching that man is a trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit, made in his image of Father, Son, and Spirit. Does one really want to rely on their ideas about how Jesus contained both divine and human traits? I trow not. They reject the *knosis* idea because they debate when and how Jesus could have picked up attributes that were previously laid aside. Let them debate, a believer need only take up a Holy Bible and believe what is laid out in its pages.

Therein is seems clear that Jesus, born in that barn, heralded by angles, and worshiped by wise men, was made a little lower than the angles, took upon the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Three days after his body went to the tomb, his soul went to hell, and his spirit was commended to his Father, he was resurrected from the dead and restored to the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. Our task is not to debate or rationalize all this, it is to believe, only believe.

In believing all that the Scriptures say about the incarnation of Christ I like to leave two things on the table. It seems very likely with this *knosis* model that Jesus operated in the flesh with no reliance on his own omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience. He operated only in the form of a servant, made in the likeness of men. With the absence of a sin nature he was able to fully tap into

these attributes through the power and presence of the Holy Spirit. He was tempted, tried, and crucified and yet he was without sin. He told us with two *Amens* and without apology “*Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.*” As miraculous and impossible as all this seems I believe my inerrant, infallible, inspired Bible.

Secondly, it seems logical to me, an engineer who thrives on logic, and it is very possible in the Scriptures that were just presented, that the Christ, in his resurrected glorified body may have retained some of the finiteness that he took on. It is possible that in his glorified body, a body like the glorified body that he promised to us, that he does not presently have omnipresence. He is presently, in some measure of finiteness, seated on the right hand of the Majesty on high (Heb 1:3, 10:12). It is possible that in his resurrected glorified body, which is the first fruit of a resurrection that we will share, that he does not have his own omnipotence. He has the power that is bestowed upon him by the Father, which is without question, “All Power.”

It is possible that in the body he presently has, a body similar to what resurrected saints will have, that he does not have his own omniscience. In the flesh Jesus told his disciples, “*Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you*” (John 15:15). In his resurrected body his disciples asked him “*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*” and he replied “*It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power*” (Acts 1:6-7). Notice that Jesus said previously, “*But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.*” It is thus possible, with these verses in tandem, that Christ, in his resurrected glorified body, does not presently know when the Father will send him for his own, and thus he does not presently have his own omniscience.

All this consideration of the amount of finiteness that Christ incarnate assumed and/or retained cannot for a moment detract

from his deity and full membership in the trinity. God the Son was always co-equal, co-eternal, co-existent with the Father and could be so while setting aside these attributes. God became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth, and the Apostle John wrote, “*and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father*” (John 1:14). One needs to carefully consider the miracle of the incarnation of Christ, never allowing our finite understanding to compromise his deity or his humanity. Further it is important to know that the works he did in the flesh are not beyond us, they are not outside the reach of the Spirit filled believer (John 14:12). In a 300 word Penny Pulpit essay, I stated it:

The first sentence of Hebrews resonates with one in Philippians 2:5-8 to reveal more about our Lord Jesus Christ in two sentences than can be fully comprehended by mere finite minds. God's Word does that on occasion; that is why genuine Christians are commanded to meditate on God's word day and night. Catholics with their “orthodox view” suppose that Jesus had a very complex “split-personality” whereby he was sometimes God and sometimes human. Modernist “scholars” take the Greek word for “to make void” and develop extravagant theories about “*kenosis*”: vain and dangerous theories that Jesus “emptied himself” of all divine attributes (even as they translate it in modernist ecumenical copyright bibles). But as for Agur, the son of Jakeh, and I, more brutish than these sophisticated theological scholars, it is enough to know that Jesus was as much man as if he were not God, and Christ was as much God as if he were not man. Thus Jesus Christ was man enough to go forty days into the wilderness; but God enough to emerge victorious; man enough to attend a wedding, but God enough to create new-wine; man enough to be thirsty in Samaria, but God enough to offer living water; man enough to have compassion on lepers, but God enough to heal them; man enough to fall asleep in a boat, but God enough to calm the sea; man enough to pay taxes, but God enough to send

Peter out for a fish; man enough to be betrayed by a kiss, but God enough to forgive his betrayer; man enough to be put to death in agony, ... but God enough to rise victorious over death! He was man enough to pay-in-full my sin debt, and God enough to be my Lord Jesus Christ. Meditate that for a moment. An Essay for week #23 - Jun 5, 2022

Chapter 7 – The Death of Christ – Cambron's Section IV.

On the death of Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr Cambron's section on “The Death of Christ.”[block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 93-101, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 70-84.]

IV The Death of Christ.

The Cross is the fundamental truth of the revealed Word of God. By the Cross we do not mean the tree, but the Sacrifice upon that tree.

We see the emblems of Christ and Him crucified in Genesis, and so on through the Old Testament. The only reason for Bethlehem is Calvary. Our salvation depends upon Christ dying upon the Cross.

A. The Fact of the Death.

1. Old Testament Anticipation.

a. In Type.

- (1) Coats of Skin (Gen. 3:21).
- (2) Abel's Lamb (Gen. 4:4).
- (3) Offering of Isaac (Gen. 22).
- (4) Passover Lamb (Ex. 12).
- (5) The Levitical Sacrificial System (Lev. 1:1 — 7:16).
- (6) The Brazen Serpent (Num. 21; John 3:14, 15).
- (7) The Slain Lamb (Is. 53:6, 7; John 1:29).

b. In Prediction.

- (1) Seed of the Woman (Gen. 3:15).
- (2) The Sin Offering of Psalm 22.
- (3) The Vicarious Sufferings of Isaiah 53.
- (4) The Cut-off Messiah of Daniel 9:26.
- (5) The Smitten Shepherd of Zachariah 13:6, 7.

2. *New Testament Revelation.*

a. *In General.* One third of the Book of Matthew, more than one third of Mark, one fourth of Luke, and one half of John deals with the last week of Christ before His crucifixion. [pg71]

b. *In Particular.*

(1) *The Heart of Christ Must Be Noted.*

(a) *His Death.* “If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life” (Rom. 5:10). See also Philippians 2:8; Hebrews 2:9, 14; Revelation 5:6-12.

(b) *His Cross.* “We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness” (I Cor. 1:23). See also Galatians 3:1; 6:14; Ephesians 2:16; Colossians 1:20.

(c) *His Blood.* “This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins (Matt. 26:28). See also Mark 14:24; Ephesians 1:7; Colossians 1:14; I John 1:7; Hebrews 9:12, 25; Revelation 1:5; 5:9.

(2) *The Three Statements Concerning His Death Must Be Studied.*

(a) *Made Sin for Us.* “He hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him” (II Cor. 5:21).

(b) *Died the Just for the Unjust.* “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit” (I Peter 3:18).

(c) *Made a Curse For Us.* “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. 3:13).

B. The Form of the Death.

1. *A Natural Death.* His death was a death such as experienced by man. It had to be a natural death, for He was The Man dying for all men.

2. *An Abnormal Death.* God cannot die, but God had to die if He was to become man’s substitute. Therefore He became a creature who could die. However, He contracted no sin while He

lived.

Man dies today because of sin; but He had no sin. Apart from our sins, He would never have tasted death.

3. *A Preternatural Death.* Christ's death was marked out and determined beforehand. Before the fall of Adam, God anticipated it. Before man sinned, God made provision for Calvary, for Christ is the Lamb slain "before the foundation of the world" (I Peter 1:20). Were the sins that man committed before Calvary taken away by the blood of bulls and goats? No! For all sins, whether committed before or after the Cross, were put on Him at Calvary (Rom. 3:25).

4. *A Supernatural Death.* While we have stated that His death was a natural death, yet it was different from the death of other men. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father" (John 10:17, 18). [pg72]

His death was of His own volition. He lay down His life Himself; no one took it from Him. Usually it took two days for a man to die by crucifixion, but He died in six hours. Matthew 27: 46 and 50 state that He cried out with a loud voice. His strength had not left Him. He died in His strength. He *gave* His life; no one took it from Him. He bowed His head in death; He was majestic, even upon the cross.

Thus we see Christ suffering two deaths for us: the first death, the separation of the soul and spirit from the body; the second death, the separation of the individual from God. Christ suffered the second death first, and the first death last. He suffered the second death when He was separated from the Father, for He cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46). Christ, the very son of God, was able to suffer in six hours what the sinner will endure throughout eternity.

C. Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Death.

"Christ died for our sins according to the *scriptures*" (I Cor. 15:3b). Anything that is not of the Scripture is false.

1. *The Death of Christ Was a Martyr's Death.* "In this He died to show us that truth is worth dying for." How does the child of God meet this argument? Simply by the following: Why didn't Christ say so? Why didn't Paul say so? Why didn't Peter say so? And why didn't John and Luke say so? If Christ had died a martyr's death, why didn't the apostles say, "Believe on Stephen's death and be saved, for Stephen was a martyr?" If Christ died as a martyr, why didn't the Father comfort Him at His death as He has done others down through the centuries? But He cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

2. *The Death of Christ Was Accidental.* By the above statement critics mean that He was the victim of a mob. This we know is not true, for He was conscious of His future death. Seven times in the Gospel of John He speaks of "mine hour," which was in the future, and which was Calvary. *He need not have died.* Nails did not hold Christ upon the cross, but His will. "Come down from the cross, if thou be the Son of God," cried the mob; but Christ did not come from heaven to come down from the cross.

3. *The Death of Christ Was a Moral Example.* This theory holds that a drunkard has only to think on Christ and he will improve. To refute this we ask, "Why didn't it improve the ones who crucified Him?" If Christ's example is for the improvement of the world, then Christianity is a failure. Why not look upon the cross of Peter, as he was crucified downward? Man needs more than improvement.

4. *The Death of Christ Was an Exhibit of God's Displeasure with Sin.* In other words some people think that God's displeasure with sin is pictured on the cross rather than in hell. If the preceding statement is true, why the incarnation? Why not crucify a plain sinner, instead of the best Man who ever lived? [pg73]

5. *The Death of Christ Was to Show Man That God Loves Him.* God does love man, and the Cross does show that God loves him, but the death of Christ was not only to show God's love.

6. *The Death of Christ Was the Death of a Criminal.* Can it be possible that one could hold to this theory? The answer is "yes." And we refute this theory by stating that Pilate found no fault in Him. A study of the trial, as found in the Gospels, will disprove

this theory.

D. Scriptural Names of Christ's Death.

1. *Atonement.* This is an Old Testament idea which means “to cover.” The only place that the word “atonement” can be found in the New Testament is in Romans 5:11, but this is a mistranslation;¹ it should be translated “reconciliation.” However, the word “atonement” is a New Testament idea meaning “at-one-ment” — at one with God through the sacrifice of His Son.

2. *Sacrifice.* “Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us” (I Cor. 5:7). See also Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26; 10:12.

3. *Offering.* “By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. . . . for by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Heb. 10:10, 14).

4. *Ransom.* “The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). Also I Peter 1:18, 19; I Timothy 2:5, 6. We have been redeemed (bought back) by the Price, which is the blood of Jesus Christ.

5. *Propitiation.* “He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (I John 2:2). See also I John 4:10; Romans 3:25. In Hebrews 9:5 the word “propitiation” is translated “mercy seat,” which is correct, for in the above Scriptures also the word “propitiation” means “mercy seat.” The law demanded death for sin; therefore, the blood of the sacrifice was placed on the mercy seat (Ex. 25:22; Lev. 16:13, 14),

1 Dr Cambron was genius, but not over and above the 57 highly skilled linguists who were divided into six companies which met in cities of Cambridge, Westminster, and Oxford, to take seven years, 1604 – 1611, to translate God's inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Old Testament and New Testament books into an authorized English Holy Bible which answered only to the original Hebrew and Greek. There had never before, and has never since, been assembled a group of more scholarly men with a more hallowed purpose. There is no reason whatsoever for anyone to ever say, “A better English translation is . . . ” There is no better English translation.

showing that death had taken place. God looked upon the mercy seat and saw blood — life — and was satisfied. Since Calvary, God looks upon our Mercy Seat, which is Christ, and is satisfied. Therefore, the underlying thought of propitiation is “satisfaction.”

6. *Reconciliation.* “To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5:19). See also Colossians 1:20. The word “reconciliation” means to cause, or affect a thorough change. Never in Scripture does it say that God is reconciled. It is man who has to be reconciled; it is man who needs a thorough change. [pg74]

7. *Substitution.* Substitution is not a Scriptural word, but it surely is a Scriptural idea. “He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all” (Is. 53:5, 6). See also I Peter 3:18; II Corinthians 5:1.

8. *Testator.* A testament is a will that goes into effect at the death of the testator. Thus, our inheritance is that which we shall receive, which is made possible by the death of the Lord Jesus. “He is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise, it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth” (Heb. 9:15-17). See also Colossians 1:12-14; Ephesians 1:1-7.

E. The Objectives of the Death.

1. *The Manifestation of Divine Character.* “Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. . . . To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus” (Rom. 3:21, 26).

2. *The Vindication of Divine Law.* The law is unto death.

There is no mercy in law, only justice. The law condemns the sinner to death; Christ took the sinner's place; therefore, Christ paid the law's demand.

3. *The Foundation of Divine Pardon.* This statement will go unchallenged in the New Testament. There is one essential feature of forgiveness, and that is: the one who forgives must take upon himself all wrong (or loss) that has been committed. For example, if a person is robbed of ten dollars, and the culprit is found, but is forgiven, who then stands the loss? It is he who forgave.

F. The Extent of the Death.

1. General Statements.

a. *Its Universality.* His death was for all men — for those who believe, and those who believe not. “We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. 2:9). See also I Timothy 2:6; 4:10; Titus 2:11; I John 2:2; II Peter 3:9.

b. *Its Limitation.* Christ's work upon the cross was conditional, as the efficiency of it depended upon the repentance and acceptance of Christ by the sinner. “We labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe” (I Tim. 4:10). [pg75]

2. Particular Statements.

a. *Christ Died for the Believer.* “Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (Titus 2:14). See also Ephesians 5:2; Galatians 2:20; I Timothy 4:10.

b. *Christ Died for the Church.* “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish” (Eph. 5:25- 27).

c. *Christ Died for Sinners.* “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but: quickened by the Spirit” (I Peter

3:18). See also I Timothy 1:15; Romans 5:10.

d. *Christ Died for the World*. “They sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation” (Rev. 5:9, R.V.²). See also John 3:16; 1:9; I John 2:2.

G. The Results of the Death.

1. In Relation to the Sinner.

a. *Provides a Substitute*. “We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death ... that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man” (Heb. 2:9).

b. *Provides a Ransom*. “Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time” (I Tim. 2:6).

c. *Provides a Propitiation*. Because of the death of Christ, God is “mercy seated” — satisfied. “He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (I John 2:2).

d. *Provides for Non-imputation of Sin*. “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them: and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5:19).

e. *Provides an Attraction*. “I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me” (John 12:32).

f. *Provides a Salvation*. “The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men” (Titus 2: 11).

g. *Provides a Gracious Invitation*. “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16).

2. In Relation to the Believer.

a. *Reconciliation*. “All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the

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

ministry of reconciliation” (II Cor. 5:18).

b. *Redemption*. “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (Eph. 1:7). See also Galatians 3:13.

c. *Justification*. “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Rom. 5:1).

[pg76]

d. *Exoneration*. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus” (Rom. 8:1, R.V.³).

e. *Possession*. “What? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have received of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s” (I Cor. 6:19, 20).

f. *Sanctification*. “We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10:10).

g. *Perfection*. “By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Heb. 10:14).

h. *Admission*. “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and a living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water” (Heb. 10:19-22).

i. *Identification*. “The love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died” (II Cor. 5:14, R.V.⁴).

j. *Liberation*. “Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage” (Heb. 2:14, 15, R.V.⁵).

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

k. *Donation*. “He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?” (Rom. 8:32).

3. *In Relation to Satan*.

a. *Dethronement*. “Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out” (John 12:31).

b. *Nullification*. “Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same; that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil” (Heb. 2:14, R.V.⁶).

c. *Defeat*. “Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son” (Col. 1:13). See also Ephesians 6:12.

4. *In Relation to the Material Universe*. “It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven” (Col. 1:19, 20).

Some teach that Philippians 2:9-11 reveals the fact of universal salvation, but this is not so. This passage declares the truth of universal adoration.⁷ [pg77] [This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.⁸ The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

6 Ibid.

7 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 93-101

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

Chapter 8 – The Resurrection of Christ – Cambron's Section V.

On the resurrection of Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr. Cambron's section on “The Resurrection of Christ.” [block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 101-109, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 78-84.]

V The Resurrection of Christ.

A. The Importance of the Resurrection.

In the Bible there are several accounts of people having been brought back to life. These people, however, were not resurrected, but restored, for they died again. But our Lord was resurrected, having died once and for all and having been raised from the dead. He now liveth and abideth forever.

His *resurrection* (death) was necessary, because He was made sin for us.

1. *Its Place in Scripture.* There are thirteen or fourteen references in the New Testament concerning the ordinance of baptism, and even fewer Scriptures referring to the Lord's Supper. However, the fact of His resurrection is mentioned over one hundred times.

2. *Its Part in Apostolic Testimony.* “With great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all” (Acts 4:33). See also Acts 2:32; 17:18; 23:6.

3. *Its Prominence in the Gospel.* If Christ be not risen there is no Gospel. “Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I have preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was

buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures” (I Cor. 15:1-4).

4. *Its Preeminence in Salvation* (I Cor. 15:12-20).

a. *First Proposition.* “Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?” (verse 12).

b. *Second Proposition.* “But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen” (verse 13). If we are not to be raised from the dead, then Christ is not risen.

c. *Third Proposition.* “And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain” (verse 14). If Christ is not risen, Christianity is a sham.

d. *Fourth Proposition.* “Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not” (verse 15). If Christ be not raised, every evangelical preacher is a fraud.

e. *Fifth Proposition.* “For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins” (verses 16 and 17). If He be not risen, He is still dead, and therefore cannot redeem us. The penalty paid for any crime is not fully paid until the one for whom it was paid is free. As long as Christ was in the tomb, the penalty for our sins was not paid; but His resurrection shows that the penalty *has* been paid. And, remember, this Scripture was written to those who were not in their sins.

f. *Sixth Proposition.* “Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished” [pg78] (verse 18). In other words, they have all gone like the beasts of the field, if Christ did not rise from the dead.

g. *Seventh Proposition.* “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable” (verse 19). If all of our hope is staked upon the resurrection of Christ, and if He has not risen, then we are of all men most to be pitied. We have done nothing else to secure salvation, and if our Saviour be not risen, we have no Saviour. We had better look into some other religion.

h. *Eighth Proposition.* “But now is Christ risen from the

dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept” (verse 20). Praise the Lord, *He is risen! He is alive!* We are saved by a living Redeemer. We, of all men, are the only sinners who are saved.

B. The Meaning of the Resurrection.

By the resurrection we mean the *bodily* resurrection, not the spiritual resurrection.

1. *Provision of the Tomb.* Guards were placed there to guarantee against the removal of His body, not His Spirit. “So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch” (Matt. 27:66).

2. *Recognition of the Disciples.* “Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God” (John 20:27, 28).

3. *Testimony of the Apostles.* “This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses” (Acts 2:32).

4. *A Testimony of the Lord Himself.* “He began to teach them, that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again” (Mark 8:31).

5. *The Announcement of Our Transformation.* “Our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself” (Phil. 3:20,21).

C. The Unscriptural Theories Concerning the Resurrection.

1. *The Unburied Body Theory.* By this statement unbelievers maintain that the tomb was never filled, that the two thieves, and Christ, were thrust out upon the trash heap. However, this is refuted by the Jew’s own law: “If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou

shalt surely bury him the same day; for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee for an inheritance” (Deut. 21:22, 23). [pg79]

2. *The Unemptied Grave Theory*. Those that hold to this say that He is still there. Surely common sense would refute this argument, for if Christ had not arisen, the Devil would have caused His body to have been found sometime during the last two thousand years.

3. *The Removal Theory*. This is that theory which proposes that Joseph moved the body out of the tomb. Of this argument we ask, “If he removed the body, why didn’t he also remove the clothing?” All will have to admit that if Joseph *did* remove the body, it would have had to be done in secret. If done in secret, why wasn’t the stone rolled back against the door? 4. *The Mistaken Woman Theory*. This theory contends that the woman misunderstood what the man in the sepulchre had said. We refute this contention by saying that the Word does not so declare it, and the Word is the only authority and witness we have.

5. *The Deliberate Deception Theory*. This supposition clings to the idea that Christ did not die at all, but rather that He fainted on the cross and was revived by the cool air of the tomb. If this be the case, where did He go? Surely, as He was an object of interest to the entire populace, He would have been recognized and openly accepted or rejected.

6. *The Fraud Theory*. This states that the apostles plainly lied and deceived those that heard them. However, all of the apostles, except John, met a martyr’s death. Why? Because of their devotion to Christ and His resurrection. Would they have sacrificed their lives for a lie? Of course not!

7. *The Self-Deception Theory*. In other words, this speculation declares that the apostles had an illusion; that is, they thought that He arose from the dead, and kept on thinking it, until after a while they believed it. We know, from human experience, that delusions soon fade away, and we awaken to reality. The apostles could not have deceived themselves very long.

8. *The Hallucination Theory*. This idea supposes that they thought they had actually seen the resurrected Saviour, when it was

merely a hallucination caused by nerves and excitement. Can you imagine Peter becoming delirious, and Thomas hysterical? 9. *The Recollection Theory*. This view sees the hysterical apostles fleeing to Samaria, and while alone in this place, they began to think that Jesus is still with them. That is where we get the idea that He arose from the dead. The Scriptures, nevertheless, declare that they remained in Jerusalem behind closed doors until He revealed Himself to them.

10. *The Misunderstood Theory*. This reasoning admits that the Saviour died, but states that the apostles preached the resurrection of His Spirit, and not His body. However, people took it wrong. The word “resurrection” is never connected with the spirit, but rather with the body, for the spirit never dies. [pg80]

11. *The Spiritual Vision Theory*. This supposition maintains that the apostles actually saw something. What they saw was a lying vision, not the Lord. The Devil had fooled them. But, if there was anything the Devil did not want them to believe, it was the resurrection of Christ, whether, a lying vision or the actual thing. Christ Himself dispels this argument by declaring, after His resurrection, that “a spirit does not have flesh and bones.”

12. *The Twins Theory*. Those who offer this suggestion say that Christ had a twin, and that three days after He had been crucified and buried, His twin showed himself, declaring that he was Christ risen from the dead. We ask, “Where was this twin hidden for thirty-three years?”

D. The Proofs of the Resurrection.

1. *The Empty Tomb*. The Gospels declare that the people held two views concerning his resurrection. One group, consisting of unbelievers, said that someone stole His body; the other group contended that He was raised by Divine Power. The empty tomb proves the latter. A Roman watch, composed of sixty men with four groups of fifteen each, were stationed to watch the tomb. Each group guarded the tomb for a six-hour period. The watch was ordered to guard the tomb against the theft of the body of Christ. Now the enemy did not wish to steal the body; they wanted it buried. We know that the apostles did not steal it, as they were

afraid. Even at His crucifixion they fled. The soldiers were paid by the unbelievers to bear false testimony. Is it not peculiar that the Jewish priests did not prosecute the soldiers, if the body had actually been stolen? Had the disciples stolen the body, would not the priests have hounded them until they admitted such a deed? Why did they not do *something*? Simply because they did not believe the story.

A new tomb: there was but one body in it, and there is no question as to who rose from the dead when the tomb became empty. It was carved out of the rock — solid rock behind, above, below, and on the side. There were no other entrances.

2. *The Undisturbed Grave Clothes*. In the Orient the bodies of the dead are wound with grave clothes, from the neck down to the feet, in a manner similar to that used on Egyptian mummies. The head is wrapped with a napkin. When this wrapping was duly done, the body was stretched out on a ledge. When Peter came in to examine the grave clothes, he saw that they were undisturbed — the body of Christ had shot through the grave clothes without bursting a single thread. Peter discovered that the grave clothes were unmolested; the clothes appeared as though they were still wrapped around the body — but there was no body.

As for the tomb, the door was not opened to let Christ out — He was *already* out! He came out of the tomb just as He had come out of the grave clothes. Yes, He was out of the tomb long before the stone was rolled away. The soldiers had been guarding a sealed, empty tomb for nearly twelve hours. [pg81]

3. *The Appearances of Christ*. In I Corinthians 15:1-11 we have recorded the number of witnesses who actually saw the Lord, the risen Saviour. This number does not include the women. The highest number of witnesses required to establish the truth in America is seven: one for murder; two for treason; three for a will; and seven for an oral will. The number of witnesses recorded in the Word is over five hundred. Certainly, according to the accepted jurisprudence, there is sufficient evidence that He arose from the dead.

4. *The Character of Christ*. No greater proof is needed in contending for His resurrection than His character. To think that

such a shameful end would come to Him who was the Perfect One! Surely, God in His justice would not have allowed the only man without sin to remain in the tomb.

5. *The New Testament.* The twenty-seven books composing the New Testament are the *effect*; the *cause* is a risen Christ. Without Christ's resurrection, there would not have been any New Testament. The death of Christ had sorely depressed the disciples. Their faith was shattered. If Christ had not appeared unto them, they would never have written about Him. The story of His life grew out of His resurrection.

6. *The Apostles' Church.* The apostles began preaching at Jerusalem only seven weeks after the crucifixion. Right there in Jerusalem, where Jesus had been crucified and buried, the apostles declared Christ to have risen from the dead. If Christ had not risen, the enemies could have produced the body, for they had crucified Him. The silence of the Jews was as much proof of His resurrection as the writings of the disciples.

7. *The Transformed Disciples.* The resurrection brought about a transformation of the disciples. Before, they had seen Christ die, and thus their faith was shattered. Two of them said, "We hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel" (Luke 24:21, R.V.¹) Sad words — no hope. All faith was now dead. They were meeting together behind closed doors, frightened, afraid for their lives, when the Lord appeared. It was hard to convince them of His resurrection, even though He actually appeared before them. But when they were convinced, *nothing* could ever change them.

How about doubting Thomas? He was not present at Christ's first appearance before the disciples, and, therefore, he doubted. I am glad that Thomas doubted, for now I am relieved of doubt. His unbelief was removed at the second appearance of the Saviour; consequently, all of our doubts concerning the resurrection should be removed.

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

8. *The Conversion of Saul.* The Church never had a greater enemy than Saul of Tarsus. He was a well-known individual in Judaism, belonging to the sect known as the Pharisees, who believed in the future resurrection of the dead, but certainly not in the resurrection of Jesus. What changed this terrible persecutor of the Church into the mighty preacher of Christ? *The resurrection of Christ!* From the day on the road to Damascus, he never doubted the resurrection. He suffered at the hands of his own countrymen and in the courts of the foreigner because of his belief in Christ's resurrection. [pg82]

9. *Christian Experience.* Since we have been born again hope has been placed in our hearts: that our sins have been taken away and that our own resurrection is assured. This hope could only be guaranteed by a risen Saviour. We are not saved from our sins by a living mother, nor by a dead Jew, but by a Living Lord.

10. *The Gospel Record.* The Gospels were written or dictated by witnesses, "chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead" (Acts 10:41b). In reading the Gospels, we notice the little details, words and phrases, which prove to us how natural and how true to life the accounts are.

E. The Result of the Resurrection.

1. In Relation to Christ Himself.

a. *It Was the Seal of His Father's Acceptance.* In other words, Christ's sacrifice was sufficient and accepted by God. "It is God's 'amen' to His Son's 'it is finished.'"

b. *It Was the Mark of His Divine Sonship.* Christ was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1:4). On being nailed to the cross, He was accursed of God. God would not let His Son remain accursed; therefore God raised him from the dead.

c. It Was the Demonstration of His Victory.

(1) *Over the Devil.* If only the Devil could have kept Him in the grave, complete victory would have been Satan's. However, Christ arose from the dead, guaranteeing salvation for every

believing soul. The believer is commanded to put on the whole armour of God in order to withstand the wiles of the Devil. One piece of that armour is the helmet of Salvation.

(2) *Over Death*. “Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also. At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you” (John 14:19, 20). See also II Timothy 1:10.

d. *It Was the Illustration of Incorruptibility*. God’s purpose and grace “is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality [incorruptibility] to light through the gospel” (II Tim. 1:10).

2. *In Relation to the Believer.*

a. *Proves His Justification*. “Jesus our Lord . . . was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification” (Rom. 4:24, 25).

b. *Illustrates His Power*. Paul prayed that God might give the Ephesians “the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him . . . that ye may know . . . what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places” (Eph. 1:17, 18, 19, 20).

c. *Provides a High Priest*. “He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them” (Heb. 7:25). See also Romans 8:34; Hebrews 3:1; 7:22.

d. *Begets a Living Hope*. “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the [pg83] resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you” (I Peter 1:3,4).

e. *Guarantees Our Resurrection*. “He which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you” (II Cor. 4:14). See also I Corinthians 15:22; I Thessalonians 4:14.

3. *In Relation to the World.*

a. *Gives Evidence of His Truth.* All that he spake is substantiated by His resurrection, for God would not have raised a liar from the dead and declare Him to be His Son. His act proved His favor.

b. *Gives Evidence of Universal Resurrection.* “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:22).

c. *Gives Evidence of World Judgment.* “He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead” (Acts 17:31).²
[This ends a block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.³ The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

2 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 101-109

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

Chapter 9 – The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ – Cambron's Section VI.

On the ascension and enthronement of Jesus Christ, the basic doctrine is again best examined from Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* book. Below is a block quote of Dr Cambron's section on “The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ.”[block quote of Dr. Cambron's *Bible Doctrines* (Zondervan) 109-113, (TheCambronInstitute.org) 84-87.]

VI The Ascension and Enthronement of Jesus Christ.

His ascension is a historical fact. If His resurrection is denied, then His ascension must also be denied. It is hard for some people to grasp the thought that a glorified, living Body is in glory; but He *is* up there, nevertheless.

A. The Meaning of the Ascension and Enthronement.

1. *Of the Ascension.* It is that event, after His resurrection, in which He departed visibly from the earth to heaven. “When he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven” (Acts 1:9-11).

2. *Of the Enthronement* (Exaltation). This is that act of God by which he gave to the risen and ascended Lord full power and glory, allowing Him to sit down on the right hand of God’s throne. “This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear” (Acts 2:32, 33). “To him

that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne” (Rev. 3:21). Christ is not now sitting on His own throne, but upon His Father’s throne. [pg84]

B. The Message of the Ascension and Enthronement.

1. In Prophecy.

a. *Testimony of a Psalmist.* “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore” (Ps. 16:10, 11). See also Psalm 68:18; 110:4, 5.

b. *Testimony of the Saviour.* “What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?” (John 6:62). See also John 16:28.

c. *Testimony of Luke.* “It came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem” (Luke 9:51).

2. In History.

a. *Testimony of Mark.* “So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and set on the right hand of God” (Mark 16:19).

b. *Testimony of Luke.* “It came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven” (Luke 24:51). See also Acts 1:9-11.

c. *Testimony of Stephen.* “He, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, and said, Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God” (Acts 7:55, 56).

d. *Testimony of Peter.* “Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him” (I Peter 3:22). See also Acts 3:15, 20, 21; 5:30, 31.

e. *Testimony of Paul.* “Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us” (Rom.

8:34). See also Ephesians 1:20, 21; 4:8-10; Colossians 3:1; I Timothy 3:16.

f. *Testimony of John.* The entire first chapter of the Book of Revelation declares John's testimony of the ascended and enthroned Christ.

C. The Nature of the Ascension and Enthronement.

1. *He Bodily and Visibly Ascended.* Luke wrote "of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen" (Acts 1:1, 2). See also Acts 1:9-11.

2. *He Passed Through the Heavens.* "Having then a great high priest, who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession" (Heb. 4:14).

3. *He Was Made Higher Than the Heavens.* This means that He was made higher than all the created beings in heaven. "Such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (Heb. 7:26). [pg85]

4. *He Sat Down on the Right Hand of God.* "Now in the things which we are saying the chief point is this: We have such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (Heb. 8:1, R.V.¹). See also Ephesians 1:20; Colossians 3:1.

D. The Necessity of the Ascension and Enthronement.

1. *For the Demonstration of His Complete Achievement.* "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins" (Acts 5:31). He said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. . . . By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of

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

Jesus Christ once for all” (Heb. 10: 9, 10). In the tabernacle here upon earth there were no chairs, and this fact signified that the showing work was never complete. He entered heaven and sat down on the throne, and thus declared that the work of our redemption was a finished act.

2. *For the Facilitation of Human Worship.* “The hour cometh and now is. when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth” (John 4:23, 24).

3. *For the Bestowment of the Holy Ghost.* “I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you” (John 16:7).

4. *For the Constitution of His Headship Over the Church.* “[God] hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all and in all” (Eph. 1:22, 23).

E. The Purpose of the Ascension and Enthronement.

1. *He Entered Heaven as a Forerunner.* “The forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made a high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec” (Heb. 6:20). Another word for “forerunner” is “captain,” “prince leader,” one who has others to follow him.” The Lord Jesus precedes us; if death comes while He tarries, we will go on to be with Him.

2. *He Entered Heaven as a Gift-Bestower.* “He saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive. and gave gifts unto men. . . and he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers” (Eph. 4:8, 11).

3. *He Entered Heaven as a Place-Preparer.* “I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also” (John 14:2, 3). [pg86]

F. The Results of the Ascension and Enthronement.

1. *Gives Us an Intercessor with God.* “Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us” (Heb. 9:24). See also Hebrews 7:25.

2. *Gives Us Access to God.* “Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need” (Heb. 4:14-16).

3. *Gives Us Ability for Service.* “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father” (John 14:12). “Greater works” does not mean healing or speaking in tongues, but the spreading of the Gospel of salvation. For example, Peter spoke, and three thousand believed; he spoke again, and five thousand others believed.

4. *Gives Us Confidence in God’s Providences.* “We know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose” (Rom. 8:28).

5. *Gives Us Our Heavenly Position.* “[God] hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus” (Eph. 2:6).²

[This ends the block quote of Dr. Cambron's book, *Bible Doctrines*.³ The book is readily available through <http://www.thecambroninstitute.org>, and it forms the foundational basis for much of this Systematic Theology.]

2 Mark G. Cambron, *Bible Doctrines*, 1954, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 109-113

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

Chapter 10 – Critique of other Systematic Theology Christology Works.

There is a difference between a Bible doctrine book and a theology book. The "ology" in theology emphasizes a discourse which meanders down every conceivable avenue of consideration for a topic. While a Bible doctrine must detail every straight and narrow consideration of what God has revealed. A thorough "ology" must do that, plus expand and expound on every thread. It must further introduce and explore some of the major broad paths and wide gates of man's creation. It should thereby open some vistas which may not have been considered by the student of doctrine, being ever vigil because the wide paths do lead to destruction. Review of other works of systematic theology pursues this mind broadening purpose.

Critique of John Miley's 1892 Methodist Christology

John Miley wrote an extensive Christology section in his *Systematic Theology*.¹ A brief introduction of John Miley, taken from wikipedia is included below:

John Miley (1813–1895) was an American Christian theologian in the Methodist tradition who was one of the major Methodist theological voices of the 19th century. Miley had graduated from Augusta College and, as a Methodist pastor, had held nineteen different pastoral appointments. He served as chair of systematic theology at Drew University in Madison, NJ beginning in 1873, after his brother-in-law, Randolph Sinks Foster, left the seat to become a

1 John Miley, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1 & 2*, The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, New York: Eaton and Mains, 1894, The Internet Archive www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01miley.

Bishop. He was the author of *Systematic Theology* (1892, ISBN 0-943575-09-5), a two-volume work which served as a key text for Methodist seminarians for decades. He also authored "*The Atonement in Christ*" (1879), in which he demonstrated what he believed were severe Biblical and theological problems with commonly held theories on the doctrine of the atonement such as the punishment view of Calvinism and the moral example view of Pierre Abélard, developing a strong moral government theology which was thoroughly Wesleyan and Arminian, heavily reliant on the work of Hugo Grotius.²

John Miley's systematic theology was reviewed in my studies to keep Hodge and Strong's excessive Presbyterian leanings in check, however, he does have an extensive Christology section. In his development Miley states that in the logical order of doctrines, meaning the intelligent order in which they arise for thought, Anthropology must precede Christology, and Christology must precede Soteriology. He then gives extensive coverage of "Leading Errors In Christology"³ before he deals with Christology proper.⁴ After which he further develops another section on the errors in Christology.⁵ Concerning the leading errors, his overlap with Dr. Cambron's coverage is shown in the table below:

2 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Miley accessed 29 Sep 2014. [wikipedia has not been, in general, treated as a reliable reference for professional works, but it is a very assailable reference.]

3 John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, pg 851 Chapter V. Leading Errors In Christology, I. Earlier Errors. 1. Ebionism 2. Gnosticism 3. Arianism 4. Apollinarianism 5. Nestorianism 6. Eutychianism : II. Later Errors. 1. The Socinian Christology ; 2. The Lutheran Christology 3. The Kenotic Christology (pg 45-59).

4 John Miley, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1 & 2*, 851,885-947.

5 *Ibid.*, 947-976

<p>Dr. Cambron <i>Bible Doctrine 1954</i> deals with: these leading error in Christology:</p>	<p>John Miley, <i>Systematic Theology 1894</i>, pg 851 Chapter V. Leading Errors In Christology,</p>
<p>... 1. <i>Ebionitism.</i> ... 2. <i>Corinthianism.</i> 3. <i>Docetism.</i> 4. <i>Arianism.</i> 5. <i>Apollinarianisin.</i> 6. <i>Nestorianism.</i> [pg70] 7. <i>Eutychanism.</i> 8. <i>Monothelitism.</i> 9. <i>Unitarianism.</i> 10. <i>Christian Science.</i> 11. <i>Millennial Dawnism.</i> </p>	<p>I. Earlier Errors. 1. Ebionism 2. Gnosticism 3. Arianism 4. Apollinai'ianism 5. Nestorianism 6. Eutychanism : II. Later Errors. 1. The Socinian Christology ; 2. The Lutheran Christology 3. The Kenotic Christology (pg 45-59).</p>

Because John Miley gives an extensive coverage to the errors of Christology, from a late 19th century Methodist's viewpoint, his public domain chapter on this topic is given in a block quote below. Make particular note of his coverage of the *kenosis* theory, which I called upon and defended earlier and which he calls an error in Christology:

Miley's Chap V. Leading Errors In Christology.

The treatment of Christological errors is specially the work of historical theology; yet some attention to them is proper in a system of doctrines. We may thus set in a clearer light the true doctrine of the person of Christ. However, a brief presentation of the leading errors is all that we require and all that we attempt.

I. Earlier Errors.

While it is convenient to make the general distinction between the earlier and later Christological errors, a chronological order is not important in the treatment of the errors as classed in the two divisions. Here it is better to

observe, as far as practicable, a logical order.

1. Ebionism. The Ebionites were probably so named by an opprobrious application to them of a Hebrew word which means poor; but not on account of their low and impoverished views of Christ, as some have held. Ebionism was a strongly Judaized form of Christianity. This is true as a general characterization. However, Ebionism represents several sects, with different Christological tenets. There were two leading sects: the Essene and the Pharisaic. The Essene Ebionites held the Mosaic law to be obligatory on all Jewish Christians, but did not require its observance by Gentile Christians. Therefore they accepted the apostleship and teaching of St. Paul. The Pharisaic Ebionites held that all Christians must observe the law of Moses, the Gentile no less than the Jewish. Therefore they repudiated the apostleship and teaching of St. Paul. They were his virulent and persistent opposers and persecutors.

Both sects held Christ to be the promised Messiah, but their notion of him was the low, secularized notion of the Jew. But, with agreement on this point, the two sects differed on others. The Essene held the miraculous conception of Christ, while the Pharisaic held him to be the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation. The former of these views is in close identity with the earlier Socinianism; the latter in a like identity with a more modern humanitarianism, which holds Christ to be a man, just as others, whatever moral superiority may be conceded him. With these statements the errors of Ebionism in Christology are manifest. The divinity of Christ and the divine incarnation in him are both denied.'

2. Gnosticism. No doubt the term Gnostic had its ground in the Greek word *ψιθωαίχ*. As appropriated by the Gnostics it meant the profession of a high order of knowledge. As knowledge is possible, such a claim is not necessarily groundless; but it may mean, and with the Gnostics did mean, the profession of a peculiar insight into great problems which lie beyond the grasp of other minds. They dealt freely, and with much pretension of knowledge, with the profoundest questions.⁶ All may instance the world-ground or absolute

6 A 2018 AD Note: This same airs is found in followers of Peter Ruckman and others who suppose angels bred with humans, created giants and that is why God destroyed the world with flood, it was those angels fault!, then supposes they did it again and made giants in Canaan, then those rascal evil angels did it again and now our world is governed by secret hidden giants covered up

being; all secondary or finite existences; the mode of their derivation from the absolute; the origin of evil and the mode of the world's redemption. Mostly, however, their treatment of these great questions was in a purely speculative mode. Hypothesis and deduction were in the freest use. Deduction, however, must be kept within its own sphere, and proceed only from grounds or principles of unquestionable truth.

The Gnostics were heedless of these imperative laws, carried their speculations into spheres where induction is the only appropriate method, and proceeded from the merest hypotheses or assumptions. With such methods in view the vagaries of Gnosticism should cause no surprise.

Gnosticism divided into various schools. This was an inevitable consequence of its purely speculative method. It was also made certain by the diverse influences to which its speculations were subject. The principal sources of Gnosticism may probably be summed up in these three. To Platonism, modified by Judaism, it owed much of its philosophical form and tendencies. To the dualism of the Persian religion it owed one form at least of its speculations on the origin and remedy of evil, and many of the details of its doctrine of emanations. To the Buddhism of India, modified again probably by Platonism, it was indebted for the doctrines of the antagonism between spirit and matter and the unreality of derived existence (the germ of the Gnostic Docetism), and, in part at least, for the theory which regards the universe as a series of successive emanations from the absolute unity." ⁷¹ Theories would thus take form just as one source of influence or another predominated, or according to the elements combined in their construction.

It is already apparent that leading tenets of the Gnostic heresy flourished in different philosophies long before the Christian era. As a heresy in Christianity it began its evil work while the apostles yet lived and wrote. There are many

by government officials in Washington DC. Other cults advance a flat earth, a geocentric universe, alien beings as our creators and/or a gap theory that might account for the Bible's misrepresentation of the age of rocks. Be careful of those who promote their own special insight into the Bible, and demonize with ignorance those who do not see things their way.

- 7 Burton: *Heresies of the Apostolic Age*, Bampton Lectures, 1829, lect. iii ; Reuss : *Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age*, book i, chap, ix ; Neander: *History of the Church*, vol. i, pp. 344-353 ; Schaff : *History of the Christian Church*, vol. li, pp. 431-442, 1886 ; Dorner : *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. i, vol. 1, pp. 188-217. [pg47]

references to it in the New Testament, particularly in the writings of St. John. It is every-where reprehended as false in doctrine, evil in practice, and corrupt in influence. These characterizations are not limited to its evils as then manifest, but are prophetic of far greater evils in a future not remote. The truth of these prophecies was fully verified in the early history of the Church.

There were two principles of Gnosticism which led to an utterly false doctrine of the person of Christ. These were the perturbing tenets of emanation and the intrinsically evil nature of matter. God was not a creator of the universe, but the source of emanations. In this mode all things have proceeded from him. But this process is on a descending scale; so that even the first emanation must be inferior to the original ground of all things. Hence, wherever Christ is placed in the scale of emanated existences, even though it were at the top, he cannot be truly divine. The other tenet that matter is intrinsically evil, and corruption of all spiritual being in contact with it, was common to the different schools of Gnosticism, and led to a denial of the divine incarnation. That is: Gnosticism denied the reality of the human nature of Christ.

What in him seemed a real body was not such in fact, but a mere phantasm or appearance. It was on this ground that the Gnostics were often called Docetse, from Sokeo, to seem or appear.⁸ If there was no reality in the bodily form of Christ, of course there was no divine incarnation in him. It was in view of this heresy as an evil already at work, and as seen in prophetic vision, soon to become a far greater evil, that St. John opened his gospel with a doctrine of the Logos, which could mean nothing less than his essential divinity, and asserted in a manner so definite the reality of his incarnation.⁹ It was in the same view that he wrote in his epistles: "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist."⁹

It is obvious that such texts are indirect reprobation of certain principles of the Gnostics, which determine for them an utterly false doctrine of the person of Christ. According to these principles he could be neither divine nor an incarnation of

8 Mansel : The Gnostic Heresies, p. 32.

9 'John i, 1-3, 14. ' 1 John iv, 3 ; 3 John 7.

divinity in our nature.¹⁰

3. Arianism. The term Arianism was derived from Arius, who became the representative of certain doctrinal views regarded as heretical. Arius was a presbyter of the Church of Alexandria, early in the fourth century, and a man of influence. He set forth and maintained views at issue with the accepted doctrine of the Trinity; but the real point of the issue concerned the divinity of the Son. When, in an assembly of his clergy, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, maintained the eternity of the Son, Arius openly opposed him, and maintained that in the very nature of his relation to the Father, the Son could not be eternal. This position could not remain as the whole adverse view. It involved doctrinal consequences which could not be avoided, and which, therefore, were soon accepted and maintained. If the Son was not eternal, then there was a time when he was not. This consequence was accepted and avowed. If the Son was not eternal, then his existence must have originated in an optional will of the Father, and either in the mode of generation or in that of creation. These consequences were also accepted; but respecting the actual mode of the Son's origin the earlier Arianism was vacillating or indefinite. Later, the mode of creation was more in favor. Thus, the Son was held to be of creaturely character. The departure from the orthodox faith was really the same, whichever view of his origin was maintained. A being originating in time, and by an optional act of God, whatever the mode of his operation, could not be truly divine. This consequence was fully accepted. [pg49]

The results of these views respecting the doctrines of the Trinity and the person of Christ are obvious. They are utterly subversive of both. The truth of the Trinity imperatively requires the essential divinity of the Son. He must be consubstantial with the Father, and his personal subsistence must be in the mode of an eternal generation, not by any optional act of the Father. A true doctrine of the person of Christ equally requires

10 Burton : Heresies of the Apostolic Age, Bampton Lectures, 1829 ; Mansel : The Gnostic Heresies ; Norton : History of the Gnostics ; Lightfoot : Commentary on Colossians, pp. 73-113 ; Ueberweg : History of Philosophy, Â§ 77 ; Eeuss : Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, book iii, chaps, ix, x ; Neander : History of the Church, vol. i, pp. 366-478 ; Domer ; Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. i, vol. i, pp. 218-252 ; King : The Gnostics and their Remains. An appendix to King's book gives very fully the literature of the subject.

the essential divinity of the Son. Hence Arianism subverts the deepest truth of the person of Christ. When the Son is reduced to a temporal existence, to a finite being, to incarnation. the plane of a creature, there can be no divine incarnation in Christ, no theanthropic character of Christ. No attribution of greatness to the Son can obviate these consequences. Arianism may declare him, as it did, the head of creation, and far above all other creatures, so far as to be like God; but all this avails nothing because such likeness means, and is intended to mean, that he is not God, and that the divine nature is not in him. No more relief comes with the ascription to the Son of the whole work of creation. Relief might thus come if this work were allowed to mean what it really means for the divinity of the Son ; but there is no relief so long as Arianism denies his divinity and reduces him to the plane of a creature. The contradictory ascription of the work of creation to the Son, after he is reduced to the plane of a creature, leaves Arianism in the utter subversion of the truth respecting the person of Christ.¹¹

4. Apollinarianism. The Apollinarian Christology was so named from Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, and was disseminated in the fourth century. Its distinctive characteristic is that it denies to Christ the possession of a human mind. Necessarily, therefore, the theory grounded itself in a trichotomic anthropology. Man was assumed to consist of three distinct natures, body, soul, and spirit. In the theory body and mind were held in their usual meaning: the former as the physical nature; the latter as the rational and moral nature. The peculiarity of the theory was in the meaning given to the psyche or soul. This was held to be a distinct nature, intermediate between the physical and mental, and the seat of the sensuous or animal life. Provision was thus made for the theory of a partial incarnation. If man consists of three distinct natures it was possible that in the incarnation the Son should assume two of these natures and omit the third. It was assumed, accordingly, that the rational and moral [pg50] nature was omitted, and that the Son united with himself merely the

11 Newman, Cardinal : Arians of the Fourth Century ; Gwatkin : The Arian Controversy ; Waterland : Defense of the Divinity of Christ ; A Second Defense of Christ's Divinity, Works, vol. ii ; Cunningham : Historical Theology, vol. i, pp. 276-293; Gieseler: Ecclesiastical History, vol. i, pp. 294-322; Schaff : History of the Christian Church, vol. iii, §§ 119-125, 1886; Doermer : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. i, vol. ii, pp. 201-241.

physical and psychic natures of man.

With such limitation of the human nature assumed in the incarnation, or the omission of the mental nature, the mental facts, must account for the rational and moral facts, such as have a human cast, in the life of Christ. The account was attempted on the assumption that the incarnate Logos so fulfilled the functions of a rational mind in Christ as to account for this class of facts in his life.

While trichotomy provides for a partial incarnation, it is the necessary ground of a Christology which makes such limitation fundamental. If man is only dichotomic natures, there is no place for such a Christology. However, the refutation of Apollinarianism is not to be most readily achieved through the refutation of trichotomy. While the Scriptures are seemingly in favor of dichotomy,¹² yet they are not decisive, as appeared in our discussion of that question. Nor can the question be concluded in any scientific or philosophic mode. On the other hand, there is here a fatal weakness of the Apollinarian Christology. In the first place, it is unable to establish the truth of trichotomy, which yet is its necessary ground. In the next place, the established truth of trichotomy could not conclude the Apollinarian Christology; indeed, could not furnish any proof of it.

The disproof of this Christology lies in the historic life of Christ. The facts of a rational and moral life in the cast of the human are as manifest therein as the facts of a psychic life, as here distinguished from the rational and moral. The presence of a human mind in Christ is the necessary ground and the only rational account of these facts. They cannot be accounted for simply by the presence of the incarnate Logos. To assume this possibility would be to assume the compression of his divine attributes into the limits of the human, after the manner of the modern kenoticism. Then there could no longer be a divine incarnation. The humanization of the Logos in Christ contradicts the deepest truth of the incarnation, which lies in the divine consciousness of the human. If the divine is in any way changed into the human there can no longer be a divine consciousness of the human.

The reality of the divine incarnation is itself the disproof of the Apollinarian Christology. The assumption of a human

12 A 2018 AD Note: In actuality the Scriptures are most in favor of the trichotomy of man, it is the Roman Catholic and orthodox theologians who favor a philosopher's dichotomy of man. This is more fully developed in our section on Anthropology.

nature without the rational mind could not be an incarnation in the nature of man. The mind is so much of man that without it there is no true human nature. Nor could the [pg51] self-incarnating Son, with such limitation of the nature assumed, so enter into the consciousness of experiences like our own as to be in all points tempted like as we are, and thus appropriate the deepest law of his sympathy with us. Our deepest trials and our deepest exigencies of experience lie in our rational and moral nature; therefore it was necessary that he should take this nature into personal union with himself. Only in this mode could he share the consciousness of such experiences and so appropriate the law of his profoundest sympathy with us.¹³

5. Nestorianism. The term Nestorianism is derived from the name of Nestorius, and means the doctrine of two persons in Christ. This doctrine was propagated early in the fifth century, and at one time very widely prevailed, particularly in the Eastern Church. Nestorius, whose name is so responsibly connected with the doctrine, was a presbyter of Antioch, and later Patriarch of Constantinople, and a man of eminence and moral worth. However, he was not the author of the Christological view so directly connected with his name. The true authorship was with Theodore of Mopsuestia, but his doctrine found able advocates in his former pupils. Nestorius and Theodoret, the latter, Bishop of Cyrus.

While it was a special aim of the Apollinarian doctrine to make sure of the oneness of the person of Christ, it was equally the aim of the Nestorian doctrine to make sure of the integrity of his two natures, particularly of his human nature. Each made an unnecessary sacrifice of vital truth in order to the attainment of its aim: the former, of the integrity of the human nature of Christ; the latter, of the unity of his personality in the union of the two natures. It is true that the dualism, such as we have named, claimed Christ to hold the personal oneness of Christ, or denied the dualism with which Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, and others charged them. Cyril was their chief opponent. Their doctrine of the union of the Logos with the human nature in Christ fell far short of the requirement of his personal oneness, and left the human in the mode of a distinct and complete human personality.¹⁴ They called it an

13 Neander : History of the Church, vol. iii, pp. 428-434; SchaffE: History of the Christian Church, vol. iii, 136.

14 Plumtptre : Christ and Christendom, Appendix H ; Hagenbach : History of Doctriiies, Â§ 99 ; Domer : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. i, vol. ii,

inhabitation ; and the general nature of the personal inhabitation, as distinct from that by which God dwells in all men, through his omnipresent essence and energy, they indicated by the [pg52] phrase 'by good pleasure' (εὐδοκίᾳ); and this indwelling by good pleasure in Christ they further discriminated from God's indwelling in other good men, by representing it as attaining in him the highest possible degree. This indwelling of the Logos in Christ was also said to be according to foreknowledge, the Logos choosing the man Jesus to be in a peculiar sense his temple, because he knew beforehand what manner of man he should be.

Among other phrases current in the same school were such as these; union by conjunction; union by relation, as in the case of husband and wife; union in worth, honor, authority; union by consent of will; union by community of name, and so forth; for it were endless to enumerate the Nestorian tropes or modes of union.^{15m} No such union of the divine nature with the human assumed in the incarnation is here expressed, or even allowed, as will answer for the personal oneness of Christ. Therefore, while Nestorianism might repudiate the doctrine of two persons in Christ, it could not free itself from the implication of such a doctrine.

The disproof of Nestorianism lies in the proofs of the personal oneness of Christ in the union of the divine and human natures. These proofs were given in the treatment of that question; hence they need not here be repeated. Further, this doctrine, as the Apollinarian, and even more fully, is refuted by the reality of the divine incarnation. The great texts adduced in the treatment of that question mean, and must mean, that the divine Son took the nature of man into a personal union with himself; so that of the two natures so united there is one Christ, very God-man. The Nestorian Christology must deny the reality of the divine incarnation, and, therefore, must be false to the Christology of the Scriptures.

6. Eutychianism. This error is coupled with the name of Eutyches, a monk without other distinction, unless we reckon to his account a notable lack of culture, an intense love of debate, and an extreme doggedness. He is not reckoned the author of this Christological error, though he may have contributed something toward its extreme form. His intense activity in the

pp. 351-398.

15 Hefele : History of Church Councils, book x, chap, ii ; Neander : History of the Church, vol. iii, pp. 504-511.

propagation of the doctrine seems to be the only reason for its bearing his name. [MILEY, ERRORS IN CHRISTOLOGY pg53]

Eutychnianism is monophysitic as it respects the nature of Christ; that is, that as the incarnate Logos Christ possessed but one nature. This view was in direct contradiction to the Chalcedonian symbol, which so formally declared that in him there were two complete, unmixed, and unchanged natures, the human and the divine. Eutychnianism admitted the reality of the divine incarnation, and the incipient duality of the natures, but denied that their distinction remained in Christ. Just when, and in what mode, the distinction ceased, and the two natures became one, are questions on which the doctrine was quite indefinite. Respecting the time, it was held that it might have been instant with the incarnation, or at the baptism of Christ, or after his resurrection. Nor was the theory less definite respecting the change in the natures whereby the two became one. Whether the divine was humanized, or the human deified, or the two so mixed and compounded as to constitute a nature neither human nor divine was not determined, though the stronger tendency was toward the view of the deification of the human nature. In this view Christ was wholly divine. The human nature was transmuted into the divine, or absorbed by the divine, as a drop of honey is absorbed by the ocean. Such an illustration was in frequent use for the expression of the change to which the human nature assumed in the incarnation was subject and the monophysitic result determined. Much is thus expressed.

The drop of honey absorbed by the ocean would no longer be a drop of honey; nor would it be distinguishable from the body of the ocean. Hence the frequent use of such an illustration fully justifies our statement, that the doctrine strongly tended to the view of a deification of the human nature in Christ.

It seems quite needless to subject such a doctrine to the tests of criticism. Unless this change is held to have occurred at least as late as the ascension of Christ, the doctrine is openly contradicted by the daily facts of his life. We may as readily question his divinity as his humanity. His life is replete with facts so thoroughly in the cast of the human that he must have possessed a human nature; for otherwise these facts have no rational or possible account. Besides, if the human nature assumed by the divine was so transmuted or absorbed, the incarnation loses its own true, deep meaning and assumes a purely docetic form. Thus all grounds of the atonement and of the sympathy of Christ through a law of common suffering with

us are utterly swept away.

It may suffice to add that such a transmutation of the human nature into the divine is an absolute impossibility. We mean by [pg54] this that it is not within the power of God. This must be manifest to any mind which takes the proposition into clear thought.¹⁶

II. Later Errors.

A review of all the modern phases of Christological error would be tedious, and without compensatory result. It will suffice that we consider some of the leading forms of such error.

1. The Socinian Christology. Socinianism, as a system of theology, originated in the sixteenth century, and took its designation from Laelius Socinus, an Italian, but who spent most of his active life in Poland, because he there found more liberty in the propagation of his peculiar doctrinal views.

However, while the original of this system is with Laelius Socinus, his nephew, Faustus Socinus, born 1539, more fully developed and propagated it, and first formed the converts to this faith into a distinct religious body, so that he may properly be regarded as one of the founders of Socinianism.

We here need only the most summary statement of its doctrinal tenets. Mostly, the Scriptures were admitted to be of divine origin, but rather as containing than as being a divine revelation. A strong rationalistic principle was held as a law of biblical exegesis. It was in this mode that Socinianism provided for itself so much liberty of interpretation, that it might the easier wrest the Scriptures from the proof of the orthodox faith and maintain its own opposing views. With all this rationalism, the earlier Socinianism admitted the supernatural in Christianity, particularly in its Christology. It held the miraculous conception of Christ; that he was the subject of supernatural moral and spiritual endowments, and that he was temporarily taken to heaven in order to a better preparation for his great work in the redemption of the world. As Socinianism denied the divinity of Christ, so it denied the doctrine of the Trinity. Its anthropology was Pelagian, and its soteriology admitted no other ground or power of human salvation than the moral influence of the life and lessons of Christ.

16 Schaff : History of the Christian Church, vol. iii, §§ 140-145, 1886 ; Hooker : Ecclesiastical Polity, book v, §§ 53-54 ; Dorner : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. i, pp. 79-119.

With these tenets of doctrine in hand, the Christology of the system is easily stated. With all the concession of supernatural facts, as previously stated, the Christ of Socinianism is a man, nothing more. True, he was declared to be more than man, but no sufficient ground was given, or even [pg55] admitted, for the truth of the declaration. No supernatural fact conceded, nor all combined, could raise him in his own nature or being above the plane of the human. No other ground is given for the assertion that he was more than man. In its Christology, therefore, Socinianism was substantially the same as the old Ebionism. In many instances of its later purely rationalistic or Unitarian forms it has degenerated from the higher views of Christ with which it began.

The Christology of Socinianism is utterly false to the Christology of the Scriptures. It denies the divinity of Christ; the reality of the divine incarnation; the union of the two natures in the personal oneness of Christ. All ground of the atonement is excluded from the system.¹⁷

2. The Lutheran Christologic. This error lies in the ascription of divine attributes, particularly of omnipresence, to the human nature of Christ. Only in an omnipresence or, at least, multipresence of his human nature could the Lutheran Christology answer to the doctrine of consubstantiation the doctrine of the presence and communion of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the supper. If in this supper the communicants really partake of the body and blood of Christ, then in some real sense, however obscure its mode, he must be present in his human nature, and, therefore, he must be present in many places at the same time. This is not denied by those who hold the doctrine of the real presence; indeed, it is affirmed.

It has often been said by divines who controvert the Christology of the Lutherans that its construction was determined to by the requirements of their doctrine of the real presence. Lutherans, however, deny this, and maintain that their doctrine of the person of Christ was constructed directly

17 Dorner : Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. ii, pp. 249-265 ; Cunningham : Historical Theology, chap, xxiii ; Owen : Works (Goold's), vol. xii. The utter falsity of this and all other forms of Christology grounded in the mere humanity of Christ is fully shown in discussions of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, to which reference was given under our own treatment of these questions.

upon the ground of the Scriptures, and in the proper interpretation of their Christological facts; yet it is admitted that the one doctrine confirms the other and sets it in a clearer light. Thus, Dr. Gerhart having maintained that the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ was developed from the Lutheran theory of the sacrament,¹⁸ Dr. Krauth replies: 'If Dr. Gerhart means no [pg56] more than that God in his providence made the discussions in regard to the Lord's Supper the means of bringing more fully and harmoniously into a well-defined consciousness and into clearer expression the doctrine of the Scriptures in regard to the person of Christ, we do not object to it; but if he means that the doctrine of our Church on the person of Christ originated in the necessity of defending her doctrine in regard to the Lord's Supper, we think he is wholly mistaken. The doctrine of our Church rests upon the direct testimony of God's word; and her interpretation of the meaning of that word is not one of her own devising, but had been given ages before her great distinctive confession, by the fathers and councils of the pure Church.'¹⁹

Theologians of any distinct Christian communion have the right of stating their own case on any such issue ; but have no final authority. That the Lutheran doctrine of the person of Christ was the doctrine of the early fathers and councils is rejected as groundless. Further, it is in the truth of doctrinal history that the Christology of the Lutheran Church has ever been associated with her doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the supper, and that mostly the former has been treated as secondary or subordinate to the latter.

It is true that Dörner concedes to Luther a construction of his Christology independently of his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, but he also says this: "During the sixteenth century it was the doctrine of the supper that gave its direction and character to the concrete development of Christology."²⁰ The Lutheran doctrine is greatly lacking in clearness. Nor is this to be thought strange, especially in view of its peculiar tenets.

Further, Lutherans have differed widely among themselves, and in fact greatly blurs the clear apprehension of the doctrine. The contentions on this question within the Lutheran Church were quite equal to those which she maintained with Papists, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. There were two schools of special prominence in these interior

18 Bibliotheca Sacra, 1863.

19 ' The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, p. 502.

20 Doctrine of the Person of Christ, div. ii, vol. ii, p. 301.

doctrinal issues: one in the following of Brentz; the other in the following of Chemnitz.

There were other schools, each with its own doctrine, and for which it contended against all opposing views. Among the contending parties there were real differences of doctrine. These contentions were fruitful of much evil. This came to be so clearly seen and deeply felt as to awaken an intense desire for peace and a harmony of doctrinal views. The attainment of these ends was [pg57] earnestly attempted. The Formula of Concord was the product of this endeavor. The aim was good, but the result brought little satisfaction. The desiderated concord was not attained. Divisions were rather increased than diminished. There was still a Brentzian doctrine, and still a Chemnitzian doctrine. Others were added, notably a Niessen doctrine, and a Tilbingen doctrine. There were others, but enough have been named to show the persistence and prevalence of the strife. These facts of division and disputation not only hinder the clear apprehension of the Lutheran Christology, but clearly point to peculiar difficulties of the doctrine, and really disprove it.

Where shall we find the doctrine? Naturally, we turn first to the Augsburg Confession; but it is not given in the looking for article which directly concerns this question.' In the the doctrine article on the Lord's Supper some facts are given which, if true in themselves, must be determinative of some vital elements of the doctrine.²¹ We note specially the alleged facts that the body and blood of Christ are truly present with the bread and wine, and are communicated to those who partake of the supper. But the determination of the doctrine of the person of Christ from the contents of this article would subordinate it to the doctrine of the supper in a manner to which Lutheran divines strongly object.

The Formula of Concord, while giving a later formulation of the doctrine, and the latest with any claim to authority, formula of still leaves us in uncertainty, and for two reasons: one, concord. that this statement was a compromise among opposing parties; the other, that it has not been held in any unity of faith. Yet we know not any better source to which we may look for the Lutheran doctrine.

Much of the article on the person of Christ is in full accord with the Chalcedonian symbol, but it contains elements article which are peculiar to the Lutheran doctrine.²² These eight.

21 Article iii. * Article x. ' Article viii.

22 Krauth : The Conservative Reformation and its Theology, p. 479.

appear in the ascription of divine attributes to the human nature of Christ. It is not meant that the human nature is deified in any Eutychian sense, but that by virtue of the union of the two natures in Christ the human possesses the attributes of the divine. This is the sense of the communication turn, the communion of the attributes of the two natures in Christ. It seems obvious that, if the union is such that the human should possess the attributes of the divine, then, conversely, the divine should possess the attributes of the human. This, however, is denied. Omniscience, omnipotence, and ubiquity are the divine attributes which are more specially ascribed to the human nature of Christ. "Therefore now not only as God, but also as man, he [pg58] knows all things, can do all things, is present to all creatures, has under his feet and in his hand all things which are in heaven, in the earth, and under the earth." These facts are central to the Christology of the article, and other facts affirmed are in full accord with them. "What the divine has in its essence and of itself, the human has and exercises through the divine, in consequence of its personal union with it. We might imitate one of our Lord's own deep expressions in characterizing it, and might suppose him to say: "As my divine nature hath omnipresence in itself, so hath it given to my human nature to have omnipresence in itself."²³ If the union of the two natures is valid ground for the omnipresence of the human, the same union must be equally valid for its omniscience and omnipotence.

The statement of such a doctrine seems entirely sufficient for its refutation. The human nature assumed by the Logos in the incarnation remained human, with the attributes of the human. In itself it possessed the capacity for only such knowledge, power, and presence as are possible to the human.

How then could it become omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent? The answer is, through the divine nature with which it was united. But if this union answers for such results, either it must give to the finite attributes of the human nature the plenitude of the infinite, or invest that nature with the attributes of the infinite. Attributes of knowledge, power, and presence, such as we here contemplate, are concrete realities of being, not mere notions or names. There can be neither knowledge, nor power, nor presence without the appropriate attribute of being. The being must answer for the character of the attribute, and the attribute must answer for all that is

23 Dörmann : *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, div. ii, vol. ii, pp. 53-115 ; 266-315 ; Schmid : *Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, Â§ 55.

affirmed of it. Only a mind possessing the power of absolute knowing can be omniscient. Omnipotence must have its ground in a will of absolute power. Omnipresence, such as the Lutheran Christology affirms of the human nature of Christ, is possible only with an infinite extension of being. Hence, either the finite attributes of the human nature assumed by the Logos must be lifted into the infinitude of the divine attributes, or the divine attributes must be invested in the human nature, which is intrinsically finite, and which in itself, even as the Lutheran Christology concedes, must ever remain finite.

It is at this point that the doctrine encounters insuperable difficulties, even absolute impossibilities. There is no possibility that the human nature of Christ should possess the attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence [pg59] which the Lutheran Christology ascribes to it. It is properly regarded as an axiom that the finite has not a capacity for the infinite. The principle is absolutely true in application to the points which we here make. The finite attributes of the human nature can neither be enlarged to the infinitude of the divine attributes nor receive into themselves the plenitude of the divine. Neither can the finite nature of man receive the investment of these divine attributes. But there can be no omniscience without the attribute of absolute knowing; no omnipotence without a will of absolute power; no omnipresence of being without an infinite extension. Here are the impossibilities which the Lutheran Christology encounters in the ascription of such attributes to the human nature of Christ,'

3. The Kenotic Christology. The seed-thought of kenoticism in Christology is credited to Zinzendorf, but it remained fruitless for a long time after he cast it forth. In later years his thought has been developed into doctrinal form. Indeed, there are several forms of this development. Professor Bruce has carefully noted four leading types of the doctrine, as severally represented by Thomasius, Gess, Ebrard, and Martensen.²⁴ With this classification he proceeds to a careful statement and critical review of each type.²⁵ A study of this discussion is helpful toward a clear insight into the kenotic Christology. We, however, are mainly concerned with the deeper tenets of the doctrine.

Kenoticism is the doctrine that in the incarnation the Logos

24 Gerhart : *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1863 ; Krauth : *The Conservative Reformation and its Theology*, article x.

25 Bruce : *The Humiliation of Christ*, lect. iv.

emptied himself of his divine attributes, or compressed them into the measure and cast of the human; that he parted with his omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence, and subjected himself to the limitations of a merely human life. These are the central ideas of the doctrine, though not all kenoticists hold so extreme a view.

Whether in the incarnation the Logos assumed a human soul as well as a body, or whether in his own humanized form he fulfilled the functions of a human soul in Christ, is a question on which kenoticists are not agreed. The admission of a distinct human soul must mean, for this doctrine, the co-existence of two souls in Christ, two not different in their human cast. In this case there could be no personal oneness of [pg60] Christ. On the other hand, the denial of a distinct human soul must mean a denial of the divine incarnation. The reality of such an incarnation cannot lie in the assumption of a mere body of flesh and blood. Certainly such a limitation could not answer to the sense of the Scriptures respecting this profound truth.

This kenoticism has really no ground in Scripture, though it assumes such ground. The proofs which it brings are proofs, because it is only by an unwarranted interpretation of the texts adduced that they can give any support to the theory. We give a few instances. "And the Word was made flesh." ' This cannot mean any transmutation of the divine Logos into a body of human flesh. Much less can it mean a transformation of the Logos into a man, for this is much farther away from a literal sense than the former. The meaning is simply that in the incarnation the Logos invested himself in a human nature, of which a body of flesh is the visible part. This interpretation places the text in complete accord with other texts of the incarnation. Here are other instances: "God was manifest in the flesh."²⁶ Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." ' These texts give the same doctrine of the incarnation, but without any suggestion of the transformation of the Son into a man. That the Logos was made flesh can mean nothing more than these texts.

The special reliance of the theory is on a passage from St. Paul: 'Who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.' We have cited the Revised Version, it being more literal than the Authorized. We gave the meaning of this text in the treatment

26 ' John i, 14. ' 1 Tim. iii, 16. ' Heb. ii, 14. * Phil, ii, 6, 7.

of the incarnation, and therefore require the less in considering its application to the present question.

"Being in the form of God" must mean an existence of the, in the nature of God or in the glory of God. If the former be the true sense, then, on the ground of his divine nature, an equality of glory with the Father was his rightful possession. If the latter be the true sense, then we have simply the fact that the Son rightfully existed in the full glory of God. It should be specially noted that this estate of glory was not his merely in right, but his in actual possession. This meaning is in the words, "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself." This accords with another text: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with [pg61] the glory which I had with thee before the world was." ' Here the clear meaning is that the Son actually existed in the glory of the Father prior to his incarnation. Such is the sense of the great text now under special consideration.

What, then, is the truth of the kenosis in this case? The Son emptied himself. But of what? Surely not of his divine nature, nor of his divine perfections, which are inseparable from his nature. Nor can this act of kenosis mean the compression of his perfections into the cast and measure of mere human powers. Such an idea seems utterly foreign to any idea which the terms of the text either express or imply.

This act of kenosis has respect to that estate of glory which, on the ground of his divine nature, the Son rightfully possessed in equality with the Father. It means a self-emptying or self-divestment of that glory. This accords with his own words as previously cited: "And now, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."²⁷ That glory he once possessed, but had surrendered. The surrender was by the act of kenosis which we have in the text under special consideration. This interpretation brings all the parts of the text into complete harmony. The form of a servant in the likeness of men, which the Son assumed in the incarnation, stands in clear antithesis, not with his divine nature and perfections, but with the estate of glory which he possessed with the Father; which glory he might have rightfully retained, but with which he freely parted, and took instead the form of a servant in the likeness of men. The text gives no support to the kenotic Christology.

The aim of kenoticism is twofold: to secure the unity of the person of Christ, and to provide for the human facts of aim of

27 John xvii, 5.

kenosis his life. The self-limitation of the Son in the incarnation to a mere human cast and measure is held to be necessary to the personal oneness of Christ, and to the reality of the human facts of his intramundane or historic life. The personal oneness is declared to be impossible on the ground of the traditional doctrine of the divine incarnation. It is readily conceded that this personal oneness is incomprehensible; but surely the the mystery is not solved nor in the least relieved by the theory of a humanized Logos as co-existent with a human soul in Christ. A duality of persons seems absolutely inseparable from such a co-existence; and this attempt to secure and explain the personal oneness of Christ is utterly futile. Further : if, as we formerly pointed out, the deepest truth of the incarnation lies in [pg62] the divine consciousness of the human, may not this question of personal oneness have for us less pressing concern than we usually concede it? All that we require is such a relation of the divine to the human in Christ as will provide for this consciousness. And may there not be such a relation without the rigid unity of personality which is usually maintained ? Let it be observed, however, that, in this hypothetical putting of the case, we do not yield the doctrine of the personal oneness of Christ. But on the ground of this kenoticism there could be no divine consciousness of the human in the incarnation, because the humanized Logos could no longer have any divine consciousness.

The implications of this doctrine of the kenosis in Christology are contrary to the deepest truths of Christian theology. If the Son of God could part with his divine attributes himself, then divinity itself must be mutable. This consequence can be denied only on a denial of the divinity of the Son. But his divinity is conceded in the very idea of his self-divestment of his divine attributes. The theory is subversive of the divine Trinity. The humanized Son, self-emptied of his divine attributes, could no longer be a divine subsistence in the Trinity. Hence this kenosis of the Son must mean the destruction of the Trinity. The theory is not less subversive of other fundamental truths of Christian theology. No ground of an atonement in the blood of Christ could remain. That the Son once existed in the divine Trinity, and in the plenitude of the divine life, could avail nothing for such an atonement. If self-reduced to the measure of a man, his death could be no more saving than the death of a man. No ground of the sympathy of Christ could remain, as that sympathy is revealed in the Scriptures, and as it must be in order to meet the exigencies of Christian experience. Such a sympathy we have found to be possible only through the divine

consciousness of human experiences of suffering and trial. But there can be no such consciousness in the mere human consciousness to which this kenoticism limits the incarnate Logos. A theory with such implications can have no ground of truth in the Scriptures.^{28 29}

Other than this thorough treatment of errors, the nineteenth century Methodist scholar John Miley follows the same development of Christology as Cambron does. Other than the coverage of the leading errors of his day there is little value added by his coverage. He does, however, dismiss the *kenotic* view of Christ's incarnation, a view that fits the Scriptures better than any classic or orthodox view, for three reasons 1) it is not the orthodox view, 2) it does not fit with the orthodox view, and 3) it is destructive to the orthodox view. Since I previously promoted this view as the best fit to Scripture, let's briefly examine his oppositions.

Answering Miley – *Kenosis* Does Harmonize Scripture

Openly examine some points of contention that John Miley has toward the *Kenotic* view of Christ's incarnation. Roman Catholicism, and consequently all Protestants are confused about the soul, and Methodist Miley is first confused that Christ, in a *Kenosis* position, might end up with two souls in co-existence. This confusion comes because orthodox theologians hold that the human is a dichotomy with only a material side and an immaterial side. That is what the learned philosophers had told them. The

28 Bruce : The Humiliation of Christ ; Pope : The Person of Christ, note viii ; Goodwin : Christ and Humanity ; Martensen : Christian Dogmatics, pp. 237-288 ; Crosby : The True Humanity of Christ ; Hodge : Systematic Theology, vol. ii, pp. 430-440 ; Gess : Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Translation and additions by Reubelt. This work and Bruce's Humiliation of Christ are specially useful in the study of this question.

29 John Miley, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1 & 2*, The Library of Biblical and Theological Literature, New York: Eaton and Mains, 1894, The Internet Archive www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo1miley, 851-947.

soul, they suppose, is something that God adds to this mix at some time during human development. The Bible student knows that man is formed with body, soul, and spirit united together in one. The Bible and its student pays little attention to exactly when and how the soul gets added; that is only important to Roman Catholic theologians who think themselves in complete control of souls of men. This orthodox insistence of discerning how two natures coexisted in Christ, and what part the soul played completely muddies the water when examining Scripture.

The Bible student knows that death is the separation of body, soul, and spirit, i.e. Christ commended his spirit into the hands of the Father (Luke 23:46), while his soul went to hell (Ps 16:10, Acts 2:31), and his body hung on a cross until it was taken to the tomb (Matt 27:60). (This separation is death, Christ's death occurred on Thursday, and he remained dead on Thursday, on Friday, the high Sabbath, and on Saturday the weekly Sabbath. That is three days in a Bible students count, despite the Roman Catholic misinformation.) This understanding of body, soul and spirit, squelches all the orthodox misunderstandings about the union of a human soul with a divine being. When engineers got lost in minutia of design details the USAF pilot attendant in our meetings used to say "Pull up! Pull up! Your in the weeds!" Such an analogy is appropriate in the orthodox theologian's consideration of how two natures molded themselves together.

When Christ humbled himself, took on the form of a servant and was made in the image of men, he took on the body, soul, and spirit that man is made of. God is a trinity, Father, Son, and Spirit; man made in his image and likeness is a trichotomy, body, soul and spirit. This need not confuse the Bible student who believes first, and rationalizes second, but it does produce great confusion for the orthodox theologians who reject the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired testimony of God and first embrace the testimony of scholar, philosopher and theologian.

Once John Miley is certain that the *Kenotic* view is unorthodox, and unable to resolve issues about where the soul of Christ comes from, he dismisses it as "only an unwarranted interpretation of the texts adduced that they(*kenoticites*) can give

any support to the theory.” Like other theologians of his day Miley considers theology a science wherein one stacks up all the facts, devises a hypothesis, refines a theory then debates until he has established the truth. Theology is nothing like that! It is not a science and cannot use the scientific method popularized and declared omniscient in the 19th century. A true Bible theologian stacks up all the revealed facts, declares them to be inerrant, infallible, and verbally inspired truth and only debates about the rational understanding that finite minds might use for comprehending those facts. Truth is not out there waiting for discovery, it is declared by ... The Truth, i.e. John 14:6, “Jesus saith unto him (Thomas), I am the way, (I am) the TRUTH and (I am) the life; no man (theologian, philosopher, or scholar) cometh unto the Father, but by me.” This is an important distinction missed by generations of theologians, theology is not a science and cannot follow the normal scientific methods.

The Bible says the Word was made flesh, that Christ was made a little lower than the angels, that he made himself of no reputation, took on the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. Miley contends “this cannot mean any transmutation of the divine” nor can it mean “a transformation into man,” it must only mean that Christ “invested himself in a human nature, of which a body of flesh is the visible part.” Orthodox theologians, and now John Miley, tiptoe around these verses because they cannot conceive that Christ was made in the likeness of men and that likeness has body, soul, and spirit. Their man made cliché that “Jesus was as much God as if he were not man, and as much man as if he were not God,” does not have the fidelity to tell what Christ did and has them, and many others, in a tailspin, not able to believe all that the Scripture is saying. When Christ humbled himself, and was made in the likeness of men, the infinite took on some level of finiteness, the eternal God was born into a merely everlasting body, and it is conceivable and adequate for understanding these Scriptures that for thirty-three years he set aside his omnipresence, his omnipotence, and his omniscience. John Miley says no, such an “interpretation” of these Scriptures is not orthodox and produces a two soul scenario. Go figure.

In exploring with his pen Miley does state that “This interpretation (*Kenosis*) brings all the parts of the text into complete harmony.” But alas, he rejects it because “A humanized soul in Christ cannot solve the mystery of the personal oneness of deity and humanity united.”³⁰ In other words *Kenosis* can bring all the Scriptures into harmony, but it cannot bring all the consternation of orthodox hypothesis and theory into harmony. As Miley wades out into the consternation of hypothesis and theory, the Bible student need only concern themselves with what brings all the inerrant Scriptures into harmony. The understanding that Christ temporarily set aside omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience, while retaining all the other attributes of his deity, and was made in the likeness of men does indeed bring all the Scriptures into harmony.

Critique of Charles Hodge's 1878 Presbyterian Christology

Charles Hodge wrote no Christology section in his *Systematic Theology*.³¹ A brief introduction of Charles Hodge, taken from Christian Classics Ethereal Library, where his public domain works are available, is included below:

Charles Hodge (December 27, 1797, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania – June 19, 1878, Princeton, New Jersey) was the principal of Princeton Theological Seminary between 1851 and 1878. A Presbyterian theologian, he was a leading exponent of historical Calvinism in America during the 19th century. He was deeply rooted in the Scottish philosophy of Common Sense Realism. He argued strongly that the authority of the Bible as the Word of

30 John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, 1894, pg 62

31 Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology: Volume I-IV*. Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, Hardback- Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940.

God had to be understood literally.³²

Charles Hodge, called the Father of printed systematic theology, only addresses a Christology as it is presented in its essential features under other topics of his systematic theology. Even then he presents his Christology as the predicates which the Church gives to Christ, rather than the predicates which the Holy Bible gives to Christ. Further, when he does address what the Bible says about Christ he speaks of what the Old Testament states, what the Gospels state, or what the Doctrine of Paul states in the Pastoral Epistles. Although Hodge is a learned Princeton graduate with a very scholarly manner, and is a very gifted communicator, his systematic theology is first and foremost laden with Presbyterian doctrine. He presents reformed theology well. Remember that for a Catholic or Protestant theologian a systematic theology book is important because there are so many loose ends of their religion that need to be tied up. For a Bible believer, holding to the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Holy Scriptures as their final authority, the Holy Bible is their Systematic Theology book, and this one, built on that premise, has only to unravel and expose those previously bound up loose ends. Ergo there is little value added in the review of Hodge's Christology.

Critique of Augustus Strong's 1907 "Baptist" Christology

Much needs to be said about Christ. Saying much, in Greek, is pronounced "*ology*." Augustus H. Strong, 1836-1921, was a Yale graduate who taught theology at Rochester Theological Seminary for forty years and became the first president of the Northern Baptist Convention. His systematic theology has a tremendous depth and scope but his motivation and purpose must cause grave concern. Strong sets out to mold a traditional reformed emphasis and an atheistic evolutionary critical scholarship into the distinctive Baptist conviction. In his Christology, this dangerous

32 Christian Classics Ethereal Library <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/hodge>
(Accessed 29 Sep. 2014).

blend caused A. H. Strong to follow Charles Hodge's lead and submerge his Christology as a by line of his Soteriology.

Even there, Strong begins his discourse on Christ with an emphasis making our Lord and Saviour little more than yet another decree of God. His opening paragraph states:

Since God did from eternity determine to redeem mankind, the history of the race from the time of the Fall to the coming of Christ was providentially arranged to prepare the way for his redemption. The preparation was two fold: I. Negative Preparation, in the history of the heathen world, and II. Positive Preparation, in the history of Israel.³³

Strong's dogmatic belief in reformed theology, and their decrees of God, not only robs him of a passion in Christology, it prevents him from seeing God in all his glory. It overshadows the fact that God is capable of being a friend of man. Reformed, Presbyterian, and Calvinistic theology has God's sovereignty, God's decrees, and God's unfolding of events exactly as he knew from eternity past, held in such an overbearing consideration, that they cannot see the whole truth of Scripture. Baptists are first and foremost people of the Book. It is distressing that A. H. Strong sacrifices solid Baptist distinctives, on the altar of John Calvin's Institutes of the Christian Religion.

Once indoctrinated with reformed theology's notion that the catholic church is the new chosen people of God, elect in the foreknowledge of God, elect before the foundation of the world,... little else can penetrate that dogma. It feeds their Replacement Theology and nurtures their Covenant Theology, and here, not even the centerpiece of all Scripture, Christ in Christology, can bump their dogma. Their decrees must remain in its preeminent position, even above Christ himself.

Augustus H. Strong is a worthy student of theology but when

33 A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology, Three Volumes in One*, Judson Press, 1907, 665.

reading his extensive systematic theology one must always keep in mind his objective. Strong's overriding purpose is to blend together reformed theology, Baptist distinctives, and the atheistic evolutionary process of creation. Abram was a friend of God forever.³⁴ The second lesson that Abram learned about God, was God does not need blenders he desires separators³⁵. Strong is genius, but he is a blender that takes doctrines, blends them and tries to reconstruct a persuasive Bible doctrine. Although he is a deep thinker, and a profound communicator, or perhaps because of that, he is dangerous.

Strong's Christology is developed extensively.³⁶ It is embedded in his Soteriology in Part IV of his second volume. It is unfortunate that early systematic theology works kept theology divorced from Bible doctrine. That divorce procedure is evident in Strong's presentation of Christology. He begins by wedging it between the decrees of God, as if Christology were only another thing that God had decreed from eternity past. Concerning the person of Christ, Strong opens with the paragraph:

The redemption of mankind from sin was to be effected through a Mediator who should unite in himself to both the human nature and the divine, in order that he might reconcile God to man and man to God. To facilitate an understanding of the Scriptural Doctrine under consideration, it will be desirable at the outset to present a brief historical survey of views respecting the Person of Christ.³⁷

The study of theology should be systematic. The sole source of theology should be the inerrant, infallible, verbally inspired Word of God. So any systematic method should start with that source as its foundation. Augustus H. Strong does not. His opening paragraph on the person of Christ gives a very practical function of

34 2Chron 20:7, Isa 41:8, James 2:23

35 A cliché from the preaching of Lester Roloff.

36 Ibid., 665-796.

37 Ibid. 669

the Christ and then delves into a historical survey of the doctrine. His Bible is not open. The seventh and last of his referenced historical doctrines is, "The Orthodox doctrine promulgated at Chalcedon, in A.D. 451." With no other development from Scripture, and his Bible still closed, A. H. Strong uses this "Orthodox" position as the doctrine of the Person of Christ and goes on to expand that Roman Catholic Orthodox position, which expounds the two natures of Christ. In a development of theology, that is certainly "systematic error." A. H. Strong's primary source of truth is not the Holy Bible, it is a Roman Catholic Synod!

The Council of Chacedon in 451 A.D., which A. H. Strong cites as his source of orthodox truth, convened 600 bishops under the auspicious of Pope Leo I³⁸. It passed the "Definition of Faith" at the council's fifth session. In the sixth session the Pope and Emperor concurred, and the formula that Christ is one in two natures was "promulgated" solemnly. (Notice here that the pope and Augustus Strong, use the exact same word!) This counsel was transferred from Nicaea to Chalcedon so as to be close to Constantinople, and the Emperor Marcian. This "Definition of Faith" has a revealing first paragraph as follows:

The sacred and great universal synod by God's grace and by decree of your most religious and Christ-loving Emperors Valentinian Augustus and Marcian Augustus, assembled in Chalcedon, metropolis of the province of Bithynia, in the shrines of the saintly and triumphant martyr Euphemia, issues the following decrees.³⁹

The Roman Catholic Religion's orthodoxy continues with more audacious claims of authority, and none of them are

38 From the Papal Encyclicals, www.papalencyclicals.net accessed Aug 2014
The decree, incidently, has a Flesch-Kincaid Reading Ease of 1.7% and an Average Grade Level for readers of 22.4 grade (that is 12th grade plus 11 years of college!).

39 www.papalencyclicals.net/Councils/ecum04.htm#Definitiooffaith accessed Aug 2014

Scripture. It also continues with a detailed definition of their faith which is not referenced to any Scripture. They then "promulgate" the Roman Catholic Religion with twenty seven additional audacious disciplinary canons. The first of which states "We have deemed it right that the canons hitherto issued by the saintly fathers at each and every synod should remain in force."⁴⁰

It is no small thing that A. H. Strong begins his Christology using Roman Catholic Canons as his defining authority. He does add foot notes that point to some shortfalls of these Roman Catholic doctrines, and he does develop their good points with the Holy Bible. But systematic development of theology needs a solid starting point in the Bible doctrine not in Roman Catholic doctrine.

A. H. Strong writes a scholarly Christology which may be effectively used to augment this work with an in-depth perspective. His two systematic flaws are: 1) his motive to blend reformed theology and atheistic evolution into Baptist distinctives, and 2) his failure to use the inerrant, infallible Word of God as a sole source for his theology, or even as his primary source of theology. These two systematic flaws are so flagrant that Strong's Systematic Theology can not be recommended as a complete work. However, his extensive and scholarly coverage of Christology provides a depth to ones studies that can be of benefit.

Strong's Christology does contain a thorough analysis of the two natures of Christ, their reality and integrity. After analyzing the humanity of Christ, and the deity of Christ, he carefully expounds on the union of the two natures in one person. (pg. 673, 681, 683) He explores the Scriptures that give the proof of this union. He discusses the modern misrepresentations of this union, giving; A) the theory of incomplete humanity, to which he urges several objections, and B) the theory of gradual incarnation, found objectionable for his documented reasons.

A depth in Strong's coverage is next found in his treatment of the real nature of this union (pg. 691-700) With extensive foot notes he examines: (a) the great importance of this union, (b) the chief problems of this union (being only one personality with pre-incarnate, incarnate and post? incarnate considerations), (c) the

40 [ibid. /ecum04.htm#Canons](#)

reason for mystery in this inscrutable union, (d) the grounding of the possibility of the union in the original creation of man, (e) the possession of the two natures does not involve a double personality, (f) the effect upon the human nature, wherein the divine nature, with its power to be, to know, and to do as God, is imparted to the human nature without passing over into its essence, (g) the effect upon the divine nature wherein the human nature, with its ignorance, weakness, temptation, suffering, and death, is imparted on the divine nature without passing over into its essence, (h) the necessity of the union in order to constitute Jesus-Christ a proper mediator between God and man, (i) the union of humanity with deity in the person of Christ is indissoluble and eternal, and, (j) the infinite and the finite are no longer mutually exclusive.

Considering this kind of depth in the miracle of the incarnation is what extends a Bible doctrine of Christology into a systematic theology of Christology. A. H. Strong is a master at corraling all the considerations for an 'ology', on a subject. When guarding against his two systematic errors, it is always a joy to explore the great depth in his discourse.

Critique of Thiessen's 1949 "Baptist" Christology

Henry Clarence Thiessen (19__-1947) taught his "Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology" which were published in 1949. Little is written about Thiessen's background. John MacArthur's Master's College history annals records him as the fourth president of the Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary. It was after Thiessen's death in 1947 that that seminary matriculated into the neo-evangelical Master's College under John MacArthur, but the seeds of that matriculation are evident in Thiessen's lectures.

The genius and integrity of Henry Clarence Thiessen needs to be unequivocally affirmed here with a rehearsal of the old truth, "It takes no size to criticize." Thiessen's theology lectures have steered hundreds into the straight and narrow path of truth. When up to your neck in alligators it is easy to lose sight of the goal of draining the swamp. Dr. Thiessen and many other sound

independent fundamental Baptists did not see how extensive was the diabolical attack against God's Word, nor how Satan would use the multiplicity of copyright translations to his full advantage. Little compromises, viewed in hindsight, open large fissures that allow the adversary to gain strategic footholds. Here we exercise some of that hindsight.

Three systematic errors of Thiessen must be held in background while critiquing his Christology. First, he did not use the Holy Bible as his sole or even primary source of theology. In fact Thiessen even denies the existence of an inspired, inerrant, infallible Holy Bible. He solidifies his errant doctrine thus: "Inspiration is affirmed only of the autographs of the Scriptures, not of any of the versions, whether ancient or modern, nor any of the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, nor of any critical texts known. All these are either known to be faulty in some particulars, or are not certainly known to be free from all error."⁴¹

Thiessen continues in this misguided ruse to express his faith in ecumenical critics and their bibles, supposing they may eventually restore some approximate similitude of the very words which God failed to preserve for our present generation. Like all neo-evangelicals Thiessen makes a pretense that although God failed to accurately preserve his very words "textual critics tell us that the number of words that are still in doubt, whether in the Old Testament or in the New, is very small, and that no doctrine is affected by this situation."⁴² (Those who say that never consider the doctrine of inspiration, the doctrine of inerrancy, the doctrine of infallibility, nor the doctrine of preservation, which are directly and blatantly attacked by Satan's modernist ecumenical textual critics, Bible critics, and translators.)

Every lecture of Henry Clarence Thiessen is effected by his steadfast belief in this "situation." Ergo he does not use the Holy Scriptures as his sole source or even his primary source of theology. By his own testimony the Bible he holds in his hands is not the inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God. Everything in his

41 Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1949, 107.

42 *Ibid.*, 107

574 pages of published Systematic Theology must be weighed because of this systematic shortfall of Dr. Thiessen.

A reformed theologian is always a reformed Augustinian theologian. Augustinian's philosophy, which constructed the Roman Catholic Church, is what the reformers were reforming, and Thiessen was more reformer than Baptist. Roman Catholic Saint Augustine framed the doctrine that God has decreed and knows for certain everything, to the minutest detail, that ever is to happen in the universe. That is Augustinian doctrine, not Bible doctrine. Any theologian who makes the concerted effort of rationalizing Roman Catholic Saint Augustine's doctrine of decrees into some rendition of a Bible doctrine is a reformer of theologian and thus properly labeled a defender of reformed theology.

In force fitting Augustinian doctrine into his theology Thiessen makes this audacious declaration:

Some hold that prayer can have no real effect upon God, since he has already decreed just what He will do in every instance. But that is an extreme position. 'Ye have not, because ye ask not' (Jas. 4:2) must not be left out of account. The facts seem to be this, that God does some things only in answer to prayer; He does some other things without one's praying; and He does some things contrary to the prayers made. In His foreknowledge, again, He has taken all these things into account, and in His providence He works them out in accordance with His own purpose and plan. If we do not pray for the things that we might get by prayer, we do not get them. If He wants some things done for which no one prays, He will do them without anyone's praying. If we pray for things contrary to His will, He refuses to grant them. Thus there is perfect harmony between the foreknowledge, decrees, and providence of God.⁴³

There is no harmony between the Augustinian doctrine of

43 Ibid., "The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule", closing paragraph, 187-188.

decrees and the revelation of God in his Holy Word. No matter how much verbiage a theologian uses to rationalize the two revelations, Augustine's doctrines do not fit into God's doctrine. Those who repeatedly try to reconcile Augustinian doctrines into God's Word are reform theologians attempting to reform what should have been discarded long ago.

Thiessen's third systematic flaw is directly connected to the first two, but is it so illuminating that it is included here as a separate entity. The inerrant, infallible, inspired Word of God is clear and emphatic that man is made in the image and likeness of God, that God is a triune being, and that man is a trichotomy, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Henry Clarence Thiessen declares that man is only material and immaterial, a dichotomy, just like the ancient Greek philosophers said. The Roman Catholic Church adopted this dichotomy of man as their doctrine. In order to hold on to this Roman Catholic dogma, Dr. Thiessen not only rejects the Scriptures that reference body, soul, and spirit as separate entities⁴⁴, he attributes 1Thes 5:23⁴⁵ as nothing more than what Paul "seems to think."⁴⁶ Dr. Thiessen has already denied the inerrancy, infallibility, and inspiration of the bible he holds in his hands, he defends Roman Catholic and Reformed Roman Catholic doctrines of decrees, and now, in defense of a Roman Catholic dogma he calls Holy Scripture just a matter of Paul's opinion. These three systematic flaws in Dr. Thiessen's lectures make the work, on a whole, very suspect and not reliable for use as a systematic theology. His Christology suffers with these flaws.

Thiessen's Christology

Like Baptist theologian, A. H. Strong before him, Baptist theologian Thiessen starts his Christology with a historical survey of the many views about the person of Christ. Likewise, the

44 1Sa 1:15, Job 7:11, Isa 10:18, 26:9, 42:1, 51:23, Da 7:25, Mic 6:7, Mt 10:28, 12:18, 1Co 5:3 6:20, 7:34, 15:45, Eph 4:4, 1Th 5:23, Heb 4:12, Jas 2:26

45 1Thes 5:23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

46 Ibid., "The Trichotomous theory", 227

orthodox view he settles on hangs on the Roman Catholic Chalcedon Canon of 451 AD, and not on Holy Scripture.

Thiessen speaks of the Pre-Incarnate Christ but only to bolster his support of the Reformed position on election. Dr. Chafer, in contrast, presents a whole informative section on the pre-incarnate Christ. Thiessen, lamely concludes his section: "We know very little of Christ's work during this period, only that the Father through Him framed the ages (Heb 1:2, A.S.V.⁴⁷ marg.) and that He chose the believers in Him before the foundation of the world (Eph 1:4).⁴⁸

When a theologian is entangled in the error of reformed theology wherein God decrees who gets saved and who burns in hell, that error permeates every area of his theology. Here it even mars Thiessen's discourse on Christology.

Thiessen's Little Value Added

Thiessen's *Lectures in Systematic Theology* adds nothing to a discourse on Christology. His commentary rehearses A. H. Strong's discourse but does not attain the depth of Strong. His rejection and denial of God's preservation of inerrancy, infallibility, and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures make his writings a liability more than an asset. One need not read more of Thiessen's lectures on Christology.

Critique of Chafer's 1948 Christology

Lewis Sperry Chafer, who waxed so incomprehensible in

47 ASV is the registered trademark of Thomas Nelson & Sons and symbolizes the bible which was copyrighted and published by Thomas Nelson & Sons in 1901. In 1928, the International Council of Religious Education (the body that later merged with the Federal Council of Churches to form the National Council of Churches) acquired the copyright from Nelson and copyrighted the ASV in 1929. Even quoting Thiessen, this author cannot recommend or condone the use of any of the modernist ecumenical copyright bibles, all of which brazenly disregard the inerrancy and infallibility of the verbally inspired Holy Bible by utilizing the Westcott and Hort Bible criticism, textual criticism and critical text as their source.

48 Ibid., "The Pre-Incarnate Christ", 287

volume four and could not communicate the truth of "So Great Salvation" in volume three, waxes more eloquent than all predecessors of systematic theologies when expressing his Christology. It is an astounding transformation, likely lectured and written prior to his venture into a printed systematic theology effort. This volume is worth its price despite all the other volumes of his incorrigible effort.

Make no mistake, Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer started as a fundamentalist. The song leader under C.I. Scofield became a gifted teacher for the newly formed World's Christian Fundamentals Association (WCFA) and in 1924 his Evangelical Theological College became Dallas Theological Seminary in Dallas, Texas, a fundamental seminary.⁴⁹ Evangelicals became Neoevangelicals when they scoffed at the Fundamental Separatist position and refused the Fundamentalist's militant attitude. Dr. Chafer never scoffed, but he never separated either. Dr. Chafer never mocked militantism, but he never became one, and he never camped with any.

Dr. Chafer's Ecclesiology and his pandering to 70+ denominations, endangers his Christology. His belief in a Catholic Church with Denominational Divides is a poisonous root which renders his whole whole Systematic Theology dangerously suspect. The rationalizations that he imagines in his work, illustrate the ever present danger of mixing with apostasy, rather than separating from it. Such is the plight of the neoevangelical who purposefully rejected the staunch separatist position of the early Fundamentalist. When trying to appease 70+ denominations, Chafer is "conceiving and uttering from the heart words of falsehood. And judgment is turned away backward, justice standeth afar off: for truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter." (Isa 59:13b-14)

Some would contend that Lewis Sperry Chafer was not neoevangelical leaning, and Dallas Theological Seminary was indeed Fundamental. One can let George W. Dollar, Professor of Church History at Bob Jones University answer that. In his 1973 book "A History of Fundamentalism in America", he states,

49 Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 160

Alumni of Dallas Seminary would raise the old claim that all is sound and Fundamental there, although such known sympathizers with New Evangelicalism as H.G. Hendricks, H.W. Robinson, G.W. Peters, and R.H. Seume serve on the faculty... Each year an array of speakers who travel with New Evangelicals mold the mind of students to a middle-of-the-road position. These speakers have included R.A. Cook, Arnold T. Olsen, H.T. Armerding, Clark Pinnock, F.A. Schaeffer, Carl Henry, Clyde Taylor, and Ted Engstrom.⁵⁰

Dr. Dollar also clarifies succinctly,

That the new evangelical strategy must be one of infiltration and not separation. In addition, he (New Evangelical Harold Ockenga, President of Fuller Seminary in Pasadena, California⁵¹) named the new evangelical forces as the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), Fuller Seminar, Billy Graham, and *Christianity Today*... In 1960 Ockenga wrote: 'my personal concern as the originator of the New Evangelicalism has been to stir the interest of Evangelical Christianity in meeting the societal problems through content of Biblical Christianity. This is the tradition of Calvin, Luther, and Knox.'⁵²

50 George W. Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 1973, Bob Jones University Press, 209

51 Harold John Ockenga (1905-1985) was an American evangelical leader, a Congregational minister, and one of the co-founders of Fuller Theological Seminary. Harold John Ockenga (June 6, 1905 – February 8, 1985) was a leading figure of mid-20th-century American Evangelicalism, part of the reform movement known as "Neo-Evangelicalism". A Congregational minister, Ockenga served for many years as pastor of Park Street Church in Boston, Massachusetts. He was also a prolific author on biblical, theological, and devotional topics. Ockenga helped to found the Fuller Theological Seminary and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, as well as the National Association of Evangelicals. from http://www.theopedia.com/Harold_Ockenga (Accessed 15 June 2014).

52 Dollar, *A History of Fundamentalism in America*, 204

Dollar goes on to clarify that Charles J. Woodbridge, a Fuller Seminary faculty member who left in protest to Ockenga's new direction, called this new and dangerous direction,

a theological and moral compromise of the deadliest sort. Such a threat is it that the sharpest language must be used to expose its threat and insidious danger... Neo Evangelicalism advocates toleration of error. It is following the downward path of accommodation to error, cooperation with error contamination by error, and ultimate capitulation to error.⁵³

It is reiterated here that Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer, founder of Dallas Theological Seminary in 1924, does not use the sharpest language and does not expose the error of the 70+ denomination that he is pandering to. He is the epitome of neoevangelicalism as herein defined. His Christology, however, has some saving merit.

Chafer's introduction to Christology brings out a notable difference between a Bible doctrine book and a theology book. The "ology" in theology emphasizes a discourse which meanders down every conceivable avenue of consideration for a topic. While a Bible doctrine must detail every straight and narrow consideration of what God has revealed, a thorough "ology" must do that, plus introduce and explore some of the major broad paths and wide gates of man's creation. It should thereby open some vistas which may not have been considered by the student of doctrine being ever vigilant to show how the wide paths do lead to destruction. Chafer's Christology pursues this mind broadening purpose.

In previous volumes Chafer has missed this higher calling of a systematic theology. Dr. Chafer states his purpose to "collect and systematically arrange, compare, exhibit and defend all facts concerning God and his works from any and every source."⁵⁴ 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

53 Ibid. 205

54 from www.ChristianBook.com book promotion accessed Dec 2013

persecuted Baptist, men such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, on equal grounds with Holy Scripture. In writing his eight volumes on Systematic Theology he repeatedly makes this blunder. Systematically such an approach is theological malpractice. His lack of organizing thoughts and direction is serious, but his total miss-organizing the "system" in systematic, coupled with his strong reliance on extra Biblical sources make his systematic theology inexcusable. His Christology, however, is still commendable.

This author has found no Systematic Theologies which carefully follow the aforementioned methodology. They each, more or less, follow Dr. Chafer's recipe and end up parked on some wide road, defending mans twisted ideas about eternal decrees of God, the election of individual souls, the Catholicness of a Church, an allegorical end time, or the replacement of God's chosen Israel with their Catholic Church. For that reason systematic theology has often been a dangerous venture for the impressionable student. For the student well grounded in Bible Doctrine, however, a careful venture into the mind broadening arena of mans ideology is still a worthwhile venture. Dr. Chafer's Christology documented in his fifth volume seems to be such a worthwhile excursion.

Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's opening chapter on the pre-incarnate Christ is the most comprehensive of all systematic theologies this author reviewed. Since his introduction to this chapter eloquently introduces his whole subject it is recited below:

Dr Chafer's Introduction to The Pre-incarnate Christ

Christology (Χριστος, λογος), to which this entire volume is devoted, is the doctrine respecting the Lord Jesus Christ. In attempting to write on His adorable Person and His incomprehensible achievements - which achievements when completed will have perfected redemption, exercised to infinite satisfaction the divine attribute of grace, manifested the invisible God to His creatures, and subdued a rebellious universe in which sin has been permitted to demonstrate its exceeding sinfulness - the limitation of a finite mind which is weakened by a faulty perception are all to apparent. Samuel Medley expressed this sense of restriction when he sang:

"O could I speak the matchless worth,
O could I sound the glories forth
Which in my Saviour shine,
I'd soar, and touch the heavenly strings,
And vie with Gabriel while he sings
In notes almost Divine."

Thus, again, the same inability is felt and expressed by Charles Wesley:

"O for a thousand tongues to sing,
My great Redeemer's praise;
The glories of my God and king,
The triumphs of His grace."

Of this incomparable One it is said that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God"; yet such an One, who thus occupied the highest place of Deity in company with the Father and the Spirit, "Was made flesh, and dwelt among us." He who is from everlasting to everlasting was born of a woman and died on a cross. He who according to the mind of the Spirit is Wonderful, was spit upon by men. He who, by the same mind, is Counselor is rejected of men. He who is The might God is crucified in abject weakness. He who is The everlasting Father, is a Son who learned obedience by the things which He suffered. He who is the Prince of Peace must Himself tread the wine press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God, for the "day of vengeance" must yet be in His heart and He must yet break the nations with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel. He who said, "I am among you as he that serveth," also said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword,": He who is the chaste, wooing Lover

of the Canticles is the King of glory who is might in battle. He who created all things occupied an infant's cradle. He who is holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners was made to be sin in behalf of others. He who was the Bread of Life was Himself hungry. He who was the giver of the supernatural Water of Life was Himself thirsty. He who was God's Gift of Life to a lost world was Himself dead. He who was dead is alive for evermore.⁵⁵

Chafer also broadens the general outline of Christology to pursue a sevenfold division. He defends the need for such an expanded outline as follows:

Dr Chafer's seven fold divisions of Christology

The larger and usual division of Christology is twofold - Christ's Person and His work. The work of Christ, being generally restricted to the redemption He has achieved, does not include other essential features- his life on earth, His teachings, His manifestation of divine attributes, His offices as Prophet, Priest, and King, or His relationships to angelic spheres. It is with this larger consideration of Christology in view that a sevenfold division of this extended theme will be pursued: (1) the pre-incarnate Christ (Chap I), (2) Christ incarnate (chaps. II-VIII), (3) the sufferings and death of Christ incarnate (chap. IX), (4) the resurrection of Christ incarnate (chap. X), (5) the ascension and session of Christ incarnate (chap. XI), (6) the second advent and kingdom of Christ incarnate (chaps. XII-XIII), and (7) the eternal kingdom of Christ incarnate (chap. XIV).⁵⁶

Despite Chafer's later complication of the genuine purpose of a theologian, he carefully defines it properly in this introduction. Chafer's Christology, likely written for lecture, rather than for his

55 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology, Volume V, Christology*, Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, MI, 3-4.

56 *Ibid.*, 5

more inclusive, less direct systematic theology, follows this formula well, as can be seen in his outline for teaching the preincarnate Christ:

To the theologian whose task is to discover, arrange, and defend the truth which God has spoken, the assignment relative to the absolute Deity of Christ is simple indeed. The joining of the doctrine of Christ's humility to the doctrine of His Deity does create a problem which demand the most exact and careful consideration; but the doctrine respecting Christ's Deity when standing alone is without complications.

The general division of the divine revelation regarding Christ's preexistence may be comprehended under a sevenfold arrangement of truth: (1) Christ is God, hence His preexistence; (2) Christ is the Creator, hence His preexistence; (3) Christ is party to the before time covenant, hence His preexistence; (4) the Old Testament anticipation of Messiah which Christ answered is that of Jehovah God, hence His preexisted; (5) the Old Testament angel of Jehovah is Christ, hence His preexisted; (6) indirect Biblical assertions declare Christ to have preexisted; and (7) direct Biblical assertions declare Christ to have preexisted.⁵⁷

In presenting the deity of Christ Dr. Chafer waxes the more eloquent. He uses the Westminster Confession's extensive delineation of God and follows that with this profound paragraph:

It is probable that no more comprehensive declaration respecting God has been framed than this; yet it is precisely this infinity of Being which Scriptures predicate of Christ. There is nothing which is said to be true of God which is not said to be true of Christ and to the same degree of infinite perfection. It is true that He took upon Himself the human form and that is so doing important problems arise regarding the theanthropic Person which He became. These problems have been considered under Theology Proper and will yet be resumed later when contemplating the incarnation and earth-life of the Savior. The fundamental issue is that Christ is God. This has also been proven earlier earlier and is now to be demonstrated again. The student is enjoined not to pass over these proofs without having attained to a profound conviction of the Deity of Christ. If he wavers respecting this foundation truth, he should re-canvass every argument and attempt no forward step until this credence is definitely acquired, for apart from this conviction no true progress

⁵⁷ Ibid., 7

will be made. If, on the other hand, such a conviction is not gained, the student is fundamentally wrong and can, under such abnormal unbelief and want of amenableness to the Scriptures, serve no worthy purpose as an exponent of the Sacred Text. The Lord has Himself declared that "all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father" (John 5:23). The Son is dishonored when assigned a lower place than that of the Father. Such dishonor to the Son is displeasing to the Father, and a ministry is vain indeed which, though sincere, advances under the displeasure of God. The Deity of the Father is all but universally admitted, so also the Deity of the Spirit; but the Deity of the Son is challenged. Such a doubt would not have arisen had the Son not become incarnate. It is His entrance into the human sphere that has provided a field for unbelief. Thus it is required the more that the exact testimony of the Word of God should be given in its full authority. As would exist through misunderstanding of the theanthropic Person, the strongest evidence is supplied concerning the Deity of Christ. The Scriptures are as clear and conclusive in their expressions respecting the Deity of Christ as they are respecting His humanity. His humanity is revealed by the natural method of ascribing to Him human titles, human attributes, human actions, and human relationships. Similarly, His Deity is disclosed in the same manner by ascribing to Christ divine, divine attributes, divine actions, and divine relationships.⁵⁸

One area where Chafer's description of the divine names applied to Christ exceeds Cambron's doctrine description is in the name of *Logos*. Since *Logos* is also the root stem of the "ology" in theology that whole thesis is included here:

1. The Divine Names. The names found in the Bible - especially those applied to divine Persons - are far more than empty titles. They define as well as indicate the Person to whom they belong. The name *Jesus* is His human designation, but it also embodies the whole redemptive purpose of His incarnation (cf. Matt. 1:21). Similar titles such as "The Son of man, The son of Mary, "The son of Abraham," "The son of David," assert His human lineage and relationships. In like manner the designations "Word," or *Logos*, "God," "Lord," "The might God," "The everlasting Father," "Immanuel," "Son of God," connote His Deity. Among these divine names, some are final in their implications.

a. DESIGNATIONS OF ETERNAL RELATIONSHIP:

58 Ibid. 8-9.

Logos (Λογος). As language expresses thought, so Christ is the Expression, the Revealer, the Manifester of God. The term *Logos* - used only by the Apostle John as a name of the Second Person - indicates the eternal character of Christ. As Logos He was in the beginning, He was with God, and He was God (John 1:1). He likewise became flesh (John 1:14) and thus is - according to divine functions - the manifestation of God to man (cf. John 1:18). In His manifestation, all that may be disclosed relative to the Person of God was not only resident in Christ - "In him dwelleth all the fullness [πληρωμα] of the Godhead bodily" (Col 2:9) - but all the competency of God - knowledge-surpassing, indeed - was resident in Him. No stronger declaration of the Deity of Christ can be made than is indicated by the cognomen *Logos*. Without the use of this specific title the Apostle Paul also has written both in Colossians and in Hebrews of the same preexistence of Christ; and concerning the origin of this title and the fact that the Apostle John employs it without explanation - suggesting a general understanding of its meaning - collateral reading may be pursued (cf. Dean Alford, M.R. Vincent, and in the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, s.w., Alexander).

Bishop Lightfoot, in his commentary on Colossians, chapter 1, verse 15 ff., has declared the meaning of *Logos* and its use in the Sacred Text. He Writes:

As the idea of the *Logos* underlies the whole of this passage, though the term itself does not appear, a few words explanatory of this term will be necessary by way of preface. The word Λογος then, denoting both "reason" and "speech," was a philosophical term adopted by Alexandrian Judaism before St. Paul wrote, to express the *manifestatio*' of the Unseen God, the Absolute Being, in the creation and government of the World. It included all modes by which God makes Himself known to man. As his reason, it denoted His purpose or design; as His *speech*, it implied His revelation. Whether the *logos* was conceived merely as the divine energy personified, or whether the conception took a more concrete form, I need not stop now to inquire; but I hope to give a fuller account of the matter in a later volume. It is sufficient for the understanding of what follows to say that Christian teachers, when they adopted this term, exalted and fixed its meaning by attaching to it two precise and definite ideas: (1) "The Word is a Divine Person," ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος; and (2) "The Word became incarnate in Jesus Christ," ο λογος σαρξ εγενετο. It is obvious that these two propositions must have altered materially the significance of all the subordinate terms connected with the idea of the λογος; and

that therefore their use in Alexandrian writers, such as Philo, cannot be taken to *define*, though it may be brought to *illustrate*, their meaning in St. Paul and St. John. With these cautions the Alexandrian phraseology, as providential preparation for the teaching of the Gospel, will afford important aid in the understanding of the Apostolic writing. - 8th edition., pp. 141-142⁵⁹

The designation of Christ which capture his eternal relationship is further enhanced by his title of "First Begotten" (πρωτοτοκος). This is explained by Chafer using John F. Walvoord's outline as follows:

First Begotten" (πρωτοτοκος). This title - sometimes translated *First-Born* - indicates that Christ is First-Born, the elder in relation to all creation; not the first created thing, but the antecedent to all things as well as the cause of them (cf. Col. 1:16). Of this title Dr. John F. Walvoord writes, "This term is used twice in the New Testament without referring to Christ. (Heb. 11:28; 12:23), and seven times as His title. An examination of these references will reveal a threefold use: (a) Before all creation (Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15). As the 'firstborn of every creature' (Col. 1:15), the title is obviously used of Christ as existing before all creation, hence, eternally self-existent. (b) Firstborn of Mary (Matt. 1:25; Luke 2:7; Heb 1:6). Here the reference is plainly to the fact that Christ was the first child born to Mary, a usage in contrast to that speaking of His eternal sonship. The term is used, then, of His pre-incarnate Person, and also of His incarnate Person. (c) Firstborn by Resurrection (Col. 1:18; Rev. 1:5). The meaning here is that Christ is the first to be raised from the dead in resurrection life, hence, 'the firstborn from the dead' (Col. 1:18). In relation to the eternity of Christ, this title is another proof that Christ is the self-existent, uncreated God spoke of in Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15; and that in view of His eternal Person, He also has the honor of being the first to be raised from the dead in resurrection life" (*Outline of Christology*, unpublished ms., pp. 5-6).

A consideration of thee designations cannot but impress the devout mind with the truth that the Lord Jesus Christ existed as God from all eternity, and that He will so exist throughout eternity to come.⁶⁰

59 Ibid., 9-10

60 Ibid., 11-12.

Dr. Chafer puts more emphasis on types than do other theologians. In his introduction to the doctrine of Christ incarnate, under the heading, the major types of Christ, he quotes a whole section of Dr. Walvoord's unpublished notes.⁶¹ In his section on the sufferings and death of Christ incarnate Dr. Chafer again includes a list of the major types of Christ.⁶² These two lists are combined and inserted into his text and should be studied with care.⁶³

Dr. Chafer included in his Christology an extensive and needful section on the second advent of Christ incarnate. The area is covered in this work under Eschatology, but it is of such importance that highlights are included in this section.

Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer set out as a young fundamentalist to reprove the Protestant's error and preach the Premillennial return of Christ and the dispensational doctrines that support it. That zeal was somewhat quenched when he settled into the midst of 70+ denominations and founded Dallas Theological Seminary, but his introduction to his chapter, "The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate" deserves audience. That introduction is included below:

Dr. Chafer's "The Second Advent of Christ Incarnate"

Since Christ is the center of all Biblical prediction, there is properly an eschatology to be included in Christology. It contemplates the return of Christ to the earth, the kingdom which He will then set up on the earth, and His eternal reign. The first of these is now to be considered, the second in the chapter following, while the last forms the theme of the closing main division of Christology or chapter XIV.

Though theologians differ about the time and the manner of Christ's second advent, all who receive the Bible seriously do agree that He will return to this earth. The Scriptures clearly teach that Christ will come for judgment and for the setting up of His

61 Ibid., 43-44

62 Ibid., 177

63 Dr. Walvoord's notes on types of Christ was found at www.walvoord.com, Browse Articles, Series in Christology (Accessed 15 June 2014), also found at http://www.1stchartfordwi.org/Systematic_Theology (Accessed 15 June 2014).

kingdom on the earth. Over this kingdom He with His Bride shall rule forever. No apology is entered or entertained for taking the vast body of Scripture which presents Christ's coming again and his kingdom in other than its natural, literal, and grammatical sense. All predictions due to be fulfilled before the manner and without exception; it is therefore reasonable to believe that unfulfilled predictions will be accomplished as faithfully and as definitely. It is possible that for want of faith some men of the past age of law who were confronted with predictions respecting the first advent when it was yet future were inclined to place some so-called spiritualizing interpretations upon these great prophecies; but it remained true, and would have remained so though no living man had taken God at His Word, that the inspired predictions moved on majestically in their natural, literal, and grammatical fulfillment. For those who have not done so, it may be introduction into almost limitless fields of divine revelation and into overwhelming demonstrations of divine faithfulness to follow through an investigation which pursues this specific method of interpretation - such, anyway, is this division of Christology designed to be. The theme is as august, majestic, and consequential as the consummation of all divine purposes in mundane spheres must be. If matters of present world crises arrest the attention and spread consternation among all civilized inhabitants of the earth, how much more should believing men be aroused to unprecedented attention by the portrayal of those stupendous realities which constitute the closing scenes - the final disposition of evil and the final enthronement of righteousness and peace unto all eternity to come! However vividly - unless it be the creation of the universe - and that program which is yet to come is, so far as that which is sublunary is concerned, more of prophecy related to the first advent and the probability of literal fulfillment of prophecy related to the second advent, George N. H. Peters writes⁶⁴: ...

... The truth that Christ is coming to the earth again is so emphatically and repeatedly asserted in the Sacred Text that nearly all creeds have included it in their declarations, and only those who are lacking in respect for the verity of the Bible text fail to acknowledge that Christ is to return; however, a wide variation in belief has existed about how and when He will return. A woeful lack of attention to the precise testimony of the Word of God is

64 Chafer is a complex writer. This paragraph analyzed by <https://readability-score.com> shows Chafer writes on an average grade level (based on the USA education system) of 17.2 (Twelfth grade plus 5 years of college!) Words per Sentence 34.3.

revealed in these conflicting sentiments more than is found in connection with any other one doctrine. Human notions and fancies have run riot with little apparent attempt to harmonize these ideas with the Scriptures. The assumption must arise that they are not diminished by it. An example of the human imagination's straying when making no reference to the extended testimony of Scripture is furnished - and similar quotation might be made from various theologians - by Dr. William Newton Clarke, late Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University, in his book *An outline of Christian Theology* (5th ed., pp. 443-46). Having written at some length on certain points and having implied that Christ's second advent is fulfilled in the death of the believer - using John 14:1-3 as the proof-text, by the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost, and by the destruction of Jerusalem, he summarizes as follows:⁶⁵...

The battle against Reformed Theology's Covenant Theology was well worded when Dr. Chafer quoted Dr. William Newton Clarke. That battle is ongoing. Their Roman gate may be wider and their Catholic path broader, but there is a straight and narrow truth expounding a Premillennial return of Christ, and a Pretribulational Rapture of the Church. Although there be few that find it, rejoice that you are herein standing on it.

Dr. Chafer has much more to say about Christology. His depth here is unique, not showing itself in other areas of his "Systematic Theology." The study of his fifth volume might be worthwhile, but this volume is not exemplary of Dr. Chafer's work.

+Critique of Geisler's 2002 Christology

Normal L. Geisler has Christology as an appendix to his systematic theology.⁶⁶ Although that tells something about his organization, he does begin his appendix with this note:

Christology is discussed in three other places:
The work of Christ on the cross is treated under

65 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, Vol V, 281-283.

66 Norman L. Geisler, *Systematic Theology In One Volume*, Bethany House, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2002, 3, 4, 5, 11.

Soteriology in chapters 60-61; the nature of Christ as a member of the Trinity is discussed in Chapter 40; Christ's future reign is examined in part 8 on eschatology ("last things"). Other elements of Christology are outlined here in this appendix.

This caption to his appendix reveals the importance of including a complete section for Christology in ones systematic theology. Although the preeminent topic touches every area of theology and might be addressed in other areas, there are concepts that need expounded in its own section. Secondly the caption tells us that Geisler only outlines his Christology, and does not expound any areas to the point of being an "ology."

Of Norman L. Geisler's *Systematic Theology in One Volume*⁶⁷, Dr. Paige Patterson, President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary said,

Great theologians are best when they are outstanding philosophers also. Then, of course, you often cannot fathom what they are saying. Norman Geisler has the unique ability as a philosopher and theologian to deal with profound concepts in ways that the common man can easily grasp. Consequently, this systematic theology will not only sit on the desk of the scholar but also of the pastor, and on the coffee table of many a layman^{68 69}.

Geisler's single volume of systematic theology is indeed superior to Charles Hodge, and Augustus Strong's work. Charles Hodge was a meticulous and scholarly Princeton graduate but he was first and foremost a Presbyterian with a staunch reformed

67 Ibid.

68 The author objects to the Roman Catholic categorization of Christians being clerics, or clergy, who are denominationally trained to read and interpret the Holy Bible, and laity or laymen, who were not trained and professional in their denomination. True, Bible believing, Born-again ones, are indwelt by the Christ and have eyes made to see, and ears made to hear. Such exude the priesthood of all believers.

69 Ibid., flyleaf

theology. Augustus Strong was a Baptist, equally meticulous and scholarly, but desiring to meld Baptist doctrine with reformed theology and atheistic evolution. Where Dr. Henry Thiessen did not believe an inspired, inerrant, infallible Holy Bible was in existence in his day, Dr. Geisler uses such as his *prima facie* source, if not his sole source for his doctrine. Dr. Geisler's work in one volume is also superior to Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's eight volumes of systematic theology. Whereas Dr. Chafer wrote an extensive Christology, and a superior chapter on the pre-incarnate Christ, Dr. Geisler's concise style and complete organized coverage of theology exceeds Dr. Chafer's verbose eight volumes of effort.

Despite Geisler's outlined treatment of Christology in an appendix, some of his outline forms present remarkable insight to the wealth of Bible information available. His presentation of fourteen direct physical evidence of the death of Christ⁷⁰ is a good example. And concerning the resurrection of Christ, he fully expounds on the twelve appearances of the resurrected Christ.⁷¹ His tabling of the miracles of Christ⁷² marks a very useful outlining in considering the whole life of Christ. The presentation of this outline prompts the inclusion the more extensive table compiled by this author.

70 Ibid., 1510-1512.

71 Ibid., 1512-1518.

72 Ibid., 1504 - 1506.

Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ.

The consideration of the life of Christ incarnate can be enhanced by the study of the following chronological table showing the harmony of the life of Christ. It is a reference I have used repeatedly in my studies.

The order of event in general according to Andrews' 'Life of Christ'¹

Introduction Childhood and 1st Year of Public Ministry

#	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
1	Preexistence						1:1-14
2	Genealogies			1:1-17		3:23-28	
3	Annunciation to Mary	Nazareth	March, 5 BC			1:26-38	
4	Birth of John the Baptist	Judea	June, 5 BC			1:57-80	
5	Birth of Jesus	Bethlehem	Dec, 5 BC	1:18-25		2:1-7	
6	Song of the angels	Bethlehem				2:8-20	
7	Visit of the Wise Men	Bethlehem	Jan, 4 BC	2:1-12			
8	Flight into Egypt	Egypt	Feb, 4 BC	2:13-23			
9	Childhood and Youth	Nazareth	2-26 BC	2:23		2:39-52	
10	First Passover at age 12	Jerusalem	Apr 8 AD			2:41-50	
11	John the Baptist Ministry	Wilderness	26-28 AD	3:1-12	1:1-18	3:1-18	
12	Baptism of Jesus	Jordan	Jan 27 AD	3:13-17	1:9-11	3:21-23	
13	Temptation of Christ more likely fits between John 4 & 5, after John lists the daily sequences after Christ's baptism.	John 4 n 5					
14	First Disciples	Bethabara	Feb 27 AD				1:15-51
15	First Miracle	Cana	Tuesday Feb				2:1-12
16	First Temple Cleansing	Jerusalem	Apr 11- 17				2:13-25
17	Discourse to Nicodemus	Jerusalem	Apr 11- 17				3:1-21

1 Cyclopedic Concordance of my mothers Scofield Reference Bible, New York Oxford University Press, 1945

18	Great Ministry in Judea	Judea	Apr				3:22-36
19	Departure to Galilee		Apr				4:1-3
20	Samaritans at Jacobs Well	Sychar	Apr				4:4-42
21	Healing of Nobel mans Son	Capernaum	Apr				4:43-54
13	Temptations of Jesus	Wilderness	Apr	4:1-11	1:12-13	4:1-13	
23	Passover likely Pentecost	Jerusalem	June 27 AD				5:1
24	Healing at pool Bethesda	Jerusalem	June 27 AD				5:2-47
24	Discourse w Pharisees b(without disciples, who were likely off fishing)	Jerusalem	June 27 AD				5:16-47

Not a Good Friday?

Let's suppose that the Bible is right and accurate, that the Passover Lamb was separated from the rest of the flock on the 10th day of first month according to Exodus 12:2-3, that the first month was called Abib according to 13:4, and that the Passover Lamb was killed in the evening of the 14th day of that month according to 12:6. Now we fit those days into the Hebrew calendar of the month of Abib, which began with the first new moon after the solar equinox in 30 AD. We know there was a feast served six days before the passover according to John 12:1; the passover being on the 14th, that would be on the 8th of Abib, and it would not be on a sabbath day. If that feast was Friday then our Passover Lamb, our Lord Jesus Christ (1Cor.5:7), was separated from the rest with a Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem on Sunday the 10th of Abib, he was crucified on Thursday the 14th of Abib, and Friday, the 15th of Abib, was, as always, the first day of the Feast of Unleavened bread and a sabbath day according to Exodus 12:15-16. John 19:31 calls it a high day sabbath, the next day, Saturday was a weekday sabbath, and the next day, Sunday was the first day the women could go to the tomb "*bringing the spices which they had prepared.*" The Emmaus Road disciples in Luke 24:21 were right to say "*to day is the third day since the these things were done*", and the Son of man was in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights (Matt.12:40), Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

If the errant Roman Catholic Church were right, there would be a feast on the sabbath day, a Palm Monday, errant Emmaus Road disciples, only two days in the tomb and a Good Friday. If hard nosed Baptists were right there would be a Palm Sabbath Saturday and errant Emmaus Road disciples, but a full 72 hours in the tomb. Let's just stick with the Bible and the calendar that God defined.

Vol 4 Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ.

Public Ministry of Christ in the 2nd Year

#	Events	Place	Date	Matt	Mark	Luke	John
22	Unrecorded Jan – Mar 28 AD		Jan-Mar, 28				
23	Passover (more likely Pentecost)	Jerusalem	Mar 30-Apr 5				5:1
24	Healing at pool Bethesda	(See above)	(See 1 st year)				5:2-47
25	Imprisonment of John	Macherus	March	14:3-5	6:17,18	3:19,20	
26	Return to Galilee	Galilee	April	4:12	1:14,15	4:14,15	
27	Rejection at Nazareth	Nazareth	“			4:16-30	
28	Takes up abode in Capernaum	Capernaum	April May	4:13-17		4:31	
29	Calling disciples to be fishers	Sea of Galilee	April May	4:18-22	1:16-20	5:1-11	
30	Many Miracles	Capernaum	April May	8:14-17	1:21-34	4:31-41	
31	First circuit of Galilee	Galilee	April May	4:23-24	1:35-39	4:42-44	
32	Healing of a Leper	Galilee	May	8:2-4	1:40-45	5:12-16	
33	Healing Paralytic	Capernaum	May June	9:2-8	2:1-12	5:17-26	
34	The call of Matthew	Capernaum	May June	9:9	2:13-14	5:27-28	
35	Discourse on Sabbath	Capernaum	May June	12:1-8	2:23-28	6:1-5	
36	Withered Hand Sabbath Day	Capernaum	May June	12:9-14	3:1-6	6:6-11	
37	Calling of the Twelve	HornsHattn	Midsummr	10:2-4	3:13-19	6:12-19	
38	Sermon of the Mount	HornsHattn	Midsummr	Ch 5 -8:13		6:20-49	
39	Healing Centurion's Servant	Capernaum	Midsumme r	8:5-13		7:1-10	
40	Raising the Widow's Son	Nain	Midsumme r			7:11-17	
41	John Baptist sends to Jesus	Galilee	Midsumme r	11:2-19		7:18-35	
42	Warnings and invitations	Galilee		11:20-30			
43	The woman, a sinner		Midsummr			7:36-50	
44	Another tour of Galilee	Galilee	Autumn			8:1-3	
45	Healing blind and dumb	Capernaum	Autumn	12:22-45	3:22-30	(11:14-23)	
46	Visit of his mother +	Capernaum	Autumn	12:46-50	3:31-35	8:19-21	
47	Eight parables by the sea	Sea of Galilee	Autumn	13:1-53	4:1-34	8:4-18	
48	Stilling the Tempest			8:18-27	4:35-41	8:22-25	
49	Restoration of the demoniac			8:28-34	5:1-20	8:26-39	
50	Matthew's Feast			9:10-17	2:15-22	5:29-39	
51	Jairus' Daughter raised, Woman Cured			9:18-26	5:21-43	8:40-56	
52	Heal two blind men and dumb possessed			9:27-34			

Public Ministry of Christ in the 3rd Year

#	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
53	2 nd rejection at Nazareth	Nazareth	Winter 29	13:53-58	6:1-6		
54	The 12 sent forth	Galilee	Winter 29	9:35-11:1	6:6-13	9:1-6	
55	Death of John the Baptist	Macherus	March 29	14:1-12	6:14-29	9:7-9	
56	Feeding of the 5,000	Bethsaida	April 29	14:13-21	6:30-46	9:10-17	6:1-15
57	Jesus walks upon the water	Sea of Galilee	“	14:22-23	6:47-52		6:16-21
58	Heals many that are sick	Gennesaret	“	14:34-35	6:53-56		
59	Discourse - Bread of Life	Capernaum	“				6:22-71
60	Discourse – Unwashed Hands	Capernaum	April 29	15:1-20	7:1-23		
61	To Sidon + Syrophenician Woman's daughter	Region of Tyre & Sidon	Sumer 29	15:21-28	7:24-30		
62	Return through Decapolis, Miracles of healing	Decapolis	“	15:29-31	7:31-37		
63	Feeding the 4,000	“	“	15:32-39	8:1-10		
64	Demanding a sign warning	Capernaum	“	16:1-12	8:11-21		
65	Blind man healed	Bethsaida	“		8:22-26		
66	Peter's confession of faith	Near Cesaera Philipi	“	16:13-20	8:27-30	9:18-21	
67	Jesus' 1 st mention Death & Resurrection	“	“	16:21-28	8:31 – 9:1	9:22-27	
68	The Transfiguration	“	“	17:1-13	9:2-13	9:38-36	
69	Healing of Demoniac boy	“	“	17:14-21	9:14-29	9:37-43	
70	Foretells death & resurrection	Galilee	“	17:22-23	9:30-32	9:43-45	
71	Jesus & Children	Capernaum	“	18:1-14	9:13-50	9:46-50	
72	Discourse/ Parb - Forgiveness	“	“	18:15-35			
73	At Feast of Tabernacles	Jerusalem	Autumn 29				7:1 - 10:21
74	Discourse – Water of life	“	11-18 Oct 29				7:32-44
75	On light & freedom	“	“				8:12-59
76	On one born blind	“	“				9:1-39
77	The good shepherd	“	“				10:1-21
78	Return to Galilee	“	Autumn 29				
79	Final Departure from Galilee	Galilee	Nov, Dec 29	19:1	10:1	9:5	
80	The Mission of the 70	Perea	“				10:1-24
81	Parable of Good Samaritan	“	“				10:25-37
82	Discourse on prayer	“	“				11:1-13
83	Ans attacks of Pharisees	“	“				11:14-54

Vol 4 Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ.

84	Discr. - Great Moral Truths	“	“			12:1-59	
85	Discr- Galileans slain Healing on Sabbath Mustard Seed	“	“			13:1-35	
86	Guest of Mary & Martha	Bethany	“			10:38-42	
87	Feast of dedication	Jerusalem	20-27 Dec 29				10:22-39
88	Retires Beyond Jordan	Perea	Jan 30				10:40-42
89	Dines with Pharisee	“	“			14:1-14	
90	Parab- Great Supper	“	“			14:15-24	
91	Counting the Cost	“	“			14:25-35	
92	Parab- Lost Sheep, Silver	“	“			15:1-10	
93	Parab- Lost Son	“	“			15:11-32	
94	Parab- Unjust Steward	“	“			16:1-13	
95	Rich man & Lazarus	“	“			16:14-31	
96	Forgiveness & Faith	“	“			17:1-10	
97	Raising of Lazereth	Bethany	Feb 30				1:11-46

The 3rd Entry into Jerusalem, From Galilee to Calvary

	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
098	Jesus to Ephraim in N Judea	Ephraim	1-4 Abib				11:47-57
099	Healing 10 Lepers	Samaria	Mon 4 Abib			17:11-19	
100	Coming Kingdom	Jezreel?	Tue 5 Abib			17:20-37	
101	Discourse on Divorce		Thr 7 th	19:2-12	10:2-12		
102	Widow, Pharisee Publican	Tirzah?	Wed 6 Abib			18:1-14	
103	Christ blessing little children		Wed 6 th	19:13-15	10:13-16	18:15-17	
104	The rich young ruler		Wed 6 th	19:16-30	10:17-31	18:18-30	
105	Parable of vineyard laborers	Shilo?	Thr 7 Abib	20:1-16			
106	Foretold death and resurr.		Thr 7 th	20:17-19	10:32-34	18:31-34	
107	James and Johns Ambitions		Thr 7 th	20:20-28	10:35-45		
108	Healing 2 blind men	Jericho	Thr 7 th	20:29-34	10:46-82	18:35-43	
109	Zaccheus the publican		Thr 7 th			19:1-10	
110	Parable of pounds		Fri 8 Abib			19:11-28	
111	Jesus arrives at Bethany	Bethany	Fri 8 th				12:1
112	Anointing by Mary		Fri 8 th	26:6-13	14:3-9		12:2-9
112b	Plot to kill Jesus & Lazarus		Sat 9 Abib				12:10-11
113	Triumphal Entry		Sun 10 Abib	21:1-11	11:1-11	19:29-44	12:12-19

The Week of His Passion (Acts 1:3) 12th Abib - 13th Abib

	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
113	Triumphal Entry		Sun 10 Abib	21:1-11	11:1-11	19:29-40	12:12-19
113a	Jesus weeps over Jerusalem					19:41-44	
113b	Cleansing temple	Jerusalem	Sun 10 th Abib	21:12- 17		19:45-48	
114	Cursing the barren fig tree	Mt Olives	Mon 11 th Abib	21:18- 19	11:12-14		
115	Cleansing temple	Jerusalem	Mon 11 th		11:15-19		
116	Fig tree withered	Mt Olives	Tue 12 Abib	21:20- 22	11:20-26	(21:37- 38)	
117	Christ's Authority Questioned	Temple	Tue 12 th	21:23- 27	11:27-33	20:1-8	
118	Parable of 2 sons	Temple	Tue 12 th	21:28- 32			
119	Para of wicked husbandman	Temple	Tue 12 th	21:33- 46	12:1-12	20:9-19	
120	Para-Marriage of kings son	Temple	Tue 12 th	22:1-14			
121	Question of tribute	Temple	Tue 12 th	22:15- 22	12:13-17	20:20-26	
122	Sadducees ? Resurrection	Temple	Tue 12 th	22:23- 33	12:18-27	20:27-40	
123	Lawyer ? great command	Temple	Tue 12 th	22:34- 40	12:28-34		
124	What think ye of Christ	Temple	Tue 12 th	22:41- 46	12:35-37	20:41-44	
125	Woes to Scribes	Temple	Tue 12 th	23:1-36	12:38-40	20:45-47	
126	Lamentation over Jerusalem	Temple	Tue 12 th	23:37- 39			
127	Widows mite	Temple	Tue 12 th		12:41-44	21:3-4	
128	Greeks Seek Jesus	Temple	Tue 12 th				12:20-50
129	Prophecy of end of world	Mt Olives	Tue 12 th	24:1-51	13:1-37	21:5-36	
130	Parable of 10 Virgins	Me Olives	Tue 12 th	25:1-13			
131	Parable of Talents	Mt Olives	Tue 12 th	25:14- 30:			
132	Last Judgment	Mt Olives	Tue 12 th	25:31- 46			
133	Plotting of Rulers w Judas	Jerusalem	Tue 12 th	26:1- 5,14-16	14:1- 2,10-11	22:1-6	

Vol 4 Chapter 11 – Harmony of The Life of Christ.

	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
134	Jesus in retirement???	Bethany???	Added to	fit good fri	into errant	tradition!	
135	Preparation for Passover	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:17-19	14:12-16	22:7-13	22:7-13
136	Arrival at upper room	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:20	14:17	22:14	
137	Strife for prominence	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th			22:24-30	
138	Washing Feet	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th				13:1-20
139	Paschal Supper	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th			22:15-18	
140	Betrayer declared	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:21-25	14:18-21	22:21-23	13:21-35
141	Lords Supper Instituted	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:26-29	14:22-25	22:19-20	1Cor11:23-5
142	Peter's fall foretold	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th			22:31-38	13:36-38
143	Farewell Discourse	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th				14:-16
144	Prayer of Jesus	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th				17:1-26
145	Jesus and Peters confidence	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:30-35	14:26-31	22:39	18:1-3
146	Garden Gethsemane	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:36-46	14:32-42	22:40-46	
147	The Betrayal	Jerusalem	Wed 13 th	26:47-50	14:43-45	22:47,48	18:4-9
148	The Arrest	Jerusalem	Midnight	26:50-56	14:46-52	22:49-53	18:10-12
149	Jesus Led to Annas, Caiaphas	Jerusalem	Thr 14 th				18:13-15
150	Jesus before Caiaphas	Jerusalem	Thr 1-5am	26:57-58	14:53,54	22:54,55	18:19-24
151	Jesus before the Sanhedrin	Jerusalem	Thr 1-5am	26:59-66	14:55-64		
152	Denials of Peter		Thr 1-5am	26:69-75	14:66-72	22:56-62	18:15-27
153	Jesus Mocked		Thr 1-5am	26:67,68	14:65	22:63-65	
154	Sanhedrim Condemns Jesus		Thr 5-6am	27:1,2	15:1	22:66-71	
155	Condemned &		Thr 5-6			23:1	

A Systematic Theology for the 21st Century Volume 4 Christology

	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
	Blasphemed		am				
156	Death of Judas		Thr 5-6 am	27:3-10	Act 1:18-19		
157	Jesus before Pilot		Thr 5-6 am	27:11- 14	15:2-5	23:2-5	18:28-38
158	Jesus sent to Herod		Thr 5-6 am			23:6-12	
159	Pilot releases Barabbas		Thr 5-6 am	27:15- 23	15:6-14	23:13-23	18:38-40
160	Jesus condemned, scourged		Thr 5-6 am	27:26- 30	15:15-19	23:24,25	19:1-3
161	Pilot seeks to release Jesus		Thr 5-6 am	27:24- 25			19:4-16
162	Led away to crucifixion		Thr 9 am	27:31- 34,38	15:20,23 -28	23:26-32	19:16-18
163	The Superscription			27:37	15:26	23:38	19:19-22
164	1 st words Forgive them					23:33,34	
165	Soldiers cast lots			27:35- 36	15:24	23:34	19:23,24
166	Jews Mock			27:39- 44	15:29-32	23:35-37	
167	2 nd words to thief					23:39-43	
168	3 rd words Woman behold son						19:25-27
169	Darkness covers the land		Thr Noon	27:45	15:33	23:44,45	
170	4 th words Distress to God			27:46,4 7	15:34,35		
171	5 th words I thirst			27:48,4 9	15:36		19:28-29
172	6 th words It is finished						19:30
173	7 th words Into thy hands		Thr 3pm			23:46	
174	Death, Veil rent, Earthquake			27:50- 56	15:37-41	23:45-49	19:30
175	Spear pierces side						19:31-37
176	The burial, the watch	Garden	Thr 3-6 pm	27:57- 66	15:42-47	23:50-56	19:38-42

His Resurrection and Appearances

	<i>Events</i>	<i>Place</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Matt</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>John</i>
177	The Morning of Resurrection	Garden	Sun 17 Abib	28:2-4			
178	Women come to the sepulcher			28:1	16:1-4	24:1-2	20:1
179	Mary Magdalene tells Peter						20:2
180	The women at sepulcher			28:5-8	16:5-8	24:3-8	
181	Peter and John race to tomb					24:12	20:3-10
182	Jesus appears to Mary				16:9-11		20:11-18
183	Jesus appears to women			28:9,10		24:9-11	
184	Guard reports to priests			28:11-15			
185	Jesus on Road to Emaus				16:12-13	24:13-25	
186	Jesus appears to Peter				1Cor 15:5		
187	Appears to apostles - Thomas			1Cor 15:5	16:14	24:36-48	20:19-23
188	Appears to all the apostles		Sun 24 Abib				20:24-29
189	Jesus to seven in Galilee	Galilee	Sun 1 Zif				21:1-23
190	Appears to more than 500	Galilee	Sun 8 Zif	28:16-20	16:15-18	1Cor 15:6	
191	Jesus appears to James		Sun 15 Zif		1Cor 15:7		
192	He appears to all the apostles	Jerusalem	Sun 22 Zif	Act 1:1-8			
193	The Ascension	Bethany	Thur 26 Zif	Act 1:9-12	16:19	24:50-53	
194	Conclusions Mark, John				16:20		20:30-31
195	Epilogue of John						21:1-25
196	Holy spirit given, Pentecost	Jerusalem	Sun 6 Sivan	Act 2:1-11			
197	Jesus appears to Paul	Damascus	37 AD	Acts 22:6-16			
198	Jesus appears to John	Patmos	96 AD	Rev 1:9-20			
199	Our high priest in heaven				Heb 9:11-28		
200	Jesus reigns in new heaven				Rev 21:1-27		

Hebrews use a Lunar Calendar, not Solar Calendar. A lunar month is 29.53 days (29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 2.8 seconds) Thus every 5.7 years i.e. (365.25-360)/30, the Hebrews added a 30 day month to their year, they call it Adar-Sheini. (of course they did not do it every 5.7 years, they did it in the pattern 6665665665 because that averages to 5.7)

The Jewish calendar counts years from the creation of the world, which they place at 3761 BC. This Hebrew year, AM 5785, began Rosh Hashanah at sunset on Oct 2, 2024, and will end at sunset on Sep 22, 2025. (AM *Anno Mundi* or 'year of the world.' James Ussher gives 4004 BC as AM)

Approx		The Hebrew Calendar	
Month	Seq	Name (RSV Name)	Ref
April	1	Abib (Nisan)	Ex 34:18 (Esther 3:7)
May	2	Zif (Iyar)	1Kings 6:1,37
June	3	Sivan	Esther 8:9
July	4	Tammuz	Ezekiel 8:14
Aug	5	Ab (Av)	
September	6	Elul (Ellul)	Neh 6:15
October	7	Ethanim (Tishri)	1Kings 8:2
November	8	Bul (Marchesvan) (Cheshvan)	1Kings 6:38
December	9	Chisleu (Kislev)	Zech 7:1
January	10	Tebet (Tevet)	Esther 2:16
February	11	Shebat (Sebat) (Shvat)	Zech 1:7
March	12	Adar	Esther 3:7,13, Ezra 6:15
Added	13	Adar Sheini	Added 7 times in 19 years

Chapter 12 – Christology Conclusion.

Christology is such a prominent, perhaps preeminent, consideration in theology, that these hundred pages seem introductory, and the study of our Lord Jesus Christ will never be complete. One will not grow in the knowledge of God, without first growing in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. As Jesus puts it, “Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works’ sake. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father” (John 14:9-12).

When you read your Bible find Christ on every page. When you spend an hour in prayer, find him listening to every word. When you make your conversation with your neighbor, include him as a centerpiece. Make much of our Lord Jesus Christ, and he can make much of you. Again this study is but an introduction for the greatest study ever undertaken.

In the last verse of his Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Apostle John put it thus, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.... And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen" (John 20:30-31, 21:25)

Bibliography

The Holy Bible

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

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

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

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.[Lewis Sperry Chafer was an American

theologian. He founded and served as the first president of Dallas Theological Seminary, and was an influential founding member of modern Christian Dispensationalism. Born: February 27, 1871, Rock Creek, Died: August 22, 1952, Seattle, Education: Oberlin College, Wheaton College. For my Doctorate of Philosophy in Theological Studies through LBTS, I was tasked to analyze all six volumes of his Systematic Theology]

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

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

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

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

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

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

Geisler, Norman L, *Systematic Theology in One Volume*, Bethany House, 2002, 3, 4, 5, 11 [Geisler, also a neoevangelical, sharply contrasts with Lewis Sperry Chafer in that Geisler 1) admits what he is, neoevangelical, 2) admits what he is attempting, a compilation of evangelical theologies, 3) shows superb organization and structure of thought, 4) contains depth, and 5) is a masterful communicator. This author cannot endorse all that Geisler believes to be true, but can endorse that he seems to capture all that has been believed by conservative evangelicals.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

----- . *History of the Christian Church*. Third edition, revised in eight volumes, Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1910.

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

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

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

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

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

Thiessen, Henry Clarence, *Lectures in Systematic Theology*, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949. [Henry Clarence Thiessen, ? -1947, President of Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary,

later renamed John MacArthur's The Master's College].

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

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

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

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 AECF 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).