

KEY

ATR = Word Pictures in the New Testament (A.T. Robertson).

BAG = Bauer Arndt and Gingrich: A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.

Barclay = The Letters of James and Peter: Daily Study Bible Series (William Barclay).

Beisner = Jesus Only Churches (E. Calvin Beisner)

Boyd = Oneness Pentecostalism and the Trinity (Gregory Boyd).

Bullinger = Figures of Speech Used in the Bible (E.W. Bullinger).

Cook = Notes on Systematic Theology (W. Robert Cook).

Grudem = Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, 1 Peter (Wayne Grudem).

Grudem2 = Systematic Theology (Wayne Grudem).

Guthrie = New Testament Introduction (Donald Guthrie).

Expositors = The Expositor's Greek New Testament: Volume Five (W. Robertson Nicoll, Ed.).

Keener = The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament (Craig S. Keener).

Leighton = 1 & 2 Peter: The Crossway Classic Commentaries (Robert Leighton).

Lewis = Integrative Theology (Gordon Lewis and Bruce Demarest).

MacArthur = MacArthur New Testament Commentary: 1 Peter (John MacArthur).

Michaels = 1 Peter Word Biblical Commentary (J. Ramsey Michaels).

NLEKGNT = New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament.

Schreiner = The New American Commentary: 1, 2 Peter, Jude (Thomas R. Schreiner).

Shedd = Dogmatic Theology (W.G.T. Shedd), 3rd edition.

Turnbull = Proclaiming the New Testament: Volume 5 (Ralph Turnbull, Ed.).

Vincent = Vincent's Word Studies of the New Testament (Marvin R. Vincent).

White = The Forgotten Trinity (James White).

Wuest = First Peter in the Greek New Testament (Kenneth S. Wuest).

TRANSLATION AND OUTLINE OF 1 PETER 1:1-2

GREEK TEXT:

1 Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας, **2** κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ραντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

1 Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the chosen strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, 2 [chosen] according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, with the sanctification of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ and sprinkling with His blood. May grace and peace be multiplied to you.

TITLE(S): "Hope for the Hurting: An Introduction to 1 Peter" (Parts 1-2)
"Satisfaction in the Sovereign Source of Our Salvation" (Parts 1-2)

Outline for the Two-Part Introduction

Part One==>

- I. Hope for the Hurting: An Introduction to 1 Peter (1:1a)
 - A. The Author (who wrote 1 Peter?)
 - 1. Petrine Authorship
 - a. Modern Objections to Petrine Authorship
 - 2. Date of writing
 - 3. Place of writing
 - B. The Audience (to whom was 1 Peter written?)
 - C. The Atmosphere (what were the circumstances of the letter?)
 - D. The Abstract (a survey of what's in 1 Peter)

Part Two==>

- I. Hope for the Hurting: An Introduction to 1 Peter (1:1a)
 - A. The Author
 - 1. The Apostle P
 - a. Who was Peter?
 - b. What was an Apostle?
 - (1) Six reasons why we cannot have apostles today:
 - B. The Audience
 - 1. Pontus:
 - 2. Galatia:
 - 3. Cappadocia:
 - 4. Asia:
 - 5. Bithynia:

Outline for Three-Part Message on Verse 2

PASSAGE OUTLINE:

- I. Those of the Diaspora were Chosen:
 - A. According to the Foreknowledge of God the Father
 - B. With the Sanctification of the Spirit
 - C. For Obedience to Jesus Christ

- II. Those of the Diaspora are Addressed:
 - A. With Grace
 - B. With Peace

THEOLOGICAL OUTLINE:

- I. We are Chosen to Salvation and Hope
 - A. The Plan of the Triune God
 - 1. Chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father
 - 2. With the sanctification of Spirit
 - 3. For obedience to Jesus Christ
 - a. Double Metonymy: "Being Sprinkled with His Blood"

- II. The Opening Greeting: Grace and Peace Multiplied to You

SERMON OUTLINE:

- I. Hope in The Sovereign Source of Our Salvation (1:2)
 - A. Selected by the Father (1:2a)
 - B. Sanctified by the Spirit (1:2b)
 - C. Saved for Service by the Son (1:2c)

Additional Outline Point for Two-Part Message on the Trinity from Verse 2

D. Parenthesis: Satisfaction in the Trinity

- 1. What do we mean by the "Trinity?"**
 - a. Complex Definitions of the Trinity:**
 - b. Simple Definition of the Trinity:**

- 2. The Trinity in History**
 - a. A By-product of the deity of Jesus Christ**
 - b. Early Witnesses: Athenagoras and Tertullian**
 - c. Councils (Nicea and Carthage)**

3. Three Essential Elements of the Triunity of God (three pillars of the faith)

a. Pillar #1 - God is one as to Essence (God is One in Unity)

(1) A Unity in Plurality

b. Pillar #2 - God is Three as to Person (God is Three in Distinction)

(1) Texts

(a) Personality of the Father

(b) Personality of the Son

(c) Personality of the Holy Spirit

(2) Summary - God is Three in Distinction (not three manifestations)

(a) Introduction

(b) Distinctions of the Son and Spirit

c. Pillar #3 - Each Person is Fully God (God is Complete in Each Person)

(1) The Father is Fully God

(2) The Son is Fully God

(3) The Spirit is Fully God

(4) The Three Persons Work Together in Unity

(a) Implications as to Prayer

4. Pulling it all together: What do we mean by “Essence” and “Person” and how do these relate to each other in the unity of the Godhead

a. What We Mean

(1) Introduction

(2) Explanation

b. How do these relate to each other in the unity of the Godhead?

c. The Insufficiency of Analogies

(1) Best Illustration from History

d. Ontological Trinity vs. Economical Trinity

5. Hairsplitting or Heresy? (Arianism and Modalism and Confusion, Oh My!)

a. Arianism / Watchtowerism

b. Modalism (dynamic/modalistic/oneness)

6. The Contribution of John chapter 1

7. So What? What Difference Does It Make?

a. The Trinity is Essential Because:

(1) The Nature of God is at Stake

(2) The Nature of Jesus Christ is at Stake

(3) The Nature of the Gospel is at Stake

8. Why Should We Love and Embrace the Trinity?

a. Because This is Who God is!

b. Three Additional Thoughts:

- (1) Loving The Trinity Encourages our prayer**
- (2) Loving The Trinity Deepens our Fellowship**
- (3) Loving the Trinity Fuels our Worship**

PASSAGE SUBJECT/THEME (what is the passage talking about): The fact that we are chosen
PASSAGE COMPLEMENT/THRUST (what is the passage saying about what it's talking about):
According to the foreknowledge of the Father, with the sanctification of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ

PASSAGE MAIN IDEA (central proposition of the text): We are to rejoice in hope regardless of our circumstances because the Triune God has ordained us to eternal life.

PURPOSE OF THE SERMON (on the basis of the CPT what does God want us to learn and do?): To understand the sovereign glory of God in a way that gives Him the praise and gives us hope.

SERMON SUBJECT/THEME (what am I talking about): There is hope for the hurting in the sovereign workings of the Triune God.

SERMON COMPLEMENT/THRUST (what am I saying about what I am talking about): Hope is found in Electing Grace of the Father, the Sanctifying Grace of the Spirit, and the Saving Grace of the Son.

INITIAL CENTRAL PROPOSITION OF THE SERMON: Hope is found in Electing Grace of the Father, the Sanctifying Grace of the Spirit, and the Saving Grace of the Son.

MEMORABLE CENTRAL PROPOSITION OF THE SERMON: Our Hope is Found in the Electing Grace of the Father, the Sanctifying Grace of the Spirit, and the Saving Grace of the Son.

SERMONIC IDEA/TITLE: Satisfaction in the Sovereign Source of Our Salvation

CENTRAL PROPOSITION OF THE SERMON SERIES ON THE TRINITY:

Main idea for the series on the Trinity (three-fold):

If our Hope is Found in the Triune God then we must know and love Him in His Triunity.
If we must know and love Him in His Triunity then we must know about His Triunity.
If we must know and love Him in His Triunity then we must believe in His Triunity.

In short - True believers will love and embrace the Triune God in all His fulness.

INTRODUCTION TO 1 PETER

A. The Author (who wrote 1 Peter?)

1. Petrine Authorship

The opening verse claims that the letter was written by "Peter" - Particularly - (Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) - Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ. With this designation he clearly identifies himself as "The Apostle Peter."

a. Modern Objections to Petrine Authorship

If you were to compose a spurious letter in the 1st or 2nd c. there is no better name to use as a forgery than Peter's, and many did just that (Gospel of Peter; Apocalypse of Peter, etc.). However, there is no doubt that this letter has come to from the hand of The Apostle Peter. This was a universally accepted fact by the earliest Xns. Guthrie claims that the letter was considered canonical as early as the word had a meaning! One scholar writes that "the epistle has been well known and consistently acknowledged as Petrine from the second century well into modern times." [Michaels, xxxii]

We know that Clement of Rome used 1 Peter in his Epistle to the Corinthians (AD 96). Polycarp, a disciple of John, cited 1 Peter as well. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria (al late 2d c.) also. Eusebius says that Papias (who died around AD 130) quoted from 1 Peter. Eusebius also includes 1 Peter in his list of NT books that are universally accepted by the church (325). The earliest reference is the reference in 2 Peter (3:9) as "this second epistle" (a reference to 1 Peter).

There are many stylistic parallels to Peter's sermons in Acts, such as the teaching that Christ is the stone rejected by the builder (2:7-8, cf. Acts 4:10-11). That X is no respecter or persons (1:17, cf. Acts 10:34). Peter teaches the readers to "gird themselves w/humility" in 5:5 which is an echo of the Lord girding himself with a towel and washing the disciple's feet (John 13:3-5). The author claims to have been an eye-witness of the sufferings of Christ (5:1; 3:18; 4:1).

Why the doubts, then?

Some people make a living at raising doubts on the integrity of the Bible. They will find the most miniscule "evidence" that supposedly points in the direction of things not being what they're supposed to be.

Biggest argument that has come up against Peter being the author is the quality of the Greek in 1 Peter. Said that the Greek is too good for an unlearned fisherman. Pointing to the use of the word *αγραμματος* in Acts 4:13.

Could Peter have known Greek well enough to write 1 Peter?

The fact that he was "unlearned" doesn't mean he was illiterate. The word simply means that he was not formally trained in the rabbinic schools.

This does not mean that he was stupid. This letter was also written some 30 years after the account in Acts 2 (note the learning that can happen in that course of time). While Aramaic was the primary language in Palestine, there is evidence that Greek was widely used, as well, and that most Jews were bilingual with many knowing Greek as well as they knew Aramaic (note the use of the LXX which was the Bible of the Gentile churches). Some scholars believe that Peter's Greek was better than his Aramaic (Moulton and Howard, cited in Guthrie, 767). While the Greek is quite good, it's an overstatement to say that it's a literary masterpiece as far as style is concerned.

Greek was very common, even in and around Israel. This goes back to the conquests of Alex. the Great who conq. Palestine in 332 BC. With that came the "Hellenization" of the area (imposition of Greek language and culture). By the time Peter wrote there had been nearly 400 years of Hellenization. There were many Gk. cities in and around Israel. Joppa on the E. coast was a center of Gk. influence. The 10 Gk. cities (Decapolis) were nearby. Newer cities such as Caesarea, Antipatris, Sebaste, Neapolis, Tiberias, Caesarea Philippi were largely Greek cities.

In and around Jerus. 100s of Jewish ossuaries (stone coffins) have been excavated, dating from the 1st c. AD or earlier. One study of the inscriptions on these tombs showed that of a sample of 175 of them, 97 are in Hebrew or Aramaic, 64 in Greek, 14 bilingual. Signif. is that you would want the inscription on your tomb to be in a language common to you and those whom you knew.

Greek was the common language of Gentiles in Palestine as seen from a plaque unearthed in the 19th c. that stood at the entrance to the Temple in Jerusalem. It dated from before 70 AD (before destruction of Jerusalem). The inscription, warning all non-jews from entering beyond that point, was written only in Greek.

An inscription on a local synagogue form on the Ophel, the hill s. of the temple area in Jerusalem was written only in Greek:

"Theodotos, son of Vettenos, priest and archisynagogos [ruler of the synagogue], son of an archisynagogos, grandson of an archisynagogos, built the synagogue for the reading of the law and for the teaching of the commandments; furthermore, the hospice and the chambers, and the water installation for the lodging of needy strangers. The foundation stone thereof has been laid by his fathers, and the elders, and Simonides." [Grudem, 28]

It's significant that a memorial plaque on a Jewish synagogue in Jerusalem would only be written in Greek. That it commemorated the work of the ruler of the Syn. who was both a priest and the son and grandson of syn. rulers demonstrates how deeply the Greek lang. and culture had permeated Jerusalem - at or before the time of the NT.

Jewish hist. Josephus states that in his day "even slaves who so chose" could acquire fluency in Greek, and it was "common" to ordinary freemen. [Grudem, 29]

"There is greater readiness now than there was formerly to admit that Jesu and his disciples, all of whom were Galileans (Acts ii.7) were bilingual, speaking Greek as well as Aramaic" [A.W. Argyle, cited in Grudem, 30]

Note the example of Joseph Conrad (1857-1924). Conrad was an accomplished author whose native tongue was Polish. He learned French as a child. He began to learn English at the age of 21 when he signed on as a seaman aboard a British ship. His novel, Lord Jim is today acknowledged as a literary classic. No one says that

Joseph Conrad could not have written Lord Jim because it was written in excellent English and that language wasn't Conrad's native tongue. [example cited in Grudem, 31]

He may have used an amanuensis, Silas/Silvanus (5:12). Dictation was a common practice (cf. Rom. 16:22). Secretaries would often aid with style and grammar. In some cases the scribe would be given a bare outline to work with and the author would check over the work when it was completed. Note that Silas was a prophet and a Roman citizen (Acts 15:32, 16:37). He was well acquainted w/Apostle Paul being Paul's chosen associate on his Second Missionary Journey in Acts. He is associated with Paul in both of the Thess. epistles. While it is possible, it is not certain that Silas actually scribed the letter. He may have simply "carried it." - The phrase used in 5:12 (γραφω δια τινος) is nowhere else used of an amanuensis, however it is used of a carrier. Possible, but we don't know. It's also possible that Peter used an unnamed amanuensis.

Another objection is that the persecutions under Nero did not spread to the areas that Peter addresses (1:1b). Others say that Peter writes too much like Paul. However, the persecutions envisioned were not martyrdoms like those under Nero, but suffering of a general kind. Cf. 3:15 and context there.

Something happened on July 19, year of 64. The great fire of Rome broke out. Here was a city built w/high wooden structures that were engulfed w/flames. The fire burned 3 days and 3 nights, it was checked and then broke out again w/double the intensity. Was pretty much common knowledge who set the fire: Nero. He had a passion for building things (or having them built). The city was full and he wanted to start over. It was said that t/firemen of the day were being deliberately hindered in their work and whenever it looked like the fire was getting under control men were seen sneaking about rekindling it. [Barclay, 147]

After the devastation the people were enraged. Nero had to find a scapegoat. Who better than the Christians (sounding a little like today).

The Roman historian Tacitus records the story in his Annals:

“Neither human assistance in the shape of imperial gifts, nor attempts to appease the gods could remove the sinister report that the fire was due to Nero’s own orders. And, so, in the hope of dissipating the rumor, he falsely diverted the charge on to a set of people to whom the vulgar gave the name of Christians, and who were detested for the abominations they perpetrated. The founder of the sect, one Christus by name, had been executed by Pontius Pilate in the reign of Tiberius; and the dangerous superstition, though put down for the moment, broke out again, not only Judea, the original home of the pest, but even in Rome, where everything shameful and horrible collects and is practiced. [Barclay, 147]

1st c. Christians were distrusted. They were connected w/the Jews who weren’t very popular. The Lord’s Supper was viewed as a secret rite where people literally ate flesh and drank blood, and Xns spoke of a coming day when t/world would be destroyed in fire. Easy to see how they served as the perfect scapegoat. So, they were and a massive persecution ensued. Nero rolled Xns in pitch & lit them alive, allowing them to burn to ash as they lit his gardens. He had t/skins of wild animals sewed on them and then he set his guard dogs on them.

Again, Tacitus writes:

“Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed by crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burned, to serve as a

nightly illumination, when daylight had expired. Nero offered his gardens for the spectacle . . . “
[Barclay, 149]

Argued that this is someone trying to copy Paul. If that's true he's pretty stupid because he used Peter's name not Paul's!

Seriously - Parallels to Paul should be no surprise. Paul was the one who confronted Peter as recorded in Gal. 2. Peter, near the end of his life, was teaching w/Paul in Rome, and Silas, who was with Peter, was Paul's traveling companion & assistant for many years.

That Peter should reflect some of Paul is of no concern. Peter also has several parallels to James. All of these writers were led by t/same Spirit and knew much of t/same sort of common idioms that were in use in t/CH.

Fact is, when you read Peter you sense that you're not reading Paul, you are indeed reading Peter.

1 Peter shares many stylistic parallels to Peter's sermons in Acts, such as t/teaching that X is t/stone rejected by the builder has become the chief cornerstone (2:7-8, cf. Acts 4:10-11). That X is no respecter or persons (1:17, cf. Acts 10:34). Peter urges his readers to "gird themselves w/humility" in 5:5 which is a parallel to Jesus girding himself with a towel & washing the disciple's feet

Beyond that, the author claims to have been an eye-witness of the sufferings of Christ (5:1) which fits Peter's life as a witness to Jesus' rejection by men, suffering in the Garden of Gethsemane, and His trial

Some point out that 1 Peter is not found in the Muratorian Canon (the earliest list of the NT books which dates to t/end of 2d c.). However, the copy we have of the MT is corrupt (not complete). Copy/ies we do have don't mention James or Hebrews.

There's no reason other than a hunger and thirst for skepticism, to believe that the Apostle Peter was the one who wrote this letter.

2.Date of Writing

We believe that Peter was written during the reign of Nero, probably shortly after the death of Paul. This would give us a window of AD 62-65.

Peter had to have written after Paul left Rome in AD 62, since he doesn't mention Paul (1 Peter 5:12-13), and Paul doesn't mention Peter during his 1st Roman imprisonment when he writes the Prison Epistles. We also have to allow time for 2 Peter to be written (around AD 65 or 66). This would give us a date of somewhere between AD 63 and 64.

Before or shortly after July AD 64 when Nero torched the city of Rome. For a summary of a background consonant with Nero's burning of Rome and the ensuing persecution of Christians, see John MacArthur, The MacArthur Bible Handbook, 481]

3. Place of Writing

"Babylon" (5:13). Three locations suggested for "Babylon" - 1) A Roman outpost in N. Egypt (but too obscure

and no reason be believe that Peter was ever in that area); 2) Ancient Babylon in Mesopotamia (also a small, distant place and there's no reason to believe that Peter was ever there). "Babylon" as a code-name for Rome. This is most likely (cf. Rev. 16:19, 17:5, 18:2). Babylon served as a "code name" for the center of worldly power and opposition to God and his saints. That was Rome, especially under Nero. Parallel to the church as a new Israel, so to speak. As Babylon was to the Israel of the OT, so Rome was to the church of the new.

It has traditionally been held that Peter set up residence in Rome and also died there.

AD 203 - Tertullian wrote: "Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome from which there comes even into our own hands the very authority of the apostles themselves. How happy is its church, on which apostles poured forth all their doctrine along with their blood! Where Peter endures a passion like his Lord's! Where Paul is his crown in a death like John's! [cited in Grudem, 34]

Eusebius, writing in AD 325

"Peter seems to have preached to the Jews of the Dispersion in Pontus and Galatia and Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, and at the end he came to Rome and was crucified head downwards, for so he had demanded to suffer." [cited in Grudem, 35]

B. The Audience (to whom was 1 Peter written?)

They were largely Gentiles: No mention of the Law (something that always came up in the Jewish churches). 1:14, 4:3-4 fits Gentiles better than Jews. They were o/s of the Covenant (2:9-10).

αρεπιδήμιος (παρεπιδημιος - sojourning, sojourner, exile * Noun: Dat. Masc. Pl.). Dative of indirect object. Idea is one who lives alongside of someone else, a foreigner, a temporary resident. "The word emphasizes both alien nationality and temporary residents" [NLEKGNT]

διασποράς (διασπορα - dispersion * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place. Very Jewish word that Peter uses (cf. James 1:1). Whenever the Jews were dispersed (such as during the captivity to Babylon, Assyria, or even during NT times) there was always the connection back to the "homeland" of Israel and the Temple in Jerusalem. There was always the hope of regathering there. The dispersion was temporary, not permanent. Peter uses the same Jewish imagery and applies it to the church/believers who are scattered like salt t/o the world w/the hope and knowledge that this, too, is temporary and that there will be a "regathering" to a heavenly home. This is our hope, too. Hope for the suffering (then and now).

These were all Roman provinces in Asia Minor. The order here may have been the route that Silas (cf. chapter 5) took in delivering the letter.

"Years after Peter wrote this letter Pliny the Younger was put in charge of Bithynia and wrote to the Emperor Trajan concerning the Christians. He tried to make them recant by force and have them acknowledge the pagan gods, both down before the image of the emperor, and curse Christ. . . . He [wrote to the emperor for advice] 'It seems to me to be necessary to get advice, because many in every age group, every status of life, and both male and female are not in danger and will be in the future. This plague of superstition has spread over cities and over the fields and villages, but I believe that its advance can be stopped.'" [Pliny the Younger, Letters, Book 10, Letter 16]

Readers were a mixed group of Jews and Gentiles, mostly Gentiles (cf. 1:14,18; 2:9-10). The areas addressed were predominantly Gentile.

Petros was Greek.

C. The Atmosphere (what were the circumstances of the letter?)

They were suffering intense persecution (cf. 1:6; 2:12,19-21; 3:9,13-18; 4:1,12-16,19). Basic purpose was how to live well in the midst of hostility w/o losing hope or becoming bitter. They are to remember Jesus Christ who also suffered on their behalf (4:13-14, etc.).

D. The Abstract (a survey of what's in 1 Peter)

No theological controversy. Theme is Hope for the Hurting. Twin themes of Hurting and Hope.

Hope is in our salvation (1:1c-6a)	Hurting is only for a little while (1:6b, 5:10)
Hope results in joy (1:6a, 8-9)	Hurting was experienced by Jesus on our behalf (1:11, 2:21, 4:1)
Hope is why Jesus came for us (1:20-21)	Hurting believers are cared for by God (5:7)
Hope results in Holiness and Obedience (1:14-15)	Hurting is to be Expected (4:12)
Hope results in Love (1:22)	Hurting as a Christian is Noble (3:14, 4:14-15)

**Note the chiasmic structure of 1 Peter as illustrated by Bullinger (Figures of Speech Used in the Bible, 392]

*** Here's a summary of Bullinger's Illustration:**

A. (1:1-2) Epistolatory

B. (1:3-12) Introduction (thanksgiving, etc.)

C. (1:13-2:10) Exhortations (General) in view of the end and hope in the fiery trial

D. (2:11-4:16) Exhortations (Particular) as to suffering and glory

D. (4:1-9) Exhortations (Particular) as suffering and glory

C. (4:7-19) Exhortations (General) in view of the end as to joy in the fiery trial

B. (5:10-11) Conclusion (prayer, etc.)

A. (5:12-14) Epistolatory

EXEGETICAL NOTES ON 1 PETER 1:1

* EXEGESIS 1:1 *

GREEK TEXT:

Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας,

Πέτρος (Πετρος - Peter * Noun: Nom. Masc. Sing.). Nominative of Appellation.
ἀπόστολος (ἀποστολος - Apostle * Noun: Nom. Masc. Sing.). Independent Nominative (in a salutation).
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ἰησοῦς and Χριστος - Jesus Christ * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Gen. of possession.
ἐκλεκτοῖς (ἐκλεκτος - Elect, chosen * Adj.: Dat. Masc. Pl.). Attributive Adj. (modifies the noun it agrees with [παρεπιδήμοις] by giving it an additional quality or description.
παρεπιδήμοις (παρεπιδημος - sojourning, sojourner, exile * Noun: Dat. Masc. Pl.). Dative of indirect object.
διασπορᾶς (διασπορα - dispersion * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.
Πόντου, (Πόντυς - Pontus * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.
Γαλατίας, (Γαλατία - Galatia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.
Καππαδοκίας, (Καππαδοκία - Cappadocia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.
Ἀσίας (Ἀσία - Asia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.
καὶ Βιθυνίας, (Βιθυνία - Bithynia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the chosen strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia,

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

Peter, (Πέτρος)

The very first word of this letter, in the Greek as well as the English is "Peter".

PETER.

I. Early background

Peter's original name was apparently the Heb. Simeon (Acts 15:14; 2 Pet. 1:1): perhaps, like many Jews, he adopted also 'Simon', usual in the NT, as a Gk. name of similar sound. His father's name was Jonah (Mt. 16:17); he himself was married (Mk. 1:30), and in his missionary days his wife accompanied him (1 Cor. 9:5). The fourth Gospel gives *Beth-saida, just inside Gaulanitis, and a largely Gk. city, as his place of origin (Jn. 1:44), but he had also a home in Capernaum in Galilee (Mk. 1:21ff.). Both places were at the lakeside, where he worked as a fisherman, and in both there would be abundant contact with Gentiles. (His brother's name is Gk.) Simon spoke Aramaic with a strong N-country accent (Mk. 14:70), and maintained the piety and outlook of his people (*cf.* Acts 10:14), though not trained in the law (Acts 4:13; literacy is not in question). It is likely that he

was affected by John the Baptist's movement (*cf.* Acts 1:22): his brother Andrew was a disciple of John (Jn. 1:39f.).

II. Call

The Fourth Gospel describes a period of Christ's activity before the commencement of the Galilean ministry, and to this may be referred Peter's first introduction to him, by Andrew's agency (Jn. 1:41). This makes the response to the subsequent call by the lakeside (Mk. 1:16f.) more intelligible. The call to the intimate band of the Twelve followed (Mk. 3:16ff.).

It was as a disciple that Simon received his new title, the Aramaic *Kepha* ('Cephas'), 'rock' or 'stone' (1 Cor. 1:12; 15:5; Gal. 2:9), usually appearing in NT in the Gk. form *Petros*. According to Jn. 1:42, Jesus conferred this title (not known as a personal name previously) at their first encounter. John's usual designation is 'Simon Peter'. Mark calls him Simon up to 3:16, and Peter almost invariably thereafter. There is nothing in any case to suggest that the solemn words of Mt. 16:18 represented the first bestowal of the name.

III. Peter in the ministry of Jesus

Peter was one of the first disciples called; he always stands first in the lists of disciples; he was also one of the three who formed an inner circle round the Master (Mk. 5:37; 9:2; 14:33; *cf.* 13:3). His impulsive devotion is frequently portrayed (*cf.* Mt. 14:28; Mk. 14:29; Lk. 5:8; Jn. 21:7), and he acts as spokesman of the Twelve (Mt. 15:15; 18:21; Mk. 1:36f.; 8:29; 9:5; 10:28; 11:21; 14:29ff.; Lk. 5:5; 12:41). At the crisis near Caesarea Philippi he is the representative of the whole band: for the question is directed to them all (Mk. 8:27, 29), and all are included in the look that accompanies the subsequent reprimand (8:33).

On any satisfactory interpretation of Mk. 9:1 the transfiguration is intimately related to the apostolic confession which precedes it. The experience made a lasting impression on Peter: 1 Pet. 5:1; 2 Pet. 1:16ff. are most naturally interpreted of the transfiguration, and, for what they are worth, the *Apocalypse* and *Acts of Peter* (*New Testament Apocrypha) show that their authors associated the preaching of this subject with Peter.

In a measure, the disastrous boast of Mk. 14:29ff. is also representative of the disciples; and, as Peter's protestations of loyalty are the loudest, so his rejection of the Lord is the most explicit (Mk. 14:66ff.). He is, however, specially marked out by the message of the resurrection (Mk. 16:7), and personally receives a visitation of the risen Lord (Lk. 24:34; 1 Cor. 15:5).

IV. The commission of Peter

Mt. 16:18ff. is one of the most discussed passages of the NT. Rejection of the genuineness of the saying is arbitrary, and generally based on dogmatic assumptions (sometimes the assumption that Jesus never meant to found the church). Others have argued that the saying is genuine but displaced. Stauffer would see it as a resurrection commission, like Jn. 21:15; Cullmann would set it in a passion context, like Lk. 22:31f. Such reconstructions hardly do justice to the distinctiveness of Mt. 16:18ff. It is a benediction and a promise: the other passages are commands. We need not undervalue Mark's vivid account of the Caesarea Philippi incident, which concentrates attention on the disciples' failure to understand the nature of the Messiahship they have just confessed, to acknowledge that the 'rock' saying belongs to the occasion of the confession.

There is still no unanimity in interpreting the passage. The suggestion that 'rock' is simply a misunderstanding of a vocative 'Peter' in the underlying Aramaic (*SB*, 1, p. 732) is too facile: the passage has obviously something to do with the significance of Peter's name, which various Gospel sources show as having been solemnly bestowed by Jesus. From early times two main interpretations have been held, with many variants.

1. That the rock is substantially what Peter has said: either Peter's faith or the confession of the Messiahship of Jesus. This is a very early interpretation (*cf.* Origen, *in loc.*, 'Rock means every disciple of Christ'). It has the great merit of taking seriously the Matthean context, and emphasizing, as Mk. 8 does in a different way, the

immense significance of the Caesarea Philippi confession. In historical perspective we should probably see the rock as, not simply faith in Christ, but the apostolic confession of Christ, spoken of elsewhere as the foundation of the church (*cf.* Eph. 2:20). The ‘rock’ saying touches the core of the apostolic function, and Peter, first among the *apostles, has a name which proclaims it. That his own faith and understanding are as yet anything but exemplary is irrelevant: the church is to be built on the confession of the apostles.

2. That the rock is Peter himself. This is found almost as early as the other, for Tertullian and the bishop, whether Roman or Carthaginian, against whom he thundered in *De Pudicitia*, assume this, though with different inferences. Its strength lies in the fact that Mt. 16:19 is in the singular, and must be addressed directly to Peter even if, like Origen, we go on to say that to have Peter’s faith and virtues is to have Peter’s keys. Comparison might also be made with the Midrash on Is. 51:1. When God looked on Abraham who was to appear, he said, ‘Behold, I have found a rock on which I can build and base the world. Therefore he called Abraham a rock’ (*SB*, 1, p. 733).

Many Protestant interpreters, including notably Cullmann, take the latter view; but it is perhaps significant that he cuts the saying from the Matthean setting. To read it where Matthew places it is surer than to treat it as an isolated logion.

It must be stressed, however, that the exegesis of this point has nothing to do with the claims for the primacy of the Roman Church or its bishop with which it has through historical circumstances become involved. Even if it could be shown that Roman bishops are in any meaningful sense the successors of Peter (which it cannot), the passage does not allow for the transfer of its provisions to any successors whatever. It refers to the foundation of the church, which cannot be repeated.

The words that follow about the keys of the kingdom should be contrasted with Mt. 23:13. The Pharisees, for all their missionary propaganda, shut up the kingdom: Peter, recognizing the Son who is over the house and who holds the keys (*cf.* Rev. 1:18; 3:7; 21:25), finds them delivered to him (*cf.* Is. 22:22) to open the kingdom. (*Power of the Keys.) The ‘binding and loosing’, a phrase for which there are illuminating rabbinic parallels, is here addressed to Peter, but elsewhere is assigned to all the apostles (*cf.* Mt. 18:18). ‘The apostle would, in the coming Kingdom, be like a great scribe or Rabbi, who would deliver decisions on the basis, not of the Jewish law, but of the teaching of Jesus which ‘fulfilled’ it’ (A. H. McNeile, *in loc.*).

But that here and elsewhere a primacy among the apostles is ascribed to Peter is not in doubt. Lk. 22:31ff. shows the strategic position of Peter as seen by both the Lord and the devil and, in full knowledge of the approaching desertion, marks out his future pastoral function. The risen Lord reinforces this commission (Jn. 21:15ff.), and it is the Fourth Gospel, which demonstrates the peculiar relationship of the apostle John to Christ, that records it.

V. Peter in the apostolic church

The Acts shows the commission in exercise. Before Pentecost it is Peter who takes the lead in the community (Acts 1:15ff.); afterwards, he is the principal preacher (2:14ff.; 3:12ff.) the spokesman before the Jewish authorities (4:8ff.), the president in the administration of discipline (5:3ff.). Though the church as a whole made a deep impression on the community, it was to Peter in particular that supernatural powers were attributed (5:15). In Samaria, the church’s first mission field, the same leadership is exercised (8:14ff.).

Significantly also, he is the first apostle to be associated with the Gentile mission, and that by unmistakably providential means (10:1ff.; *cf.* 15:7ff.). This immediately brings criticism upon him (11:2ff.); and not for the last time. Gal. 2:11ff. gives us a glimpse of Peter at Antioch, the first church with a significant ex-pagan element, sharing table-fellowship with the Gentile converts, and then meeting a barrage of Jewish-Christian opposition, in the face of which he withdraws. This defection was roundly denounced by Paul; but there is no hint of any theological difference between them, and Paul’s complaint is rather the incompatibility of Peter’s practice with his theory. The old theory (revived by S. G. F. Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*, 1951), of persistent rivalry between Paul and Peter, has little basis in the documents.

Despite this lapse, the Gentile mission had no truer friend than Peter. Paul's gospel and his had the same content, though a somewhat different expression: the Petrine speeches in Acts, Mark's Gospel and 1 Peter have the same theology of the cross, rooted in the concept of Christ as the suffering Servant. He was ready with the right hand of fellowship, recognizing his mission to Jews and Paul's to Gentiles as part of the same ministry (Gal. 2:7ff.); and at the Jerusalem Council is recorded as the first to urge the full acceptance of the Gentiles on faith alone (Acts 15:7ff.).

Peter's career after the death of Stephen is hard to trace. The references to him in Joppa, Caesarea and elsewhere suggest that he undertook missionary work in Palestine (James no doubt now assuming leadership in Jerusalem). He was imprisoned in Jerusalem, and on his miraculous escape he left for 'another place' (Acts 12:17). Attempts to identify this place are fruitless. We know that he went to Antioch (Gal. 2:11ff.); he may have gone to Corinth, though probably not for long (1 Cor. 1:12). He is closely associated with Christians in N Asia Minor (1 Pet. 1:1), and possibly the prohibition on Paul's entry into Bithynia (Acts 16:7) was due to the fact that Peter was at work there.

Peter's residence in Rome has been disputed, but on insufficient grounds. 1 Peter was almost certainly written from there (1 Pet. 5:13; *Peter, First Epistle of). That book shows signs of being written just before or during the Neronian persecution, and *1 Clement 5* implies that, like Paul, he died in this outburst. Doubts cast on the interpretation of *1 Clement* (cf. M. Smith, *NTS* 9, 1960, pp. 86ff.) have little foundation. On the other hand, Cullmann's suggestion, based on the context in *1 Clement* and Paul's hints in Philippians of tensions in the church at Rome, that Peter, perhaps at Paul's request, came specifically to heal the breach, and that bitterness among Christians led to the death of both, is worth serious consideration. The story in the *Acts of Peter* of his martyrdom by crucifixion (cf. Jn. 21:18ff.) head downwards cannot be accepted as reliable, but this work (*New Testament Apocrypha) may preserve some valid traditions. Certainly these Acts, like other 2nd-century witnesses, emphasize the co-operation of the apostles in Rome.

Excavations in Rome have revealed an early cultus of Peter under St Peter's (cf. Eusebius, *EH* 2. 25): it is not safe to claim more for them. (*Peter, FIRST AND SECOND EPISTLES OF.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY. F. J. Foakes Jackson, *Peter, Prince of Apostles*, 1927; E. Stauffer, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 62, 1944, pp. 1ff. (cf. *New Testament Theology*, 1955, pp. 30ff.); O. Cullmann, *Peter: Disciple—Apostle—Martyr*², 1962; *JEH* 7, 1956, pp. 238f. (on excavations); J. Toynbee and J. Ward Perkins, *The Shrine of St. Peter and the Vatican Excavations*, 1956; H. Chadwick, *JTS* n.s. 8, 1957, pp. 31ff.; O. Karrer, *Peter and the Church*, 1963; R. E. Brown, K. P. Donfried, J. Reumann (eds.), *Peter in the New Testament*, 1973. A.F.W. [The New Bible Dictionary, Logos Bible Software]

Peter's brother Andrew introduced him to Jesus (John 1:40-42). They ran a fishing business on the Sea of Galilee (Matt. 4:18; Luke 5:1-3). They were originally from the village of Bethsaida (John 1:44), but later moved to Capernaum nearby (Mark 1:21,29).

Peter was the clear leader among the Apostles of Jesus Christ, specifically while Christ walked the earth prior to his crucifixion. Each list of apostles in the gospels lists the name of Peter first (Matt. 10; Mark 3; Luke 6). Also in Acts 1. The Gospel writers give us more information about Peter than any other person other than Jesus Christ.

He was a fisherman by trade, as were most of the disciples. He was married and his wife served as a partner in ministry (Mark 1:29-31; 1 Cor. 9:5). He was indeed married (cf. Jesus healing his mother in law, Luke 4:38-39).

Peter was called to follow Christ early in His ministry (Mark 1:16-17). He was appointed as an apostle (Matt. 10:2; Mark 3:14-16).

Peter was known as "Simon" (Greek) or "Simeon" (Hebrew) - cf. Mark 1:16; John 1:40-41. His father's name was Jonas/John (Matt. 16:17; John 1:42). Simon was a common name in 1st c. Palestine (8 other "Simons" mentioned in NT). Peter's full name was "Simon Barjona" (lit. Simon the son of Jonas or John).

His given name was "Simon" but who was given the name Cephas (Aramaic) which meant "stone". The Gk. is Petros or Peter which means "a detached but large fragment of rock" [Wuest, 13].

Jesus renamed him "Peter" (Greek - Πέτρος) or "Cephas" (Aramaic) - Meaning is "stone" or "rock" (John 1:42).

Interestingly, Peter is still called "Simon" in so-called neutral settings such as in reference to his home (Mark 1:29; Luke 4:38), in reference to his mother in law (Mark 1:30; Luke 4:38); his business (Luke 5:3,10). Significant that Peter is referred to as "Simon" during points of failure in his life, such as in Matthew 17:24-25; Mark 14:37; Luke 5:4-8, 22:31. After the resurrection, Jesus called him "Simon" for the last time. Tired of waiting for the appearance of the Lord, Peter decided to go fishing (John 21:3):

"Dutifully following their leader, the rest of the disciples said to him, 'We will also come with you' (v. 3). But those whom Jesus called to be fishers of men (Matt. 4:19) were not allowed to revert to being catchers of fish, 'and that night they caught nothing' (John 21:3). The next morning Jesus met the unsuccessful crew on the shore, where he prepared breakfast for them. Afterward, Jesus asked Peter three times, "Simon son of John, do you love me?" (John 21:15-17), and three times he affirmed his love for the Lord." [MacArthur, 5]

The point is that when Peter failed, it was usually because he was acting like an unregenerate person - the person whom he was before he met Jesus. Remember, it was J. who gave him a new name and that new name marked a change in Peter. No longer "Simon" he was to be Peter, the rock. Similar to us. We have been given a new name (Rev. 2:17). When you sin and fail you are acting like your old name, not your new name.

Sometime affectionately known as "The Apostle with the Foot-Shaped Mouth" (why we I.D. w/him so well!), Peter is well-known for his blunders. He was impulsive, outspoken, etc.

Transformation Peter-

The "Rock" began to live up to his name following Pentecost. After the resurrection and ascension of JC Peter became the leading spokesman for the early church. He initiated the replacement of Judas (Acts 1:15). He preached the first post-Pentecost sermon in Acts 2 with the result that 1000s came to believe in Christ for salvation. Confronted the Jewish leaders with boldness (4:8-20). Disciplined erring church members (Acts 5:1-11). He dominates the first half of the book of Acts up until the arrival of the Apostle Paul. Peter performed miracles. God used him to open the door of the gospel to the Samaritans (Acts 8) and the Gentiles (Acts 10). According to tradition, Peter had to watch as his wife was being crucified. He encouraged her with the words, "Remember the Lord." When it was his turn to mount the cross, he reportedly declared that he was unworthy to be crucified in the same manner as His Master, but should rather be crucified upside down, which, again according to tradition, he was sometime during AD 67 or 68. (Cf. John 21:18-19.)

On Matt. 16:18 - "Thayer quotes Schmidt as treating petros and petra as synonyms, petros meaning 'a detached but large fragment of rock,' petra 'the massive living rock.' The foundation of the Church of Jesus Christ is that massive living rock, the Son of God seen in His deity, acknowledge as such by Peter. Peter is but a fragment of that massive rock in the sense in which he speaks of believers as 'lively stones,' deriving their eternal life from the great Living Stone Himself (2:4-5)." [Wuest, 13]

"Yet the pronouncement can be read either seriously, as if to say, 'You are indeed a strong foundation,' or ironically, as if to say, 'Some rock you are!' The section as a whole favors the ironic reading. In a few short verses immediately following Simon's acknowledgment of Jesus as 'the Christ, the Son of the living God' (v. 16), Matthew employs a loosely chastic structure to lift 'Peter' up to a height of insight, only to bring him down to a depth of ignorance . . ." [Michaels, lv-lvi.] See Michaels page lvi. for the chastic pattern.

On the predicted death of Peter in John 21 see Michaels, lviii.

Go through high lights of Peter's life in the gospels and Acts (see sermon notes: 1PET02-1004)

an Apostle of Jesus Christ (ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)

ἀπόστολος (ἀποστολος - Apostle * Noun: Nom. Masc. Sing.). Independent Nominative (in a salutation). Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός - Jesus Christ * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Gen. of possession. From ἀπο (off) and στέλλο (to send).

An ἀπόστολος was an official rep. who was appt. and authorized by the sender (here Jesus Christ). Importance and uniqueness of Apostles is suggested by the fact that the phrase "of Jesus Christ" is attached to no other office in the NT. Nowhere do we find "Teachers of Jesus Christ" or "Prophets of Jesus Christ" or "Evangelists of Jesus Christ." NT Apostle was akin to the OT prophet; they could speak and write the very words of God (Acts 5:3-4; Rom. 2:16; 1 Cor. 2:13, 14:37; 2 Cor. 13:3; Gal. 1:8-9; 1 Thess. 2:13, 4:8,15; 2 Thess. 3:6,14; 2 Pet. 3:2). The NT was written by Apostles or by close associates of the Apostles. It was the Apostles whom the promises of John are directed (i.e. John 14:26, et al).

αποστολος lit. "a messenger" or "one sent out on a mission"

Two uses of term in NT (office & function)

In sense of function, we could use "apostolos" in a contemporary setting. A Christian missionary is an "apostolos" - a messenger ==>

Rom. 16:7 Greet Andronicus and Junias, my kinsmen, and my fellow prisoners, who are outstanding among the apostles, who also were in Christ before me.

2 Cor. 8:23 As for Titus, he is my partner and fellow worker among you; as for our brethren, they are messengers (αποστολος) of the churches, a glory to Christ.

PHI 2:25 But I thought it necessary to send to you Epaphroditus, my brother and fellow worker and fellow soldier, who is also your messenger (αποστολος) and minister to my need;

That's being an apostle in gen. sense of function - a messenger. Paul means much more than that here. He's referring to himself in sense of office. There were only 13 in history of CH (orig. 12 minus Judas, Matthias,&

Paul)

In the sense of "office" Apostles were unique to 1st c.

There are some groups that claim to have apostles in sense of "office" today, many charis./pent. & mormons among them. Some1 showed me a baptism cert. other day from a pent. CH which was signed by the pastor who designated himself as an apostle. That's nothing less than dangerous. We don't have apostles today. "Tony, How do you know?" 6 reasons==>

1. The church was founded by the Apostles (Eph. 2:19-20)==>

19 So then you are no longer strangers and aliens, but you are fellow citizens with the saints, and are of God's household, 20 having been built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus Himself being the corner stone,

2. An Apostle had to be an eyewitness of the resurrection (Acts 1:22; 1 Cor. 9:1) ==>

1 Cor. 9:1 Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?

3. An apostle had to be personally chosen by Jesus Christ (Acts 1:24-25)

Something Paul alludes to constantly in his letters (for example read Gal 1)

4. Apostles were authenticated by miracles (2 Cor. 12:11-12)

11 . . . for in no respect was I inferior to the most eminent apostles, even though I am a nobody. 12 The signs of a true apostle were performed among you with all perseverance, by signs and wonders and miracles.

5. Apostles held absolute authority (1 Cor. 5:3-5; Philemon 1:8; Jude 17)

Absolute in the sense that they had the ability to speak and write on behalf of God in an inerrant way. You can see the danger of some1 maintaining that gift today. God's Word is complete. Chaos.

6. Apostles have an eternal and unique place of honor (Rev. 21:14)

And the wall of the city had twelve foundation stones, and on them were the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb - cf. Matt. 19:28.

to the chosen strangers, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia,
(ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας καὶ Βιθυνίας,)

Address different translations and the twice use of chosen/elect by the NIV==>

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who reside as aliens, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, who are chosen 2 according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, [1:1-2a, NASB]

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, To God's elect, strangers in the world, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, 2 who have been chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, [1:1-2a, NIV]

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 2 Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, [1:1-2a, KJV]

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, To the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 2 chosen and destined by God the Father [1:1-2a, RSV]

ἐκλεκτοῖς (ἐκλεκτός - Elect, chosen * Adj.: Dat. Masc. Pl.). Attributive Adj. (modifies the noun it agrees with [παρεπιδήμοις] by giving it an additional quality or description.

No where else in Jewish or Xn lit. do we find the word "strangers" qualified by the word "chosen." The word ἐκλεκτός is used in NT 22 times. It always refers to persons chosen by God from a larger group. Chosen to be something - to be included among God's people (cf. Mat. 20:16; 24:31; Rom. 8:33).

"But in the Greek text 'chosen' is merely an adjective ('chosen sojourners'), and is nine words distant from this phrase. Since verse 1 contains no verb, it is most natural to let 'according to the foreknowledge of God the Father' modify the whole situation of the readers described in the first verse: they are chosen sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, etc., according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.' This implies that their status as sojourners, their privileges as God's chosen people, even their hostile environment in Pontus, Galatia, etc, were all known by God before the world began, all came about in accordance with His foreknowledge, and thus (we may conclude) all were in accordance with this fatherly love for his own people. Such foreknowledge is laden with comfort for Peter's readers." [Grudem, 50]

παρεπιδήμοις (παρεπιδημος - sojourning, sojourner, exile * Noun: Dat. Masc. Pl.). Dative of indirect object. Idea is one who lives alongside of someone else, a foreigner, a temporary resident. "The word emphasizes both alien nationality and temporary residents" [NLEKGNT]

παρεπίδημος, ον (Polyb. 32, 6, 4; Athen. 5 p. 196A; Dit., Or. 383, 150; PPetr. I 19, 22 [225 BC]; III 7, 15; LXX.—Dssm., B 146f [BS 149]) *staying* for a while in a strange place, *sojourning* in our lit. subst. οJ παρεπιδημο" *stranger, exile, sojourner, resident alien* of the Christians, who are not at home in this world ἐκλεκτοὶ π. *chosen exiles* 1 Pt 1:1. (w. πάροικοι [cf. Gen 23:4; Ps 38:13] 2:11. (W. ξένοι) π. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *exiles on the earth* Hb 11:13 (cf. Ps.-Pla., Axioch. 365b παρεπιδημία τίς ἐστὶν ὁ βίος.—MMeister, De Axioho Dial., Diss. Breslau '15, 86ff). M-M.* [BAG]

The English word "strangers" (or "aliens") has the idea of someone with whom we are not acquainted, or people in a foreign place. But the Gk. word really goes beyond that. The word is made up of para (along side of) + ἐπι (upon) + δέμος (used in Biblical Gk. of the people of a pagan city. Think about it. The description is of God's chosen people who have settled in alongside of those who are not God's chosen people. Note the same use in 2:11.

God's people are not of this world. We are pilgrims, sojourners, aliens, exiles, strangers. Cf. 1 John and our relationship to the world. Also James. "The church is God's suffering people, having no place of rest in this world." [Schreiner, 50]

This word is used only here and in 2:11 and Hebrews 11:13. In the LXX it is used in Gen. 23:4; Ps. 38:13. We were chosen to be strangers. God's choice of us is both the reason and the result of our being aliens. Why you can't be a "worldly Xn". We have been plucked out of this world and have been given citizenship in heaven.

διασπορᾶς (διασπορα - dispersion * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place. Lit. (δια (through) and σπορα (a scattering of seed). Engl. word "dispersion" comes from this Gk. word.

Used in the LXX in Deut. 28:25. Also used in John 7:35 and James 1:1.

Very Jewish word that Peter uses (cf. James 1:1). Whenever the Jews were dispersed (such as during the captivity to Babylon, Assyria, or even during NT times) there was always the connection back to the "homeland" of Israel and the Temple in Jerusalem. There was always the hope of regathering there. The dispersion was temporary, not permanent. Peter uses the same Jewish imagery and applies it to the church/believers who are scattered like salt t/o the world w/the hope and knowledge that this, too, is temporary and that there will be a "regathering" to a heavenly home. This is our hope, too. Hope for the suffering (then and now).

Interesting that this three-fold title (elect, sojourners, dispersion) is very Jewish. Yet Peter writes largely to Gentiles. Gentiles who were thought by many of t/Jews to be o/s of God's scope of mercy. One ancient saying was that "God created the Gentiles to be fuel for the fires of Hell" and another said that "just as the best of the snakes must be crushed, so also the best of the Gentiles must be destroyed." [Barclay, 165]

The idea of national election was common to Israel: Deut. 7:6, 14:2; Isa. 45:4; Psa. 105:6,43.

The idea of dispersion was a technical term for the Jews scattered in exile o/s of the national land of Palestine. Sometimes they were deported, as 586 and 722 BC (Babylon and Assyria). Sometimes they were simply displaced of their own doing (James 1:1). Peter takes these very Jewish terms and uses them of a Gentile-Jewish church - the church now scattered through the different provinces of the Rom. Empire. Hebrews 13:14.

Note the future gathering of the scattered in Mark 13:26-27, cf. Deut. 30:4).

All areas south of the Black Sea. Actually 4 Roman Provinces.

Πόντου, (Πόντυς - Pontus * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.

Pontus was far N. Jewish travelers from Pontus were in Jerusalem during spect. events of Pent. in Acts 2 (v. 9). This province was also the home of Aquila, the Jew who with his wife Priscilla came to faith in X while in Rome and subsequently ministered with Paul (Acts 18:18).

Γαλατίας, (Γαλατία - Galatia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.

Galatia was in central Asia Minor and contained the towns of Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium where Paul ministered several times (cf. Acts 14:1-13, 16:1-5, 18:23).

Καππαδοκίας, (Καππαδοκία - Cappadocia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.

Cappadocia was in the E. portion of Asia Minor, N. of Cilicia and is also mentioned in Acts 2:9.

Ἀσίας (Ἀσία - Asia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.

Asia (not the continent as we know it today, but a single province E. of the Aegean Sea). It was an independent K.D. whose last king, Attalus the Third, gave it to Rome as a gift in 133 B.C. Asia included most of W. Asia Minor and contained such subdivisions as Mysia, Lydia, Caria, and much of Phrygia. This province was also the site of extensive ministry by Paul on this 3rd Mission. Jmny - Acts 19:10 says, "all who lived in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks."

καὶ Βιθυνίας, (Βιθυνία - Bithynia * Noun: Gen. Fem. Sing.). Adverbial Gen. of place.

Pontus and Bithynia were two regions that composed a single province known as "Pontus & Bithynia."

Bithynia was located in N. Asia Minor near the Bosphorus, the strait separating the European and Asian sections of modern Turkey. This is where Paul was forbidden to go (Acts 16:7).

This letter had a wide circulation (encyclical letter). In each of these 5 areas there were many churches. For example, there are 7 CHs in Asia Minor that are mentioned in the first section of the book of Revelation: Ephesus, Smyran, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea. Other places were notable, such as Colossae.

Covers an area of some 300,000 miles.

Peter addresses such a wide audience because the Roman persecution of believers had and was going to sweep across the Empire. Believers all over were going to suffer (cf. Luke 21:12; Phil. 1:29; James 1:1-3). Peter begins by reminding these suffering believers that even though they are suffering, they are to remember that they are God's chosen people and as such there is hope. Suffering is only for a little while. (cf. 4:13,16,19; Rom. 8:35-39; 2 Tim. 3:11; Heb. 10:34-36).

These were all Roman provinces in Asia Minor, now in modern Turkey. The order here may have been the route that Silas (cf. chapter 5) took in delivering the letter. Paul ministered in parts of Galatia and Asia. No record of Paul ministering in Pontus, Cappadocia, or Bithynia. Paul was, in fact, forbidden to enter Bithynia (Acts 16:7). Of course, there were lots of converts of Paul and those converted during Pentecost who may have founded the churches mentioned here.

Route ==> From Pontus Silas would have traveled to Galatia, then through Zela to Caesarea in Cappadocia, then westward on the great trade route which went thru S. Galatia (passing thru the Pauline churches of Iconium and Pisidian Antich), then to Laodicea in Asia - perhaps to other churches in Asia (Colossae/Ephesus) and finally on to Bithynia and the churches there (Nicaea, Nicomedia, Chaledon). From there Silas would then have boarded a ship to Rome. Perhaps Silas traveled to Pontus first because the persecution was worse there?

"Years after Peter wrote this letter Pliny the Younger was put in charge of Bithynia and wrote to the Emperor Trajan concerning the Christians. He tried to make them recant by force and have them acknowledge the pagan gods, both down before the image of the emperor, and curse Christ. . . . He [wrote to the emperor for advice] 'It seems to me to be necessary to get advice, because many in every

age group, every status of life, and both male and female are not in danger and will be in the future. This plague of superstition has spread over cities and over the fields and villages, but I believe that its advance can be stopped." [Pliny the Younger, Letters, Book 10, Letter 16]

They were suffering intense persecution (cf. 1:6; 2:12,19-21; 3:9,13-18; 4:1,12-16,19). Basic purpose was how to live well in the midst of hostility w/o losing hope or becoming bitter. They are to remember Jesus Christ who also suffered on their behalf (4:13-14, etc.).

* EXEGESIS 1:2 *

GREEK TEXT:

κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ραντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.

κατὰ πρόγνωσιν (πρόγνωσις - foreknowledge * Noun: Accus. Fem. Sing.).

θεοῦ (θεός * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Subjective Gen. with a noun of action (foreknowledge). The word produces the action implied by the noun of action.

πατρὸς (πατήρ * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Nom. of Appellation.

ἐν ἀγιασμῷ (ἀγιασμός - holiness, sanctification * Noun: Dat. Masc. Sing.). Dative/Instrumental of Assoc.

πνεύματος (πνεῦμα * Noun: Gen. Neut. Sing.). Gen./Ablative of source. Subj. Gen. according to Expositors.

εἰς ὑπακοὴν (ὑπακοή - obedience * Noun: Accus. Fem. Sing.). Accus. of purpose.

καὶ ραντισμὸν (ραντισμός - sprinkling * Noun: Accus. Masc. Sing.). Accus. of ?????

αἵματος (αἷμα - blood * Noun: Gen. Neut. Sing.). Gen. of possession.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Objective Gen. with a noun of action (obedience). Objective Gen. receives the action produced by the noun of action.

χάρις (χάρις * Noun: Nom. Fem. Sing.). Independent Nom. in a salutation.

ὑμῖν (σύ - to or for you * Pronoun: 2PP Indep. PPN. Dat.).

καὶ εἰρήνη (εἰρήνη * Noun: Nom. Fem. Sing.). Independent Nom. in a salutation.

πληθυνθείη. (πληθυνω - increase, multiplied * Verb: Aor. Optative Passive). Voluntary Optative in an independent or main clause. Commonly used to express a wish or a prayer. "The optative could be looked upon as a weakened subjunctive. The subjunctive is the mood of probability, the optative of possibility. The subjunctive expresses action which is objectively possible, the optative that which is subjectively possible. The optative is a step further removed from reality than the subjunctive. The assertion made by the optative is more doubtful than that of the subjunctive. It is reduced to the level of a wish." [Brooks and Winberry, Greek Syntax, 124]

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

[chosen] according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, with the sanctification of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ and sprinkling with His blood. May grace and peace be multiplied to you.

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

[chosen] according to the foreknowledge of God the Father (κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς)

κατὰ πρόγνωσιν (πρόγνωσις - foreknowledge * Noun: Accus. Fem. Sing.).

This particular word is only used 2x in NT - the other use is in Peter's sermon in Acts 2:23. Petrine word.

As to foreknowledge in relationship to believers, John Gill writes: "This regards the everlasting love of God to his own people, his delight in them, and approbation of them; in this sense he knew them, he foreknew them from everlasting, affectionately loved them, and took infinite delight and pleasure in them." [cited in The Grace of God and the Bondage of the Will, 319] Cf. the song, "When he was on the cross I was on his mind."

Note that faith is not in mind here (faith isn't the object of the foreknowing; it never is!). Look at how Peter uses the verb form a little later in the same chapter:

"For He was foreknown before the foundation of the world but has become appeared in these last times for the sake of you."

Note that the eternal trinity was involved in the process!

Contra foreordination: "I affirm that God has a true foreknowledge of future free-will choices without himself being the agent that causes them or renders them certain." cited in Grudem, Systematic Theology, 348]

There's no such thing as "God looking ahead" because there is no "ahead" with God. God is omniscient which means that he knows all things at once. Shedd says that "The infinite mind comprehends all things in one simultaneous intuition, and, consequently, there is for it no 'before or 'after.' Charnock (God's Knowledge), "God considers all things in his own simple knowledge as if they were now acted; and therefore some have chosen to call the knowledge of things to come, not prescience or foreknowledge, but knowledge; because God sees all things at one instant.

Augustine: "But what is future to God? For, if divine knowledge includes all things at one instant, all things are present to him and there is nothing future; and this knowledge is knowledge and not foreknowledge." [Concerning Diverse Questions, 2.2.2].

Note 2 Tim. 2:19 - "The Lord KNOWS them that are His." (also John "I know them (sheep)").

"When applied to God's knowledge of persons (whether of Jesus or his people), 'foreknowledge' is more than mere prescience, it involves choice or determination as well . . ." [Michaels, 10]

The word "know" used in the OT (remember the "Jewishness" of Peter's words) often has covenantal ramifications. Cf. the Hebrew word as it's used in Gen. 18:19; Jer. 1:5; Amos 3:2).

"The rich associations of that term continue into the New Testament. That foreordination also is involved is clear from Acts 2:23, where foreknowledge is paired with predestination. Romans 11:2 drives us in the same direction. Paul queries whether God has 'rejected his people whom he foreknew' (NRSV). The terms 'rejected' (apostatō) and 'foreknew' (proegnō) function as antonyms. We could rephrase the verse, 'Has God rejected his people whom he chose?'" [Schreiner, 55]

Note 1:20 as it's related to Christ and the fact that it was in the "fulness of time" that God "sent" the Son (so Galatians). One cannot say that God looked ahead when it was something that He predestined and cause to

happen (cf. Acts 2:23 and passage that speaks of Christ being slain from before foundation of the world).

"I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to him."
[Martin Luther, cited in Barclay, 169] This is what we call "inability."

On Acts 2:23, Wuest writes: "The first time the noun form *prognosin* is found in in Acts 2:23, where it is used in the clause 'him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.' The words 'counsel' and 'foreknowledge' are in a Greek construction which makes both words refer here to the same act, presenting that act in its two aspects." [Wuest, 15-16]

πατὴρ (πατήρ * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Nom. of Appellation. The tender fatherhood of God was actively involved. Adds to the concept of hope.

Note the election of Israel: Deut. 7:6, 14:2; Psa. 105:43, 135:4. Cf. Eph. 1:11; 2 Thess. 2:13; John 15:16; Rom. 8:29-30; 1 Cor. 1:27; Eph. 1:4-5, 2:10; Col. 3:12; 1 Thess. 1:4; Titus 1:1; Acts 13:46-49. Also the book of life which existed from before the foundation of the world (Rev. 13:8, 17:8, etc.). Cf. my witness as a new Christian using this point.

"From eternity past, God has had a large body of believers in mind whom He chose to love (1 John 4:10...), to save from their sin (Eph. 2:1-5...), and conform to the image of His Son (Rom. 8:29...). And each one of those names, from every nationality and every era of history, God specifically secured in eternal purpose before the world began." [MacArthur, 17-18]

Address different translations and the twice use of chosen/elect by the NIV==>

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who reside as aliens, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, who are chosen 2 according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, [1:1-2a, NASB]

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, To God's elect, strangers in the world, scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, 2 who have been chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, [1:1-2a, NIV]

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 2Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, [1:1-2a, KJV]

Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, To the exiles of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, 2 chosen and destined by God the Father [1:1-2a, RSV]

Verse 1 in the Greek Text==>

ἐκλεκτοῖς (ἐκλεκτός - Elect, chosen * Adj.: Dat. Masc. Pl.). Attributive Adj. (modifies the noun it agrees with [παρεπιδήμοις] by giving it an additional quality or description.

No where else in Jewish or Xn lit. do we find the word "strangers" qualified by the word "chosen." The word ἐκλεκτός is used in NT 22 times. It always refers to persons chosen by God from a larger group. Chosen to be something - to be included among God's people (cf. Mat. 20:16; 24:31; Rom. 8:33).

"But in the Greek text 'chosen' is merely an adjective ('chosen sojourners'), and is nine words distant from this phrase. Since verse 1 contains no verb, it is most natural to let 'according to the foreknowledge of God the Father' modify the whole situation of the readers described in the first verse: they are chosen sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, etc., according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.' This implies that their status as sojourners, their privileges as God's chosen people, even their hostile environment in Pontus, Galatia, etc, were all known by God before the world began, all came about in accordance with His foreknowledge, and thus (we may conclude) all were in accordance with this fatherly love for his own people. Such foreknowledge is laden with comfort for Peter's readers." [Grudem, 50]

Therefore, it may be that the idea of foreknowledge modifies the entire situation of verse 1, focusing on the election of the sojourners as well as their situation in life (that they have been dispersed, their suffering, that they are strangers, etc.).

23 Nouns in these two verses. One adjective in v. 1 (ἐκλεκτοῖς). There's really only one verb and that's in a completely different sentence - the benediction at the end of verse 2 (πληθυνθείη). Tough sentence to deal with. We really have one major sentence in this passage and that sentence has 21 nouns, one adjective and no verbs. Make your English teacher shudder! Obv. we're dealing with 1st c. Koine where you have nouns that function adverbally & prep. and pronouns which give verbal ideas.

"Sheep Shudder" ("Thaaaatss, nooooot fairrrrrrrrr")

This paper will attempt to briefly analyze the theological meaning of God's foreknowledge, especially as to how God's foreknowledge relates to His decree. The format that the writer will utilize to outline this study will follow a grammatical, biblical, theological, and applicational analysis of the term "foreknowledge."

Introduction

Traditionally, the debate over the meaning of God's foreknowledge is a consequence of the debate between Calvinists and Arminians over predestination; especially as it relates to the doctrine of election. For example, Calvinists hold to the position that God's foreknowledge is *causative*; what God decrees He foreknows. Cook explains:

In biblical usage the two concepts [foreknowledge and predestination] are sequential only in that foreknowledge points to initiating cause, namely, God's love in His choice, while predestination points to the willing act which determines the destiny or outcome.¹

Arminians, on the other hand, view God's foreknowledge as simple prescience, akin to His omniscience. In relating foreknowledge to election, one Arminian author states:

having set forth these conditions for being in Christ, God foreknows from the beginning who will and

¹W. Robert Cook, A Systematic Theology in Outline Form. (Portland: copyright by author, 1990), 164.

who will not meet them. Those whom He foresees as meeting them are predestined to salvation.²

Therefore, according to the Arminian doctrine, foreknowledge is simply God's knowing future events apart from His having a causative relationship to them.³

Grammatical Analysis

The Greek words translated "foreknow" and "foreknowledge" are the verb *progino_sko_* and the noun *progno_sis*.⁴ The verb has the basic meaning of "to know beforehand," "to know in advance;" and the noun simply means "foreknowledge."⁵

The Septuagint uses the verb *progino_sko_* and the noun *progno_sis* apart from any Hebrew equivalent.⁶ The verb is attested three times (Wisdom 6:13, 8:8, 18:6), while the noun is used only twice (Judith 9:6, 11:19).⁷

While Septuagint usage does allow for prescience when used of inanimate objects (Wisdom 6:13), when used of God the usage is clearly connected with His decree:

Yea what things Thou didst determine were ready at hand, and said, Lo we are here: for all Thy ways are prepared, and Thy judgements are in Thy foreknowledge. (Judith 9:6)

Biblical Analysis

The verb *progino_sko_* is used five times in the New Testament (Romans 8:29, 11:2; Acts 26:5; 1 Peter 1:20; 2 Peter 3:17), while the noun *progno_sis* is attested twice (Acts 2:23; 1 Peter 1:2).

In Romans 8:29, foreknowledge is explicitly connected with God's decree:

For whom He foreknew, He also predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren. (NASB)

Romans 11:2 refers to God's people Israel whom He "foreknew." It is obvious from the context that this means

²Jack W. Cottrell, "Conditional Election," in Grace Unlimited, ed. Clark H. Pinnock (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1975), 61.

³This view, as it relates to election, is primarily based upon two New Testament passages: Romans 8:29 and 1 Peter 1:2.

⁴These words are comprised of the prefix *pro* (before) with the verb or noun *gino_sko_* /*gno_sis* (to know/know).

⁵Colin Brown, ed., The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corporation, 1986), vol. 1, Foreknowledge, by P. Jacobs and H. Krienke, 692.

⁶*Ibid.*, 692.

⁷Judith 9:6 is clearly a reference to God's foreknowledge as related to His decree.

more than prescience. In Acts 26:5, Paul, in his defense before Festus and Agrippa, discusses his own life and the fact that all the Jews have known (*progino_sko_*) him for a long time (i.e. personal knowledge). Acts 2:23 and 1 Peter 1:20 attribute God's foreknowledge to the mission of Christ. Cook comments:

God not only knew ahead of time that Christ would be the lamb (a concept that is self-evident and tautological), he determined it. No other interpretation of [foreknowledge] makes sense . . .⁸

1 Peter 1:2 relates to God's election of individual believers "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, by the sanctifying work of the Spirit." Commenting on this verse, C. Samuel Storms writes:

The first thing that strikes me about the Arminian interpretation of this verse is the utter absence of any reference to faith or free-will as that which God allegedly foreknows or foresees in men.⁹

Storms goes on to say:

Thus to "foreknow" on God's part means to "forelove." That God foreknew us is another way of saying that He set His gracious and merciful regard upon us, that He knew us from eternity past with a sovereign and distinguishing delight.¹⁰

The Greek word *gno_sis*, and its cognates, appears to have its background in the Hebrew word *ya_da*.¹¹ The Hebrew term refers to knowing with experience or intimacy. For example, it is used of sexual union (Genesis 4:1, 19:8); of personal acquaintance (Genesis 29:5; Exodus 1:8); of knowing good from evil (Genesis 3:5,22); and of knowing the true God (1 Samuel 2:12-3:7; Jeremiah 3:22).¹² Both *gno_sis* and *gino_sko_* have parallel meanings to those of *ya_da*.

In Matthew 1:25, the statement "he kept her a virgin" is literally "he knew her not" (*egino_sken*). Moreover, in Philippians 3:10, the Apostle states his foremost desire, "that I may know Him" (*gno_nai*). The reference in Romans 11:2 also has the meaning of the Hebrew *ya_da*:

God has not rejected His people whom He foreknew. Or do you not know what the Scripture says in the passage about Elijah, how he pleads with God against Israel? (NASB)

In this context, "foreknow" is synonymous with "forelove."

The conclusion is, therefore, that the word "foreknow" carries a much broader possibility of meanings than mere

⁸W. Robert Cook, A Systematic Theology in Outline Form. (Portland: copyright by author, 1990), 165.

⁹C. Samuel Storms, Chosen for Life (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987), 74.

¹⁰Ibid., 75-76.

¹¹Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 358.

¹²R. Laird Harris, ed., Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1980), vol. 1, sv. *Ya_da*.

omniscience. In those contexts which speak of God's electing or predestinating, the idea of personal causation is present.

Theological Analysis

Reformed scholar Loraine Boettner makes the point that what is foreknown is foreordained:

What God foreknows must, in the very nature of the case, be as fixed and certain as what is foreordained; and if one is inconsistent with the free agency of man, the other is also. Foreordination renders the events certain, while foreknowledge presupposes that they are certain.

Now if future events are foreknown to God, they cannot by any possibility take a turn contrary to His knowledge. If the course of future events is foreknown, history will follow that course as definitely as a locomotive follows the rails from New York to Chicago. The Arminian doctrine, in rejecting foreordination, rejects the theistic basis for foreknowledge. Common sense tells us that no event can be foreknown unless by some means, either physical or mental, it has been predetermined. Our choice as to what determines the certainty of future events narrows down to two alternatives--the foreordination of the wise and merciful heavenly Father, or the working of blind physical fate.¹³

Millard Erickson expands upon the idea that what is foreknown is foreordained and relates it to human freedom: It should be noted that if certainty of outcome is inconsistent with freedom, divine foreknowledge, as the Arminian understands that term, presents as much difficulty for human freedom as does divine foreordination. For if God knows what I will do, it must be certain that I am going to do it. If it were not certain, God could not know it; He might be mistaken (I might act differently from what He expects). But if what I will do is certain, then surely I will do it, whether or not I know what I will do. It will happen! But am I then free? In the view of those whose definition of freedom entails the implication that it cannot be certain that a particular event will occur, presumably I am not free. In their view, divine foreknowledge is just as incompatible with human freedom as is divine foreordination.¹⁴

This line of theological reasoning can be illustrated in the following syllogism:

1. What is foreknown is fixed.
2. What is fixed is certain.
3. What is certain is predestined.

As was mentioned previously, Christ was crucified according to the foreknowledge of God (1 Peter 1:20; Acts 2:23). Does foreknowledge in this context mean that God had no absolute plan--no causative personal relationship to the mission of the second person of the Trinity, Jesus Christ? It would be absurd to deny causation here. In the same way, divine foreknowledge as it relates to *any* element of God's predetermined purpose, must relate to God's active involvement in bringing the event to pass.

Applicational Analysis

In the final analysis we ask the question, "What difference does it make?" Is a proper understanding of God's

¹³Loraine Boettner, The Reformed Doctrine of Predestination (Phillipsburg, NJ: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1932), 42.

¹⁴Millard J. Erickson, Christian Theology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), 360.

foreknowledge as it relates to His plan all that important? The following three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative are offered.

God's foreknowledge demonstrates His love. Just as Jesus Christ was "foreknown" by God (1 Peter 1:20) in the sense that God has eternally set His love upon Him, believers have been foreknown by God in that He has eternally set His love upon them (Romans 8:29).

God's foreknowledge demonstrates His sovereignty. God's omnipotent sovereignty entails more than His omniscience. God is not "looking ahead" and planning His course accordingly. His plan is unconditional and complete according to His good pleasure (cf. Ephesians 1:2ff.).

God's foreknowledge demonstrates His personal care. Predestination apart from foreknowledge might imply impersonal fatalism. However, God is not a God of impersonal fatalism but a God who is intimately involved with His creation and in His plans for it.

"For as many as may be the promises of God, in Him they are yes; wherefore also by Him is our Amen to the glory of God through us." (2 Corinthians 1:20)

Selected Notes From My Sermon on Election in Colossians 3:12a

Intro on the sovereign glory of God - theme of Scripture

If U were to ask me what underlying theme of Θ 's dealings w/humanity is, I would unhesitantly reply: "The sovereign glory of God."

By that: From Gen. to Rev. we find that all things (all of creative history) work out to the glory of God as he sovereignly orchestrates happenings of the universe.

I think this is the greatest revelation man can exper. - even greater than understanding God's love - there's nothing greater than gaining a sense of His sovereign glory (cf. Isaiah 6 - Isaiah saw the Lord and declared "woe is me for I am ruined..." And the Angels didn't declare "Love! Love! Love!" but "Holy! Holy! Holy!").

Daniel and King Neb.

Most of you are fam. w/story of Daniel. Dan was Heb. prophet taken into captivity by Babylon under rule of King Neb. in 605 BC. Dan. served as servant/interpreter of dreams to the King. And after several encounters with power of God, Neb. "comes to his senses" and declares >>>

“But at the end of that period (what period?) I, Nebuchadnezzar, raised my eyes toward heaven, and my reason returned to me, and I blessed the Most High and praised and honored Him who lives forever; For His dominion is an everlasting dominion, And His kingdom endures from generation to generation. “And all the inhabitants of the earth are accounted as nothing, But He does according to His will in the host of heaven And among the inhabitants of earth; And no one can ward off His hand Or say to Him, ‘What hast Thou done?’ (Dan. 4:34-35)

Neb. "came to his senses" and declared what? Love of God? "Healing touch" He declares the glorious sov. of

God! Sounds alot like Psalm 135:6 >>>

Whatever the Lord pleases, He does, In heaven and in earth, in the seas and in all deeps.

Prov. 16:9 The mind of man plans his way, but the LORD directs his steps.

Prov. 20:24 Man's steps (his ways) are ordained by the Lord . . .

Psalm 139:16 Thine eyes have seen my unformed substance; And in Thy book they were all written, The days that were ordained for me, when as yet there was not one of them.

If your salvation wasn't the sov. work of God then you're not saved--because it would have been impossible for you to have extricated yourself from your sinful pos. apart from enabling work of God.

A Phrase with a Jewish background ἐκλεκτος. What does it mean to be "the elect of God?" Greek noun - ἐκλεκτος = elect, selected, chosen.

ἐκλεκτος = BAG - "Chosen, select [used] gen[erally] of angels 1 Ti 5:21 . . . Of the Messiah . . . Luke 23:35 . . . esp. of those whom God has chosen fr. the generality of mankind and drawn to himself . . .

Used in classic literature of individual soldiers who were "the chosen" - that is, they were chosen or drafted for special service.

Same word is used by Jesus in Matthew 22:14 >>>

For many are called, but few are chosen (ἐκλεκτος). [The gospel goes out to many, but only some respond]

Used in Mark 13:20 (of the tribulation)

And unless the Lord had shortened {those} days, no life would have been saved; but for the sake of the elect (ἐκλεκτος) whom He chose, He shortened the days. [Who are the "elect?" They are those whom God chose!]

What does it mean to be elect/chosen? It means that if you are a Xn it's ultimately (from God's perspective) because He chose you.

So simple, it makes me wonder why anyone who believes in the authority of God's Word would question what this means. Elementary.

Amazes me how many Xn's misrepresent/misunderstand/vilify biblical teaching on election. To be ἐκλεκτος is to be chosen. It's to be T "chosen of God." Chosen for what? Chosen for salvation. It's that simple!

You responded to God because God responded to you first. He opened your eyes; He softened your heart; He made the foolishness of the Gospel the power of God to you for your salvation. Then you freely responded to Him in faith. GREAT COMFORT IN THAT (I believe that's why Paul begins this section affirming this wonderful truth).

A. Seven Biblical Facts About the Believer's Election in Christ]

I don't pretend to have all of this figured out. There's a point of tension here. There's a point where you and I have to let God be God and simply affirm what is taught in His Word.

1. Election is unto salvation

a. 2 Thess. 2:13 >>>

But we should always give thanks to God for you, brethren beloved by the Lord, because God has chosen you from the beginning for salvation through sanctification by the Spirit and faith in the truth.

*Who does the choosing here? - God

*Who does God choose? - You (Individual believers)

*He has chosen individual believers for what? - For salvation (to be saved)

*Through what? - "sanctification by the Spirit and faith in the truth."

b. John 6:37-44 - "draw" (6:44) = ἐλκυω - "to draw or drag"

Used in Acts 16:19 Paul and Silas being "dragged" before the authorities in the marketplace. Strong word. Idea of an irresistible force; used in Gk lit. of a desp. hungry man being drawn to food, & of demonic forces being drawn to animals when they were not able to possess men [MacArthur, Eph., 11]

I can't be any more clear can it? No one can come to Jesus Christ unless God the Father draws him/her to X.

(1) Three impossibilities from John 6:37-44

1. It's imp. for anyone to come to X unless T Father draws him [election](44)

2. It's imp. for someone whom God draws not to come to X [irresist. grace] (37)

3. It's imp. for the one who comes, by the will of God to be cast out [E.S.] (37)

We could also look at John 6:65 >>>

For this reason I have said to you, that no one can come to Me, unless it has been granted him from the Father. [Note response 6:66 - as a result of this many of his disciples withdrew and were not walking with Him anymore.]

And John 10

10:26-29 - "But you do not believe, because you are not of My sheep. "My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me; and I give eternal life to them, and they shall never perish; and no one shall snatch them out of My hand. [Sheep are not an empty class: they hear, know, believe, trust, follow, love the shepherd.]

c. Argument?

You say, "I chose God." Sure you did. But you chose Him because He chose you first. He responded to you; that's why you responded to Him.

(1) Parallel to the calling of the disciples

Matt. 4:18-20 As Jesus was walking beside the Sea of Galilee, he saw two brothers, Simon called Peter and his brother Andrew. They were casting a net into the lake, for they were fishermen. **“Come, follow me,”** Jesus said, **“and I will make you fishers of men.”** At once they left their nets and followed him.

Jesus gave an invitation; the disciples freely responded.

John 16 >>> **You are my friends if you do what I command. I no longer call you servants, because a servant does not know his master’s business. Instead, I have called you friends, for everything that I learned from my Father I have made known to you. You did not choose me, but I chose you and appointed you to go and bear fruit—fruit that will last.**

Who really did the choosing here? God or man?

(a) Someone may argue: "What about Judas-was he chosen?"

John 13:18 "I do not speak of all of you. I know the ones I have chosen; but it is that the Scripture may be fulfilled, 'He who eats My bread has lifted up his heel against Me.'

Was Judas chosen? Not unto salvation.

2. Election is unconditional

It's unconditional (it's not conditioned on anything but God) in that it's based entirely on God's sovereign will to His glory.

The Dictionary of New Testament Theology (dictionary of Greek words and their meanings), says this >>>

"If it be asked what are the principles which underlie God's choice, the only positive answer that can be given is that he bestows his favour upon men and joins them to himself solely on the basis of his own free decision and his love which is not dependent on any temporal circumstances." [DNTT, 1:542]

a. Ephesians 1:3-6

Note that $\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega$ is an aorist middle which indicates Θ 's independent choice. Could be translated: "to pick for oneself."

b. Arguments against

(1) It's the church

I know that some people argue that this refers to the CH. That is, God chose the CH as an entity, not indiv. people. My response is simple. That's not what it says!

Besides, if you believe that you have same problem that those who hold to theory of "dynamic inspiration" of Script. (they believe that the thoughts are inspired not the words). You can't have inspired thoughts w/o inspired

words. ISW you can't have an elect church apart from elect individuals.

Every excuse I've heard to explain away this passage does just that!

(2) Foreknowlege

Someone says, "Well it's foreknowledge." God looks ahead and chooses those who choose Him." Isn't that Rom. 8?

8:29-30 For whom He foreknew, He also predestined {to become} conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren; and whom He predestined, these He also called; and whom He called, these He also justified; and whom He justified, these He also glorified.

Sounds good at first. Problem is, it's not true.

God doesn't have foreknowledge in the sense of prescience alone--He's not a divine fortune teller who predicts random future happenings (he's active/not reactive).

God has complete knowledge of all things past present and future at all times. To say that God at some point "looked ahead" is an attempt to define God by our human terms/reasoning, & it destroys His complete omniscience & omnipot.

(a) Foreknowledge = προγνωσκω ^ε προγνωσις

Intimate words implying a relationship. It's like me saying, "I know my wife." "To foreknow is to forelove." These words parallel in meaning the Heb. word יָדָע (knowing with experience/intimacy)

Used of a sexual union (Gen. 4:1); or personal friendship (Gen. 29:5); or knowing good from evil (Gen. 3:5); and of knowing the true God (Jer. 3:22).

The Gk. word is used the same way in Matthew 1:25 ("he kept her a virgin;" lit. "he did not know her").

So the word "foreknow/foreknowledge" means much more than simply looking ahead. That's not even close to what the biblical word means.

BTW - same word is used of Θ's relationship to Israel in Rom. 11:2 >>> =God has not rejected His people whom He foreknew.

Words are also used of Jesus >>>

Acts 2:23 this Man, delivered up by the predetermined plan and foreknowledge of God,

1 Peter 1:20 For He was foreknown before the foundation of the world, but has appeared in these last times for the sake of you

The foreknowledge argument is a baseless, weak argument. And if you stop and think about it, the results are the same. Foreknown is foreordained. If God knows that something is definitely going to happen, can anything change that? NO!

Think about the Lamb's book of life (Rev. 13:8; 17:8) where it says that believer's names were recorded from before the foundation of the world. If that's true, and it is, could anything have changed it? NO!

Remember: We're dealing with God's perspective here. God's sovereignty. I am not denying that there is a human element here as well (get to that later).

3. Election is necessary because of sin

Remember back to Col. 1:21 (depravity of man). 10 theological truths (the believer's past position).

1. Alienated, hostile, engaged in evil deeds (1:21)
2. Dead in sin, by nature a child of God's wrath (Eph. 2:1 ff.)
3. Under a curse - [the curse of the law (Gal. 3:10-13)]
4. An enemy of God (Rom. 5:10)
5. Darkened in understanding (Eph. 4:18)
6. Unable to please God, hostile to Him (Rom. 8:5-7)
7. Unable to understand the gospel (1 Cor. 2:14)
8. Unable to truly seek God (Rom. 3:11)
9. Blinded by Satan (2 Cor. 4:4)
10. Destined for hell--eternal separation from God (Rev 20:13).

And I asked the question: "Why do people reject JC?" >>> They choose to! Why do they choose to? Because they are: Alienated, hostile, Dead in sin, children of wrath, under a curse, darkened in understanding, unable to please God, hostile to Him, unable to understand the gospel, unable to truly seek God, blinded by Satan.

Man's very nature is fallen. Man is wrong at the centre of his being, and therefore everything is wrong. He cannot be improved, for, finally, nothing will suffice but a radical change, a new nature. Man loves the darkness and hates the light. What can be done for him? Can he change himself? Can he renew his nature? "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots?" Can man change the whole bias of his life? Give him new clothing, provide him with a new house in new surroundings, entertain him with all that is best and most elevating, educate him and train his mind, enrich his soul with frequent doses of the finest culture ever known, do all and more, but still he will remain the same essential man, and his desires and innermost life will be unchanged. [D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, The Plight of Man and the Power of God, 147]

"Before a man can seek God, God must first have sought the man." [A.W. Tozer]

Can't understand how any X'n looking at his/her own exp. in coming to X; his/her exp. in wit. to others; can deny truths of John 6! (moms testimony).

That's why I've said that every X'n is a spiritual Lazarus (John 11). You or I could have screamed at Lazarus from then to eternity ("Lazarus, come out; Lazarus wake up; Lazarus walk the aisle and be saved; Lazarus you're late for dinner") all to no avail. It takes a miracle to make a physical resurrection.

ISW it takes a miracle to make a spiritual resurrection (Remember, the Bible says that you were dead apart from JC).

That's why you have Acts 13:48 >>>

Acts 16:14 >>> (Lydia). Luke used same verb "διδασκαλεω" (to open) to describe Jesus' illumining the minds of the disciples to recognize Him (Luke 24:31) and understand the Scriptures (Luke 24:45).

4. Election is presented as a comfort for the believer, not as an opportunity to question God's justice

So important. Scripture always speaks of predestination in terms of those who are X'ns as a comfort and encouragement to them. Comfort in knowing that their salvation is no accident, and thus it is secure.

"We [believers] are a chosen people, the elect of God. The Greek term means selected out of a number. We have been called to be God's people, not because of our goodness, but because of His grace. This results in praise, not pride. The overflowing gratitude for the call of God is what creates in us the desire to allow Him to guide and control our actions. Responsibility to emulate Christ is in our response to the amazing love we have experienced. We are "holy and dearly loved." [Lloyd Ogilvie, Colossians, 107]

It's a comfort, not an opportunity to point an accusing finger at God (questioning His justice). I would like to think that's not even a poss.

a. Romans 9:1-24a

(1) Background

Paul is wrestling with the problem of Israel as God's chosen nation that had rejected her Messiah. If salvation was from the Jews and for the Jews why did they reject Jesus as their Messiah? Is God done with Israel? Has God or His Word in some way failed? No - (11:26).

Verse 3 - Voluntative imperfect - expresses hesitation due to the impossibility of the desire (hyperbole).

Verse 19 - transition to a polemic (Same arguments that the church has dealt with for 1900 yrs.).

Verses 20-24a - perspective!

It is obvious from Paul's wording that the ones who might be asking such questions [that is questioning God's fairness] would not be seeking God's truth but rather self-justification. Attempting to excuse their own unbelief, sinfulness, ignorance, and spiritual rebellion, they would be apt to accuse God of injustice. But human understanding is so limited, even sincere questions about God's sovereign election and predestination ultimately must go unanswered. . . . it is one of the many truths about God that we must accept by faith, simply because He has revealed it in His Word. [MacArthur, Romans 9-16, 37-38]

As Bob Jones used to say, "The problem isn't with me, if you don't like what it [Scripture] says call up heaven."

5. Election finds its roots in the history of the church

From pages of Script. to early church fathers, men such as Tertullian (d. 220); Ambrose (d. 397); Athanasius (d. 373); & Augustine (d. 430), T Ch. has held to absolute sovereignty of God.

In fact, Aug., early in his min. held to cond. election accord. to God foreknowledge, & later, thru serious study, changed his pos. calling his former view, "The pest of the Pelagian heresy." [which denied depravity of man]

From Aug. to time of T Reform. where you have men such as Calvin & Luther who both tenaciously held to uncond. election (cf. Luther's The Bondage of the Will).

Following T Reform. you have many men/several church creeds, such as the Belgic Confession (1561); the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) & T 1689 Baptist Confession of Faith that all uphold a Calvinistic view of God's sov.

In fact, Arminianism was act. condemned by the Synod of Dort in 1619.

Then you have contemporaries such as Spurgeon in the last c. & men such as John MacArthur/Charles Swindoll/R.C. Sproul/J.I. Packer/Warren Wiersbe (I could name dozens more pastors/writers/scholars/& theologians). Someone once asked me if a partic. theol. book I had upheld a pos. of predestination & I replied that you are hard-pressed to find one that doesn't!

God's absolute sov. has been dominant pos. of T church from 1st c.onward.

While that in itself, doesn't nec. prove anything, it is a strong consid--esp. in light of fact that church is called T "pillar and support of the truth" in 1 Tim. 3:15. And I'm going to be very careful before I disagree w/something that has been T dominant position of the church t/o it's history.

6. Election doesn't negate evangelism (contrary, election guarantees results)

I've had people ask me, "If you believe in predestination, why do you believe in evangelism?"

*Why do I believe in predestination? It's biblical

*Why do I believe in evangelism? It's biblical (do I need any other reason?)

2TI 2:10 For this reason I endure all things for the sake of those who are chosen (ἐκλεκτος), that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus {and} with {it} eternal glory.

Bob Ricker, President of the BGC >>>

I am encouraged by the doctrine of divine election because I know "All that the Father gives Me will come to Me" (John 6:37). Even though people coming to Christ are entering into and believing the miraculous (virgin birth, substitutionary death/atonement, resurrection, second coming--just to name a few!), I know that when a person is drawn by the Holy Spirit, he or she will come. It is a happy privilege of being part of this by our life and witness.

To say that, because God is absolutely sov. evang. is unnec. is like saying that because a tru believer can't lose his salvation, there's no reason to live a godly obedient life. Don't lose sight of the facts. The Bible is clear that those who come to salvation do so because God chose them. The Bible is also clear that believers are commanded to evangelize with the results being solely up to God. To deny unconditional election is to misread the Bible. To deny personal responsibility in evangelism is not only to misread the Bible, it's downright disobedient.

Fortunately, Xns are not privy to the knowledge of God (who's elect; who will or will not ultimately come to faith in X). Our respons, therefore, transcends this information, bringing us back to Script. And Script. is clear that we are to share our faith and that the results are up to God.

That's a great comfort in evangelism. Knowing that T results R not up 2 me, but that I'm to share T Gospel w/the comfort/assurance that God knows those that are his & that His sheep will hear his voice.

Listen: we're accountable. The issue isn't whether or not the elect will come to salvation, the issue is whether or not we will be obedient in leading them there. That's the issue!

7. Election is balanced by human responsibility

a. Note the word "balance"

If you've been a part of this Ch. 4 any length of time & if you know me at all, you know that I'm balanced! There's no reason why any of U should have an issue w/anything I've said because I've said it all before, just not in this big a dose. There is a balance between human responsibility and God's sovereignty.

I am committed to preaching/teaching what T Script. means by what it says w/o compromise. I'm not going to compromise when something is "difficult." & if T Script. emphasizes God's absolute sovereignty I will teach that, & when Script. emphasizes human responsibility (not free-will which isn't a biblical term) I will teach that. Since the Bible upholds both with an apparent tension, who am I to do less? If Scripture lays these truths side-by-side without a problem, why can't we uphold them in the same way?

b. Classic example of Acts 4:27-28

I have no problem with passages such as Phil. 2:12-13 >>> ISW - have no problem with God's sovereignty and our responsibility. I don't completely understand it, but I can't because I'm not God (Deut. 29:29 applies!).

I'm going to close this a.m. w/ a rather lengthy quote by John MacArthur. Listen to this quote and see if you can't rest in its truth >>>>

God's sovereign election and man's exercise of human responsibility in choosing Jesus Christ seem opposite and irreconcilable truths--and from our limited human perspective they are opposite and irreconcilable. That is why so many earnest, well-meaning Christians throughout the history of the church have floundered trying to reconcile them. Since the problem cannot be resolved by our finite minds, the result is always to compromise one truth in favor of the other or to weaken both by trying to take a position somewhere between them. We should let the antinomy remain, believing both truths completely and leaving the harmonizing of them to God. . . . Because we cannot stand the tension of mystery, paradox, or antinomy, we are inclined to adjust what the Bible teaches so that it will fill our own systems of order and consistency. But that presumptuous approach is unfaithful to God's Word and leads to confused doctrine and weakened living. It should be noted that other essential scriptural doctrines are also apparently paradoxical to our limited capacity. It is antinomous that Scripture itself is the work of human authors, yet the very words of God; that Jesus Christ is fully God and fully man; that salvation is forever, yet saints must remain obedient and persevere to the end; that the Christians's life is lived in total commitment and discipline of self, yet is all of Christ. Such inscrutable truths are an encouragement that the mind of God infinitely surpasses the mind of man and are a great proof of the

divine authorship of Scripture. . . . It is not that God's sovereign election, or predestination, eliminates man's choice in faith. Divine sovereignty and human response are integral and inseparable parts of salvation--thought exactly how they operate together only the infinite mind of God knows. [John MacArthur, Ephesians, 11 &13]

John Chadwick >>> I sought the Lord, And afterwards I knew He moved my soul to seek Him, Seeking me! It was not that I found, O Savior true; No, I was found by Thee.

Back to the text here==>

[chosen] according to the foreknowledge of God the Father (κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς)

πατρὸς (πατήρ * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Nom. of Appellation. The tender fatherhood of God was actively involved. Adds to the concept of hope.

Puritan Thomas Watson: The name Jehovah carries majesty in it; the name Father carries mercy in it."

With fatherhood also comes sonship. Note the concept of sonship and/or heir.

Note the progression: Selected by the Father; Sanctified with the Spirit; Saved by the Son for Service. This is not some sort of conditional experience. It's a package deal! The entirety of it all, from their election to their salvation and service, is by God's sovereign grace. Election itself doesn't save; it only renders salvation sure. With salvation comes sanctification and obedience. But since all of this is secure, there is great hope and encouragement. Cf. the progression in Romans 8:28-30 and the concept of hope that v. 28 introduces.

There is partnership in the Trinity as to the saving work of men.

with the sanctification of the Spirit, (ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος)

ἐν ἁγιασμῷ (ἁγιασμος - holiness, sanctification * Noun: Dat. Masc. Sing.). Dative/Instrumental of Assoc. or Locative of sphere.

Election ==> Effectual Calling. This may be in view here (so Calvin), that the sanct. of the Sp. is referring to our E.C.

Give a definition of the word and the three facets of "sanctification." To be set-apart. Holy.

John 15:19 "If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world, but I chose you out of the world, therefore the world hates you.

Note the parallel to 2 Thess. 2:13==>

But we should always give thanks to God for you, brethren beloved by the Lord, because God has chosen you from the beginning for salvation through sanctification by the Spirit and faith in the truth.

1 Thessalonians 4:7 For God has not called us for the purpose of impurity, but in sanctification.

1 Corinthians 6:11 And such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.

Cf. 1 Peter 1:12.

ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ (ΠΝΕΥΜΑ * Noun: Gen. Neut. Sing.). Subj. Gen. - the sanctification produced by the Holy Spirit. Note that the Holy Spirit is indeed active today. Cf. 2 Thess. 2:13 (Trinity).

DEU 7:6 "For you are a holy people to the \Lord\ your God; the \Lord\ your God has chosen you to be a people for His own possession out of all the peoples who are on the face of the earth.

1PE 2:9 But you are \a chosen race, a \royal \priesthood, a holy nation, a people for\ {God's}\ own possession,\ that you may proclaim the excellencies of Him who has called you out of darkness into His marvelous light;

Figure of Speech "Antimeria" (the exchange of one part of speech for another) - 1 Peter 1:2 "Sanctification of the Spirit": i.e., spiritual sanctification, or perhaps it may be the Genitive of Origin and mean that sanctification of which the Spirit is the author and source." [Bullinger, 502]

The Holy Spirit works in us to faith (Eph. 2:8), repentance (Acts 11:15-18), regeneration (Titus 3:5), adoption (Rom. 8:16-17).

What a wonderful parallel in 1 Thess. 4:7==>

1 Thessalonians 4:7 For God has not called us for the purpose of impurity, but in sanctification.

"God the Father chose the sinner out from among mankind to be the recipient of the setting-apart work of the Spirit, in which work the Holy Spirit sets the sinner apart from his unbelief to the act of faith in the Lord Jesus." [Wuest, 16]

"We have therefore the three steps taken by the three persons of the Triune God. God the Father chooses the sinner to salvation. God the Spirit brings the sinner thus chosen to the act of faith. God the Son cleanses him in His precious blood." [Wuest, 17]

Note Wuest above. Is it Peter's intent, then, to demonstrate how the salvation of these believers was worked out by the three persons of the Trinity? That God chose them, the Holy Spirit convicted and drew them thus setting them apart, and that the Son of God died for them? This would fit the ordo salutis of the New Testament.

Note the parallel in 2:9-10. ==> "The sanctifying work of the Spirit sets believers apart from sin to God, separates them from darkness to light, sets them apart from unbelief to faith, and mercifully separates them from a love of sin and brings them to a love of righteousness." [MacArthur, 21]

Sanctification includes suffering. There's no way around it (cf. James 1:2-4; Phil. 1:29; Rom. 5:3; 1 Peter 1:6ff.). Ground to Growth upon which we tread is paved with Suffering. Suffering is the means to great growth. We aren't exempt from suffering. We are promised help in time of need while suffering. And hope in the midst of suffering. Can you imagine going through life w/o Jesus Christ? Some say it's a crutch. Not a crutch, it's confidence - confidence laced w/joyful expectation. Can't help but wonder how people "cope" w/o X

for obedience to Jesus Christ and sprinkling with His blood. (εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ραντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,)

This 3d prepositional phrase looks at the act from the human side of the equation.

Cf. Eph. 2:10, 1 Thess. 4:3; John 14:15.

εἰς ὑπακοὴν (ὑπακοή - obedience * Noun: Accus. Fem. Sing.). Accus. of purpose. From ὑποκούω - to hear. Note that he who has ears to hear, let him hear and that God gives us those ears! Also, note James (not hearers only but doers).

Same sort of thing Paul refers to in Rom. 1:5 (the obedience that comes from faith). Two facets, obedience which is our salvation (in believing we were obedient to the call of God on us - really our first step of obedience - the first time you ever really were obedient to God was when you believed in him). Also obedience as a regular aspect of our sanctification (above).

καὶ ραντισμὸν (ραντισμος - sprinkling * Noun: Accus. Masc. Sing.). Accus. of ????? Perhaps has as its background Numbers 19.

"More significantly, Hebrews uses the same . . . language (where the LXX did not) in connection with the institution of the Mosaic covenant: Moses built an altar at the foot of Sinai, and when he had sacrificed cattle he threw half of the blood against the altar; the other half he put in bowls, and read aloud to the people out of the scroll of the covenant the Lord's commands. When they promised to obey all that the Lord commanded, Moses took the bowls and threw the remaining blood at the people, saying (in the words of Heb. 9:20), "This is the blood of the covenant which God commanded you" (cf. Exod 24:3-8; Heb 9:18-21)." [Michaels, 12]

May be that Peter is drawing from Exo. 24:3-8.

"Peter relies on language that had perhaps become already fixed among Christians as a way of alluding to the same typology. To 'obey' was to accept the gospel and become part of a new community under a new covenant; to be sprinkled with Jesus' blood was to be cleansed from one's former way of living and released from spiritual slavery by the power of his death (cf. 1:18)." [Michaels, 12-13]

According to Barclay, there were three occasions when a person would be sprinkled with blood in the OT: 1) When a leper had been healed, he was sprinkled w/the blood of a bird (Lev. 14:1-7). In this sense, sprinkling is symbolic of cleansing. 2) Sprinkling was part of the consecration of priests (Ex. 29:20-21; Lev. 8:30). It was a sign of being set apart for service (parallel to sanctification). 3) Initiation of the covenant unto obedience (Exo. 24:3-8). Implication, sprinkling was for obedience.

On obedience as belief in the gospel, see Rom. 1:5, 15:18, 16:26 (cf. Acts 7:51; Rom. 10:16; 2 Thess. 1:8, 1 Peter 2:8, 3:1, 4:17), Acts 6:7, 1 Peter 1:22,23-25

Parallel to the Passover and the application of the blood to the doorposts. Sprinklings and sacrifices () were a foreshadowing/type of that which was to come in JC. Cf. Hebrews 9:12-15,22.

Isaiah 52:15 Thus He will sprinkle many nations, Kings will shut their mouths on account of Him; For

what had not been told them they will see, And what they had not heard they will understand.

If you are sprinkled, you are "marked" as it were. You have been marked out as one owned by the Son.

αἵματος (αἷμα - blood * Noun: Gen. Neut. Sing.). Gen. of possession.

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός * Noun: Gen. Masc. Sing.). Objective Gen. with a noun of action (obedience). Objective Gen. receives the action produced by the noun of action.

"Sprinkled with His blood" = a double metonymy or a metalepsis where both words stand for something else (blood = Christ's death and sprinkled = the application of that death to our lives). Cf. Bullinger, 609-10. Very Jewish (OT) in concept (Exo. 24:7; Hebrews 9:19). The same word is used in LXX in Num. 19:9,13,20. Used in the NT only here and Heb. 12:24.

"Reference to the death of Christ on the cross and to the ratification of the New Covenant by the blood of Christ as given in Heb. 9:19f.; 12:24 with allusion to Ex. 24:3-8. Paul does not mention this ritual use of the blood of Christ, but Jesus does (Matt. 26:28 = Mark 14:24). Hence it is not surprising to find the use of it by Peter and the author of Hebrews." [ATR, 80]

"Obedience and sprinkling of blood also established the first covenant (Ex 24:7-8). [Keener, 709]

1PE 1:22 Since you have in obedience to the truth purified your souls for a sincere love of the brethren, fervently love one another from the heart,

Note difference yet connection between election (selection), sanctification and justification (salvation).

May grace and peace be multiplied to you. (χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη πληθυνθείη.)

χάρις (χάρις * Noun: Nom. Fem. Sing.). Independent Nom. in a salutation.

ὑμῖν (συ - to or for you * Pronoun: 2PP Indep. PPN. Dat.).

καὶ εἰρήνη (εἰρήνη * Noun: Nom. Fem. Sing.). Independent Nom. in a salutation.

πληθυνθείη. (πληθυνω - increase, multiplied * Verb: Aor. Optative Passive). Voluntative Optative in an independent or main clause. Commonly used to express a wish or a prayer. "The optative could be looked upon as a weakened subjunctive. The subjunctive is the mood of probability, the optative of possibility. The subjunctive expresses action which is objectively possible, the optative that which is subjectively possible. The optative is a step further removed from reality than the subjunctive. The assertion made by the optative is more doubtful than that of the subjunctive. It is reduced to the level of a wish." [Brooks and Winberry, Greek Syntax, 124]

This particular greeting is only found in 3 NT Epistles==>

2PE 1:2 Grace and peace be multiplied to you in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord;

JUD 1:2 May mercy and peace and love be multiplied to you.

". . . grace and peace are multiplied to match the growth of hostility with which the Christians addressed are confronted, lest the word of Jesus be fulfilled . . . (Matt. xxiv.12) . . ." [Expositors, 41]

20 of the 27 books in the NT are letters. In 15 of those 20 letters, including the 13 written by Paul and the two

by Peter, this opening prayer occurs. The sequence is always thus: first grace then peace. Grace isn't a word that's used by many today (tolerance?). Peace is something that we often hear.

Where does grace and peace come from? What are they?

Grace = Greek term; Peace Hebrew. Wholeness or wellness. "The flower of peace grows on the root of grace." [Leighton, 19]. Peace comes from reconciliation with God (Rom. 5:1ff.) and the tranquility that follows from it (Phil. 4:7).

(Rom. 5:1-2) Therefore having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom also we have obtained our introduction by faith into this grace in which we stand

We can see grace in the previous verse and the peace that comes from it. There is an indissoluble link between our election, effectual calling, and our salvation. The effectual calling is that which we respond to. It's like the first two links are in heaven, in God's own hand (election and salvation). The calling part comes down from heaven to us and we grab hold of it, one in each hand. However, the bond is as eternal as the bond between the 3 persons of the Godhead.

Excursus on the Trinity

“They were elected also to the *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus*. They were designed by God’s decree to be sanctified by the Spirit, and to be purified by the merit and blood of Christ. Here is a manifest allusion to the typical sprinklings of blood under the law, which language these Jewish converts understood very well. The blood of the sacrifices must not only be shed but sprinkled, to denote that the benefits designed thereby are applied and imputed to the offerers. Thus the blood of Christ, the grand and all-sufficient sacrifice, typified by the legal sacrifices, was not only shed, but must be sprinkled and communicated to every one of these elect Christians, *that through faith in his blood they may obtain remission of sin*, Rom. 3:25. This blood of sprinkling justifies before God (Rom. 5:9), seals the covenant between God and us, of which the Lord’s supper is a sign (Lu. 22:20), cleanses from all sin (1 Jn. 1:7), and admits us into heaven, Heb. 10:19. Note, [1.] God hath elected some to eternal life, some, not all; persons, not qualification. [2.] All that are chosen to eternal life as the end are chosen to obedience as the way. [3.] Unless a person be sanctified by the Spirit, and sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, there will be no true obedience in the life. [4.] There is a consent and co-operation of all the persons of the Trinity in the affair of man’s salvation, and their acts are commensurate one to another: whoever the Father elects the Spirit sanctifies unto obedience, and the Son redeems and sprinkles with his blood. [5.] The doctrine of the Trinity lies at the foundation of all revealed religion. If you deny the proper deity of the Son and Holy Spirit, you invalidate the redemption of the one and the gracious operations of the other, and by this means destroy the foundation of your own safety and comfort.” [Henry, Matthew, Matthew Henry’s Commentary on the Bible, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers) 1991]

INTRODUCTORY IDEAS

Note the limitations of language (limitations in theology).

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!
Early in the morning our song shall rise to Thee;
Holy, holy, holy, merciful and mighty!
God in three persons, blessed Trinity!
[Reginald Heber (1783-1826)]

Several months ago this writer brought up the song above in a small group setting only to have one member of the group declare, “I will never sing that song.”

The Trinity is the highest revelation of God that he has made for his people. It is essential to embrace the doctrine of Trinity if we are going to embrace God in who He is (embrace, not fully understand).

White calls it “the capstone, the summit, the brightest star in the firmament of divine truths.” [White, 14]

When I was at the FT. Lauderdale theol. conference someone joked, “Of course we know that most of our people are Arians, modalists.” (I may add Pelagians). People in the pew do have a gross misunderstanding of theology because the church has done such a bad job of teaching.

People in churches who will remark, “Jesus is the Son of God, but not God.” (Arianism) Or, “everyone is basically born good.” (Pelagianism), Or “The trinity is like a man who is a father, a son, and a husband (modalism).

Shedd— “. . . the doctrine of the Trinity, though not discovered by human reason, is susceptible of a rational defense when revealed. Shedd quotes Dr. South - “as he that denies this fundamental article of the Christian religion may lose his soul, so he that much strives to understand it may lose his wits.” [Shedd, 219]

D. Parenthesis: Satisfaction in the Trinity

1. What do we mean by the “Trinity?”

Word “Trinity” from Latin *trinitas* meaning “threeness” [Packer, 40]. People who claim that the word’s not in the Bible . . . Question is, “Is it biblical?” I can take a biblical word and use it unbiblically (fulness) or I can take a word that’s not used in t/Bible and use it biblically.

A more accurate term would be “tri-unity” rather than Trinity. W/Triunity, the concept of threeness and oneness is preserved.

Main Idea from vv. 1-2:

[Our Hope is Found in the Electing Grace of the Father, the Sanctifying Grace of the Spirit, and the Saving Grace of the Son.](#)

Main idea for the series on the Trinity (three-fold):

If our Hope is Found in the Triune God then we must know and love Him in His Triunity.
If we must know and love Him in His Triunity then we must know about His Triunity.
If we must know and love Him in His Triunity then we must believe in His Triunity.

In short - True believers will love and embrace the Triune God in all His fulness.

the first three words of this phrase will show you how important this is. If you’re not sure what I mean, what if I would have said “True believers will be premillennial as to eschatology?” Or “True believers will not practice infant baptism?” Or, “True believers will celebrate the Lord’s Table every week?” “True believers will have churches led by pastor-elders?”

“The goal of the Christian life, including the goal of Christian study and scholarship, is always the same: Jesus Christ, ‘in whom are hidden the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.’ Do we long for a ‘true knowledge’ of Christ? When we sing, ‘Lord, I want to know you,’ do we really mean it, and then take advantage of the ways He has given us to attain this ‘true knowledge’ of Him? To know Christ truly is to know the Trinity, for God has not revealed himself in such a way as to allow us to have *true* and *balanced* knowledge of the Father outside of such knowledge of the Son, all of which comes to us through the Spirit. A person who wants to ‘know Jesus’ must, due to the nature of God’s revelation, know Him as He is related to the Father and the Spirit. We must know, understand, and love the Trinity to be fully and completely Christian. This is why we say the Trinity is the greatest of God’s revealed truths.” [White, 15]

If that’s true (and it is) then we must do what we can to know God is His fulness. If we say we love Him, then, as the saying goes, to love Him is to know Him. If I say “I love my wife,” yet put forward no effort to know

about her, what she's like, what she desires in life, what drives her personality, etc. my love rings quite hallow.

a. Complex Definitions of the Trinity:

There is one only and true God, but in the unity of the Godhead there are three coeternal and coequal Persons, the same in substance but distinct in subsistence (Deuteronomy 6:4; Matthew 28:19; 2 Corinthians 13:14). [James Orr, ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. This was expressed by the Council of Constantinople as "one *ousia* in three *hypostaseis*."]]

“While there is only one divine nature there are three subsistences or persons called the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who possess not a similar but the same numerical essence and the distinction between them is not merely nominal but real.” [John Dick Lectures on Theology, cited by Cook, 126]

“There is in the Divine Being but one indivisible essence (Deut. 6:4; 1 Cor. 8:4,6; James 2:19; John 10:30; Isa. 45:5-6, 46:9). . . . The term ‘essence’ refers to God’s essential being or nature. . . . In this one being there are three persons or three individual subsistences—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These are to be viewed as personal self-distinctions in the divine essence or substance. . . . The whole undivided essence of God belongs to each of the three persons. Thus there is no subordination regarding the essential being of any person, although . . . there is an economical or administrative subordination.” [Cook, 130]

a. Simple Definition of the Trinity:

“God is One as to Essence, Three as to Person.” (one essence - three persons)

Not “Gods are” but God (one) is. Not one person and three persons (contra.) not one essence and three essences (contra.) but [^]

2. Historical Development of the Doctrine

a. Athenagoras and Tertullian

Trinitarian speculation began in the second c. w/Athenagoras (c. 177) who defended the doctrine as an essential part of t/faith of t/CH. Doct. was expounded by Tertullian, who was largely respons. for t/vocabulary used by t/Western Ch even today. It was T. who argued that there was one God who existed eternally in three persons. [New dict. of Theol. sv Trinity]

Early belief which is said to have influenced Tertullian is referred to as economic Trinitarianism, the belief that God the Father used his two hands, the Son and the Holy Spirit, so serve as his mediators in creating the world. This belief paralleled the belief that God worked in three successive phases in the history of the world, with the Father supervising over the age of the OT, the Son over the Gospel age, and the Holy Spirit at work since Pentecost. View fallacious since it limits God to time-space, also because it is modalistic. Part and parcel to this view is the belief that the Father is the Creator, the Son the Savior, and the Spirit the Sanctifier. These views were a later form of Monarchianism, and later attributed “somewhat unfairly”, to Sabellius, a 3rd c. heretic. [NDT sv. Trinity]

Sabellius tried to mediate between modalism and orthodoxy, responding to t/claim that modalism results in patripassionism. So Seb. posited two poles of opposition and attraction in God, the Father and the Son. Both, said Seb. become incarnate in Jesus, but on the cross they separated, as the Son cried out “MY God, My God . . . ?” The love of the Father could not endure the separation, so He brought forth the H.S. as a kind of glue, to weld the Son back to him. [NDT, sv. Trinity]

Eastern Trinitarianism is associate with Origin. Working indepen. of Tertullian, Origin dev. a doctrine of three hypostaseis of Father, Son and HOLY Spirit. Each were revealed to share in the same essence, or ousia. However, Origin arranged these in hierarchical order, with the Father as God-in-himself (autotheos), the Son as his exact image, and the Holy Spirit as the image of the Son. He insisted that this order existed in eternity, thus maintaining that the Son had always been subordinate to the Father (subordinationism). [NDT, s.v. Trinity]

b. Councils (Nicaea and Carthage)

It has been said that classical Trinitarianism developed rapidly following the Council of Nicaea (325 AD). [NDT, s.v. Trinity]

“There it had been stated that the Son was consubstantial (*homoousios*) with the Father, but soon afterwards this key term and the doctrine it embodied were widely rejected in favour of compromise formulae, such as *homoiousios*, ‘of a similar substance.’ Athanasius, almost alone in the East, but after 339 with the support of the West, battled for an understanding (reflected in *homoousios* as he read it) which would make the Son numerically identical with the Father. The Son was not to be regarded as a part of God, nor was he a second deity; he was simply God himself, in whom the fullness of divinity dwelt (Col. 2:8) and in whom the Father himself was to be seen (Jn. 14:9).” [NDT, s.v. Trinity]

It was at this time that controversy erupted over the person and nature of the Holy Spirit. It was thought that biblical evidence for the divinity of the Holy Spirit was scant, and the fact that the Holy Spirit did not have a ‘personal’ name, like the Father and the Son, added to the debate with many believing him to be inferior to the Father and Son. This subordination was countered first by Athanasius, followed by Basil of Caesarea who contended that the Holy Spirit was God on the ground that Scripture called him the Lord and giver of life. Basil also argued that the Spirit proceeded from the Father (John 15:26) and was to be worshiped along with the Father and the Son. [NDT, s.v. Trinity]

Basil’s theol. was decl. ortho. at the Constantinople (the Second Ecumenical Council) in 381 AD. This has been the basis for Trinitarianism in the Eastern Church since that time. The Western Church, however, is a different story. There was considerably more speculation in the West [NDT s.v. Trinity]. Much of the Western’ Church’s theology as it relates to the Trinity may be traced to Basil and Augustine. Augustine developed his theology of the Trinity in his masterful work *De Trinitate*, composed between 399 and 419. Augustine’s doctrine of hte relationship between the mems. of the Trinity which stood on contrast to that of contemporary Greek thought which thought in terms of causal origins for the persons of the Trin. The Father was unbegotten, the Son begotten, and the Holy Spirit proceeding.

Augustine did not reject this way of thinking, but modified it considerably. For him, the one primordial God was not the Father, but the Trinity. The diff. persons found their cause not in some generation or procession, but in an inherently necessary interior relationship with each other. He developed this view by using a number of analogies, of which the most significant are mind and love. A mind knows itself because it conceives of its own existence; what is more, it must also love its self-conception. A lover

cannot love without a beloved, and there is of necessity a love which flows between them but which is not strictly identical with either. From this, Augustine deduced that God, in order to be himself, had to be a Trinity of person, since otherwise neither his mind nor his love could function. [NDT, s.v. Trinity]

Augustine's conclusions resulted in the idea of cause between the membs. of the Trin. being replaced by that of relationship

It was Augustine that also affirmed that the H.S. proceeded from the F. and the S. (*a Patre Filioque*). This became the position of the W. CH and eventually led to the great division between the East and the W.

Richard of St. Victor (d. 1173) developed concept of a social trinity with the relationship between t/members of t/Godhead being paradigmatic of human society itself. During the Reformation, the traditional Western doctrine was reaffirmed with a different development of thought as it related to the work of t/diff. persons in the Trinity being introd. by John Calvin. [NDT, s.v. Trinity]. It was Calvin who stressed that believers were adopted by grace into the life of the Godhead. This was a work of God inside the Trinity (*ad intra*). The result of this emphasis was an explosion of works dealing with the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of the Trin. suffered a bit during the 18th c. (emphasis on Unitarianism). Karl Barth, who along with Augustine was uncomfortable with the term "person" (but apparently not the concept), brought a great reemphasis on Trinitarianism.

The Trinity is the highest revelation of God that he has made for his people. It is essential to embrace the doctrine of Trinity if we are going to embrace God in who He is.

White calls it "the capstone, the summit, the brightest star in the firmament of divine truths." [White, 14]

To pervert or misunderstand t/Trinity is to pervert & misunderstand t/very character & nature of God. In a very real sense it's to take His name in vain and thus violate t/3rd commandment, since God's name is t/embodyment of who He is.

Word "Trinity" from Latin *trinitas* meaning "threeness" [Packer, 40].

People who claim that the word's not in the Bible . . . Question is, "Is it biblical?" False teachers make a living out of taking biblical terminology and twisting it to mean something quite unbiblical.

I can take a biblical word and use it unbiblically (fulness) or I can take a word that's not used in t/Bible and use it biblically. Word "Lordship" isn't in the Bible, yet I believe that when applied to JC it's a biblical term. Many such words, including t/Trinity.

While t/Trinity conveys a biblical concept, a more accurate word is "Triunity" which encompasses both ideas of oneness and threeness.

We're talking about a nonnegotiable issue here. The Doctrine of t/Trinity sits at the throne of God along with other nonnegotiable doctrines such as salvation by grace alone thru faith alone, the full deity and humanity of JC, the virgin birth, the bodily resurrection of X.

To know t/God of the Bible is to know a Triune God. To deny a Triune God is to deny t/God of the Bible (thus

to deny one's own salvation).

“The goal of the Christian life, including the goal of Christian study and scholarship, is always the same: Jesus Christ, ‘in whom are hidden the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.’ Do we long for a ‘true knowledge’ of Christ? When we sing, ‘Lord, I want to know you,’ do we really mean it, and then take advantage of the ways He has given us to attain this ‘true knowledge’ of Him? To know Christ truly is to know the Trinity, for God has not revealed himself in such a way as to allow us to have *true* and *balanced* knowledge of the Father outside of such knowledge of the Son, all of which comes to us through the Spirit. A person who wants to ‘know Jesus’ must, due to the nature of God’s revelation, know Him as He is related to the Father and the Spirit. We must know, understand, and love the Trinity to be fully and completely Christian. This is why we say the Trinity is the greatest of God’s revealed truths.” [White, 15]

If that’s true (and it is) then we must do what we can to know God is His fulness. If we say we love Him, then, as the saying goes, to love Him is to know Him. If I say “I love my wife,” yet put forward no effort to know about her, what she’s like, what she desires in life, what drives her personality, etc. my love rings quite hollow.

There is one only and true God, but in the unity of the Godhead there are three coeternal and coequal Persons, the same in substance but distinct in subsistence [James Orr, ed. The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. This was expressed by the Council of Constantinople as "one *ousia* in three *hypostaseis*."]]

“While there is only one divine nature there are three subsistences or persons called the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, who possess not a similar but the same numerical essence and the distinction between them is not merely nominal but real.” [John Dick Lectures on Theology, cited by Cook, 126]

“A) There is in the Divine Being but one indivisible essence (*ousia, essentia*). B) In this one Divine Being there are three Persons or individual subsistences, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. C) The whole undivided essence of God belongs equally to each of the three persons. D) The subsistence and operation of the three persons in the divine Being is marked by a certain definite order. (e) There are certain personal attributes by which the three persons are distinguished. F) The Church confesses the Trinity to be a mystery beyond the comprehension of man.” [Louis Berkhof, Systematic Theology, 87-89]

“There is in the Divine Being but one indivisible essence . . . The term ‘essence’ refers to God’s essential being or nature. . . . In this one being there are three persons or three individual subsistences—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These are to be viewed as personal self-distinctions in the divine essence or substance. . . . The whole undivided essence of God belongs to each of the three persons. Thus there is no subordination regarding the essential being of any person, although . . . there is an economical or administrative subordination.” [W. Robert Cook, 130]

God eternally exists as three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and each person is fully God, and there is one God” [Grudem, 226]

“God is One as to Essence, Three as to Person.”

Not “Gods are” but God (one) is. Not one person and three persons (contra.) not one essence and three essences (contra.) but [^] (1 essence - 3 persons)

Before we get into the biblical support for the Triunity of God I thought it may be good to spend a moment in

looking at the doctrine historically. IOW - How did the CH t/o its history understand this doctrine and why?

Safe to say that t/Xn CH from its earliest times to present has uncompromisingly believed & taught that God is a Trinity of F, S, & H.S. - Even if, early on that belief was implicit rather than explicit.

CH upheld what t/Jews were taught in t/OT - that God is one. There is no other (we call this 'monotheism'). But, then, what do you do w/the Messiah? The one who called himself God; the great "I AM" of Jn. 8:58

The first thing that the CH this side of the Apostles dealt with was who X was and is. Cults not new. Had them in 1st and 2nd c. Groups such as t/docetists and the gnostics who denied that JC was God in the flesh.

False teachers were so pervasive in t/4th c. that Gregory of Nyssa wrote about how they could be found everywhere: "Every place in the city is full of them: the alleys, the crossroads, the forums, the squares. Garment sellers, money changers, food vendors—they are all at it. If you ask for change they philosophize for you about [the nature of Christ]. If you inquire about the price of bread, the answer is that the Father is greater and the Son inferior. If you speak about whether the bath is ready, they express the opinion that the Son was made out of nothing."

Be like stopping at Wegmans & after you ask for a lb. of salami from t/deli manager he doesn't respond w/"how thin would you like that cut" but "Jesus was only a man." Then you head over to Walmart and the gal in t/photo dept. doesn't say, "matte or glossy finish" she says, "The Trinity is a pagan belief." You next go to McDonald's and pull into t/drive through. Instead of hearing "Welcome to McDonald's, May I take your order" you hear "Welcome to McDonald's, "Our big Macs are not eternal and neither is JC."

Satan has been at work from the beginning of time. False teachers plagued Israel // CH (from t/time of X thru t/Apostles, onward).

False teachers weren't focused so much on God t/Father or on t/Holy Spirit. Focused their attacks on JC by denying that he was truly human, or by denying that he was truly God.

For example, the Gnostics of 2d c. claimed that X was not truly human, for being human would have meant that he was sinful. So they said he just appeared human. This, of course, turned t/work of X into an illusion: If he just appeared to be human he also just appeared to suffer and die. If he only appeared to suffer and die, then those who believe in such a Savior would only appear to be saved!

The CH responded by refuting these errors which, in turn, caused t/CH to formulate what in fact the Bible taught about X in his person (who he was) & work (what he came to do).

Little doubt the early church was trinitarian. Even if they were implicitly so at t/first. IOW - they hadn't formulated their belief into a systematic whole.

Same way w/their belief that JC was God. They believed it even though they hadn't formulated that belief into a systematic doctrine, examining all of the implications of that belief.

But it almost always takes attacks against a doctrine to force those who uphold t/truth to define it. IOW - CH councils, creeds, doctrinal statements, position papers and the like are in response to false teachers and false teachings. It took heretics like Marcion who denied t/authority of t/OT and much of t/NT (limiting his NT to

most of Paul's letters and Gospel of Luke) to bring t/CH together at Carthage to affirm t/which books of t/Bible are indeed canonical.

ISW - it was attacks against true doctrine which compelled t/CH to put in writing what it is that it believes and defends about issues such as who Jesus is and the Trinity.

Some cultists & false teachers will say that t/CH made up t/doctrine in t/3rd or 4th c. - even claiming that t/CH borrowed from pagan Gk. thought or from Hinduism or Buddhism. Simply not true. For 1 thing t/test of any teaching is whether it is found in Scripture. God's Word always trumps CH history & councils. However, we do find that t/post-apostolic CH did uphold t/Trinity - we have evidence that dates as early as t/first part of t/2nd c. (a generation w/i t/Apostles).

The Letter of Barnabas, dated to t/early 2nd c. affirms "a Trinity of God t/Father, Christ t/preexisting Lord and Judge, and the Holy Spirit who prepares hearts for salvation." [cited in Lewis, 255]

Athenagoras (c. 177) who defended the doctrine as an essential part of t/faith of t/CH.

Later in the 2nd c. AD ==>

The Didache (teaching) a document discovered in the late 1800s in Constantinople indicates that t/CH believed in a Triune God. [cited in Lewis, 255]

2nd c. theologian, Theophilus, was t/1st to use t/term "Trinity" (trias) of t/Godhead (FSHS). [cited in Lewis, 255]

Irenaeus (c. 190) wrote against t/heresy of t/Gnostics and claimed that the one Creator and Redeemer God subsists as Father, Son, and Spirit.

Tertullian (c. 200) wrote extensively on the Trinity. He claimed that God is a unity of substance, with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit distinct divine persons w/i t/substance of the one God. [cited in Lewis, 255]

Early in 4th c. a man by name of Arius shows up. He was an elder in Alexandria who came to t/false conclusion that, "If the Father begat t/Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence: and from this is it evident that there was a time when the Son was not. It therefore necessarily follows that he had his subsistence from nothing." [New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, s.v. Arianism]

Arius was quite a promoter so he had his favorite slogan set to a popular tune and soon half of Alexandria was singing "There was a time when the Son was not."

Arius had his thorn in the flesh, a dwarfly-looking young man w/dark skin and a red beard by name of Athanasius. It's been said that Athanasius could have been the patron saint of stubbornness. Athanasius, only in his early 20s, was Bishop of Alexandria. According to history, Athanasius never gave up on anything. He once grabbed the bridle of the Roman Emperor Constantine's horse and refused to let it go until Constantine conceded a theological point.

By God's providential plan, Athanasius also would not give up his opposition to Arius which led to Arianism being branded heresy at the councils of Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381)

The result was a statement that reads==>

“We believe in One God, the Father almighty . . . ; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten from the Father before all ages, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father. . . . And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, who proceeds from the Father. Together with the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified.”

Then you have St. Augustine who was t/most prolific at that point in writing about t/Trinity. He composed his masterful work *De Trinitate*, between 399 and 419.

Could go on . . . To the middle ages with men like Thomas Aquinas, & t/Reformation with Calvin, Luther, Zwingli, Tyndale. All of these men upheld t/belief that God is one in essence and three in person.

A position that is upheld in t/more recent confessions of faith, such as the Lutheran Augsburg Confession (1530) and Formula of Concord (1577); The Anglican 39 articles (1563), the Westminster Confession of 1646 and the 1689 Baptist Confession.

It’s reflected in our own doctrinal statement which says that we at Clarkson Community Church **believe in one sovereign God** who exists as three coeternal, coequal persons: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit

Creeds, councils, the collective teaching of t/CH is important and carries weight. CH is t/pillar and support of t/truth & creeds councils show how God has been at work in history in building His CH. But creeds are still bound to t/plain teaching of Scripture and are therefore only useful in as much as they are biblical themselves.

3. Three Essential Elements of the Triunity of God (three pillars of the faith)

Principle of Progressive Revelation

a. God is one as to Essence (God is One in Unity)

(1) A Unity in Plurality

Scripture is clear and dogmatic about the unity of God, especially as it relates to monotheism (Deuteronomy 4:35, 6:4; Isaiah 44:6-8, 45:5-6, 46:9; John 10:30; 1 Corinthians 8:4; James 2:19).

DEU 6:4 "Hear, O Israel! The \Lord\ is our God, the \Lord\ is one!

ISA 44:6 "Thus says the \Lord\, the King of Israel And his Redeemer, the \Lord\ of hosts: 'I am the first and I am the last, And there is no God besides Me.

1CO 8:4 Therefore concerning the eating of things sacrificed to idols, we know that there is no such thing as an idol in the world, and that there is no God but one.

JAM 2:19 You believe that God is one. You do well; the demons also believe, and shudder.

Wooden One - like a dead piece of lumbar (1 two by four).

Elohim - plural of majesty vs. reflection of the Trinity (cf. Cook, page 128)

Shema (Dt. 6:4) and the Heb. word Echad, from the root “to unite” and is used to refer to a compound unity (i.e. rain, class of students). Used that way in Gen. 2:24. Cf. other word for one, yachid which carries the idea of one and only, unique in Gen. 22:2,12,16 (cf. Hebrews 11:17 - monogenes). **According to James M. Boice, “the word [echad] is never used in the Hebrew Bible of a stark singular entity.” [Boice, 111]

Plural pronouns used (Gen. 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isa. 6:8). Also plural verbs (Gen. 1:26; 11:7). Indicates a distinction of persons.

(2) Summary

Substance. Essence. Learn the word Ontological. This does not obviate a distinction of persons.

(3) Historical Departures

(a) Tritheism; Polytheism; Binitarianism

Christianity is Monotheistic. Tritheism; Polytheism (Mormonism - denies Trinity but believes in many gods)

b. God is Three as to Person (God is Three in Distinction)

(1) Texts

Triunity in the OT - Passages where God speaks in a plural number with a plural noun and a singular verb (Gen. 1:26; 11:7; Isa. 6:8). Over 500 times the plural noun elohim is used by Moses with a singular verb suggesting plurality in unity (cf. Ecc. 12:1; Isa. 54:5).

Shema (Dt. 6:4) and the Heb. word Echad, from the root “to unite” and is used to refer to a compound unity (i.e. rain, class of students). Used that way in Gen. 2:24. Cf. other word for one, yachid which carries the idea of one and only, unique in Gen. 22:2,12,16 (cf. Hebrews 11:17 - monogenes). **According to James M. Boice, “the word [echad] is never used in the Hebrew Bible of a stark singular entity.” [Boice, 111]

Plural pronouns used (Gen. 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isa. 6:8). Also plural verbs (Gen. 1:26; 11:7). Indicates a distinction of persons. Plural of majesty? In Heb. no other examples of a monarch using plural verbs or plural pronouns of himself, so this suggestion has no evidence to support it. [Grudem, 227]. Other suggestion is that God is speaking of the angels. But angels do not participate in t/creation of man; man wasn't created in image and likeness of angels.

Baptism formula w/singular name. Note the definite article before each name. Also 2 Cor. 13:14 (three articles).

Gen. 19:24; Zech. 1:12, 3:1-2.

Gen. 19:24 Then the \Lord\ rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the \Lord\ out of heaven,

ZEC 1:12 Then the angel of the \Lord\ answered and said, "O \Lord\ of hosts, how long wilt Thou have

no compassion for Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, with which Thou hast been indignant these seventy years?"

ZEC 3:1-2 Then he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the \Lord,\ and Satan standing at his right hand to accuse him. And the \Lord\ said to Satan, "The \Lord\ rebuke you, Satan! Indeed, the \Lord\ who has chosen Jerusalem rebuke you! Is this not a brand plucked from the fire?"

MAT 28:19 "Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,

2CO 13:14 The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be with you all.

(a) Personality of the Father

Intellect, emotion, will. True of the Triune God, certainly true of the Father.

God "knows" all things.

Prov. 3:19 **The \Lord\ by wisdom founded the earth; By understanding He established the heavens.**

Rom. 11:33 **Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and unfathomable His ways!**

God demonstrates emotion:

Judges 10:16 **So they put away the foreign gods from among them, and served the \Lord;\ and He could bear the misery of Israel no longer.**

Psalm 5:5 (cf. Rom. 9) - God "hates."

Psa. 78:40 **How often they rebelled against Him in the wilderness, And grieved Him in the desert!**

God exercises a will

Isa. 14:24-27 **The \Lord\ of hosts has sworn saying, "Surely, just as I have intended so it has happened, and just as I have planned so it will stand, to break Assyria in My land, and I will trample him on My mountains. Then his yoke will be removed from them, and his burden removed from their shoulder. "This is the plan devised against the whole earth; and this is the hand that is stretched out against all the nations. "For the \Lord\ of hosts has planned, and who can frustrate {it}? And as for His stretched-out hand, who can turn it back?"**

Isa. 46:10 **Declaring the end from the beginning And from ancient times things which have not been done, Saying, 'My purpose will be established, And I will accomplish all My good pleasure';**

(b) Personality of the Son

Intellect, emotion, will.

Grew in knowledge, had great wisdom,

Felt emotion (O Jerusalem; wept at Lazarus' grave)

Has a will. John 14:15; Matt. 26:39.

JOH 14:15 "If you love Me, you will keep My commandments.

MAT 26:39 And He went a little beyond {them,} and fell on His face and prayed, saying, "My Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from Me; yet not as I will, but as Thou wilt."

(c) Personality of the Holy Spirit

Intellect, Emotion, Will..

Masc. pronoun used w/Spirit which is neuter (would be expected to see a neuter pn. used). (John 14:26; ;15:26; 16:13-14). He teaches (John 14:26); He bears witness (John 15:26; Rom. 8:16); He prays on our behalf (Rom. 8:26-27); Searches and knows the depths and thoughts of God (1 Cor. 2:10-11); He gives spiritual gifts as he wills (1 Cor. 12:11). He disallows certain activities (Acts 16:6-7); He speaks (Acts 8:29, 13:2); Can be grieved (Eph. 4:30).

(2) Summary - God is Three in Distinction (not three manifestations)

(a) Introduction

Crucial Issue: The Definition of Terms -

Person - Presupposes the quality of personality (Cook, 127). "Personality in turn presupposes the power of self-consciousness and self-determination." [Ibid]. Personality is a distinct individual existence to which belongs reason and the power of moral agency. "While the attributes of deity are held in common by each member of the Godhead, there are attributes of each individual person, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, which are peculiarly theirs and are held separately." [Ibid]. "The distinct properties of each person are usually referred to as paternity, filiation, and precession, respectively., while the attributes of deity are commonly shared by all. This is referred to as perichoresis, or coinherence and describes the fact that there is undivided identity of nature in the three persons of the Godhead." [Ibid]

This must be understood as a person apart from a bodily existence. Possible because we are talking about eternal God who is spirit.

Subsistence - This is a word preferred by some to convey the idea of personhood. Preferred by John Calvin.'

God is not a "unit" like a piece of wood; he is a unity. Trinity in unity and unity in trinity. God is not one and three, but one in three.

"God is not a unit, but a unity. A unit, like a stone or a stick, is marked by mere singleness. It admits not interior distinctions and is incapable of that inherent trinality which is necessary to self-knowledge and self-consciousness. Mere singleness is incompatible with society, and therefore incompatible with divine communion and blessedness. God is blessed only as he is self-knowing and self-communing. A subject without an object could not experience either love or joy. Love and joy are societal. They imply more than a single person." [Shedd, 222] Could add "fellowship."

Distinct Doesn't Mean Separate. They are distinct, but not separate. They work in unity. Each is fully and

completely in the other (Father in t/Son, Son in t/Father, Spirit in F&S).

You can't take one away & still have God. They're not each 1/3 of God. The Father is 100% God; Son // HS //

Yet, they each have personality (intellect, emotion, will). They each relate to the other on a me-you-he basis.

IMPORTANT: Distinction in person doesn't mean independence. The persons are not independent from each other. What the father does the son does, Spirit, etc. You cannot take a person away and have any of God left and each of the persons is fully God. We're talking about a distinction of what makes God, God in his essence, or mode of being. There's a distinction, but never a separation. Each of t/members of t/Trinity are in one another, yet they are distinct persons. (have more to say about that later).

Why theologians say that even though it is lacking, word "person" is the best that we have in the English language. It still falls short because when we think of a "person" we think of someone with a bodily existence. We can't think in terms of three persons who make up one essential being. Keep in mind, we are talking about God who is an eternal, omnipotent, infinite, omnipresent Spirit.

We could simply say God, as God, is made up of three distinct, but not separate modes--a mode of God's essence would be another way of saying who God is.

One theologian suggested that we might use an illustration of a mirror. He writes that if you could look into the mirror and rather than see only a reflection, a true duplication (what is in t/mirror is as much you as you are), you may get as close to the idea of God as human lang. allows [cited in Shedd, 223]

Yet, you would not have two eternal beings (God is one as to essence), but one. Not two or three who are eternal, omnipotent, sovereign, etc. but 1 God who shares the completeness of His essence w/i t/3 persons.

Another example would be sunshine. The sun, its light and its heat are distinct. They are distinct, but not separate. If they were separate you could remove t/sun and still have heat/light. Or remove t/heat & still have t/sun. Or remove the light & still have heat. SW w/Triunity of God. Can't remove one at expense of t/other. Ea. person is in/with t/other.

(b) Distinctions of the Son and Spirit

The Son -

John's Gospel

Mark 13:32.

Psalms 110:1 (cf. "God the Father said to God the Son"). Cf. Mat. 22:41-46.

"Jewish interpreters to this day will have no more satisfactory explanation of Psalm 110:1 (or of Gen. 1:26) than they did in Jesus day." [Grudem, 228]

MAR 13:32 "But of that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father {alone.}"

PSA 110:1 (A Psalm of David.) The \Lord\ says to my Lord: "Sit at My right hand, Until I make Thine enemies a footstool for Thy feet."

MAT 22:41-46 41 Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question, :42 saying, "What do you think about the Christ, whose son is He?" They * said to Him, "{The son} of David." 43 He *said to them, "Then how does David in the Spirit call Him 'Lord,' saying, 44 #"\The Lord said to my Lord\, "\Sit at My right hand\, \Until I put Thine enemies beneath Thy feet\""?# 45 "If David then calls Him 'Lord,' how is He his son?" 46 And no one was able to answer Him a word, nor did anyone dare from that day on to ask Him another question.

Angel of the Lord - (Gen. 16:7-13; cf. 18:1-21; Zech. 3:1-2.).

Cf. Psalm 45:6-7 w/Heb. 1:8.

PSA 45:6-7 Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of uprightness is the scepter of Thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness; Therefore God, Thy God, has anointed Thee With the oil of joy above Thy fellows.

HEB 1:8-9 But of the Son {He says}, #"\Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever\, \And the righteous scepter is the scepter of His kingdom\. "\Thou hast loved righteousness and hated lawlessness\; \Therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee\ \With the oil of gladness above Thy companions.\" #

Note the word πληρωμα in Col. 1:19, 2:9 implies a fulness that transcends a unit. It's a multiplicity in unity. If God were merely a "wooden one" he couldn't be omnipresent or infinite. "It may be true that in one essence there can be but one person, when the essence is finite and limited, but not when the essence is infinite." [John Owen, The Doctrine of the Trinity Vindicated, cited in Shedd, 222]

The Spirit - Isa. 61:1 and Isa. 48:16 (spoken by JC).

ISA 61:1 The Spirit of the Lord \God\ is upon me, Because the \Lord\ has anointed me To bring good news to the afflicted; He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, To proclaim liberty to captives, And freedom to prisoners;

ISA 48:16 "Come near to Me, listen to this: From the first I have not spoken in secret, From the time it took place, I was there. And now the Lord \God\ has sent Me, and His Spirit." #

John 14:16

“And I will ask the Father, and He will give you another Helper, that He may be with you forever;

John 15:26

“When the Helper comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, that is the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, He will bear witness of Me,

JOH 17:5 "And now, glorify Thou Me together with Thyself, Father, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.

JOH 17:24 "Father, I desire that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am, in order that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me; for Thou didst love Me before the foundation of the world.

Interrelation of the F, S. and HS in John 13:1,2, 14:6-11, 14:16-17,26, 15:26-27, 16:13-15, 17:1-26).

NT Revelation - Matthew 3:16-17

16 And after being baptized, Jesus went up immediately from the water; and behold, the heavens were opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, *and* coming upon Him, 17 and behold, a voice out of the heavens, saying, "This is My beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleased."

Days of Arias - "Go to the Jordan and you will see the Trinity." [Shedd, 224]

Transfiguration of Jesus in Matt. 17:1-9.

Who was Jesus praying to? Etc.?

IMPORTANT: Distinction in person doesn't mean independence. The persons are not independent from each other. What the father does the son does, Spirit, etc. You cannot take a person away and have any of God left.

"Each of them is all that God is; and none of them is separated from the others in being God. The persons are not independent individuals: they are, to use classical language, ways in which God is God. This suggests, moreover, another dimension of God's unity. Because the persons are not separate things, they do not do things separately, and they do not do different things. All of the works of God are works of the Father done in the Son and perfected through the Spirit." [Richard A. Norris, Understanding the Faith of the Church, 101]

c. Pillar #3 - Each Person is Fully God (God is Complete in Each Person)

(1) Father is Fully God

Matthew 28:19

"Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,"

Significance of this is often overlooked, esp. when you understand the significance of God's "name" in scripture. To put two others on the same par w/God, if they were not in fact God, would be blasphemous. Also note that name is singular.

Also 2 Corinthians 13:14

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be with you all.

Why theologians say that even though it is lacking, word "person" is the best that we have in the English

language. It still falls short because when we think of a “person” we think of someone with a bodily existence. We can’t think in terms of three persons who make up one essential being. Keep in mind, we are talking about God who is an eternal, omnipotent, infinite, omnipresent Spirit.

We could simply say God, as God, is made up of three distinct, but not separate modes--a mode of God’s essence would be another way of saying who God is.

One theologian suggested that we might use an illustration of a mirror. He writes that if you could look into the mirror and rather than see only a reflection, a true duplication (what is in t/mirror is as much you as you are), you may get as close to the idea of God as human lang. allows [cited in Shedd, 223]

Yet, you would not have two eternal beings (God is one as to essence), but one. Not two or three who are eternal, omnipotent, sovereign, etc. but 1 God who shares the completeness of His essence w/i t/3 persons.

Another example would be sunshine. The sun, its light and its heat are distinct. They are distinct, but not separate. If they were separate you could remove t/sun and still have heat/light. Or remove t/heat & still have t/sun. Or remove the light & still have heat. SW w/Triunity of God. Can’t remove one at expense of t/other. Ea. person is in/with t/other.

Deity of t/Father, Son, & H.S. is fully in each person simultaneously and eternally. Ea. is fully, completely, eternally God.

JOHN 6:27 - **Do not work for food that perishes, but for food which endures to eternal life, the food that the Son of Man will give to you, for on Him, the Father God has set His seal.**

(2) The Son is Fully God

Not only is this affirmed in the Bible, it was affirmed early on in t/Post-apostolic CH.

Example - CH father Ignatius, whose life overlapped w/the Apostles, wrote around 110 AD :
Our God, Jesus Christ, was conceived by the Mary according to God’s plan, both from the seed of David and of the Holy Spirit [cited in Boyd, Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity, 151]

A bit later, Athenagoras declared that Christians are those who **hold the Father to be God, and the Son God, and the Holy Spirit, and declare their union and their distinction in order.**” [cited in Boyd, Oneness Pentecostals and the Trinity, 160]

Key point of this is that these were early CH leaders who were carrying on the teaching of t/Apostles. They wrote extensively, they carried huge influence t/o the CH. If they had been declaring something totally at odds (heretical) from what t/Apostles themselves had taught their would have been an outrage. We would have a record of how t/CH at large opposed them & denounced them as heretics. Instead, what they taught was received as Christian truth because it wasn’t anything new.

It wasn’t anything new because t/Apostles taught it; it’s recorded for us in t/NT.

(a) Six categories of evidence that Jesus Christ is Fully God

i. He possesses attributes of God

Jesus possesses attributes that are characteristic of God alone, the non-communicable attributes (explain).

*** Examples of these would be:**

Eternal (no beginning or end) - John 8:58; 17:5 (cf. Isa. 9:6).

Omnipresence (present everywhere). Matt. 18:20; 28:28.

Omniscience (to know all things). Luke 6:7-8; John 2:24, 4:29 Omnipotence (all-powerful) Ephesians 1:20-23; Revelation 1:8

Immutability (doesn't change) Hebrews 13:8.

ii. He Does Things Only God Can Do

Jesus performs works that fall solely under the prerogative of God.

He forgives sin (Mark 2:5-7)

He grants eternal life (John 10:28)

He is the judge of the universe (Matthew 25:31-33, cf. Joel 3:1-2)

He creates Creator (Colossians 1:16-17)

He rose from the dead (John 10:18).

iii. He Possesses the Names of God

His titles include:

1. Son of God

"though the term 'Son of' can mean 'off-spring of' it also carries the meaning 'of the order of.' The designation 'Son of God' when used of our Lord means 'of the order of God' and is a strong and clear claim to full deity."

[Charles Ryrie, Basic Theology.] A son is same character/essence of a Father (unless adopted).

2. Mighty God (Isaiah 9:6)

3. Immanuel (Isaiah 7:14, cf. Matthew 1:23);

4. Alpha and Omega (Revelation 1:8, cf. 22:13)

5. God (John 1:1,18)

6. Lord (John 20:28; Romans 10:13, cf. Joel 2:32; Philippians 2:10-11, cf. Isaiah 45:22ff.)

iv. He Claimed to Be God

In John 8:58, Jesus clearly equates Himself with YHWH (cf. Exodus 3:14-15). He told t/Jews in John 8:24 [=>]

The same Jesus who quoted the Shema and said ==>

"The foremost [commandment] is, 'HEAR, O ISRAEL! THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD

Also said to the Jews in John 10:30 ==>

I and my Father are one.

One neuter (essence). Note two persons "I and the Father" and the plural verb "we are" not sing. "is".

v. He Is Worshiped as God

He receives worship reserved for God, as God. Jesus knew that (Mt. 4:10)

Then Jesus *said to him, “Begone, Satan! For it is written, ‘YOU SHALL WORSHIP THE LORD YOUR GOD, AND SERVE HIM ONLY.’”

Sev. times men are warned against worshiping any other than God, such as angels (Rev. 19:10, 22:9).

Yet, JC receives worship: Man born blind in John 9, after being healed worshiped Jesus (Jesus didn’t rebuke him for doing so).

Hebrews 1:6 says that all the angels are to worship Him (Christ).

Phil 2:10-11 [=>]

This was the practice of believers from the 1st c. onward.

Pliny the Younger's report to the Emperor Trajan (AD 111-112) that the Christians in Bithynia met on a fixed day before dawn and "recited an antiphonal hymn to Christ as God." [cited in Bruce, Colossians, 158]

vi. Scriptures Says He is God

There are several passages in the New Testament that explicitly state that Jesus Christ is God.

The writer to the Hebrews tells us in Hebrews 1:8-9=>

But of t/Son He says, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever, And t/righteous scepter is the scepter of His kingdom. "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated lawlessness; Therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee . . .

PSA 45:6-7 Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of uprightness is the scepter of Thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness; Therefore God, Thy God, has anointed Thee . . .

Not only do we see that the Son is eternal, but also that He is God the Son who is distinct in person from God the Father.

Romans 9:5 . . . (Jesus was an Israelite according to the flesh) **who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.**

Some have argued that this passage should be punctuated differently. There should be a period after the word “all.” (read it that way). However, that does not grammatically make sense. The context all along has been JC & there’s no reason to think that Paul is talking otherwise.

Titus 2:13 **looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus**

There is a well-known Gk. rule of grammar known as “Sharp’s Rule.” According to this rule, the same person who is called God is the exact same person who is called Savior, namely JC.

Same construction in 2 Peter 1:1=>

SIMON PETER, a bond-servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to those who have received a faith of the same kind as ours, by the righteousness of our God and Savior, Jesus Christ:

And, of course you have John 1:1 [=>]

(3) The Spirit is Fully God

Remember Isa 6? Isaiah's great vision of YHWH/Lord (which by the way was a vision of JC according to John 12:41). In 6:9, the Lord says:

“Go, and tell this people: ‘Keep on listening, but do not perceive; Keep on looking, but do not understand.’

Then we get to t/Book of Acts, and this same verse is quoted by TAP. In chapter 28:25-26==>

. . . Paul [spoke] one *parting* word, “The Holy Spirit rightly spoke through Isaiah the prophet to your fathers, saying, Paul goes on to quote Isa. 6:9!

Same thing in Hebrews: 3:7-11 “The Holy Spirit Says” quoting Psalm 95 OT where God is speaking. Same thing again in 10:15-17

According to 2 Sam. 23:2-3 the Spirit of t/Lord is the God of Israel. According to Acts 5:3 a lie against the HS is a lie against God.

Matthew 28:19 “Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,”

Significance of this is often overlooked, esp. when you understand the significance of God's “name” in scripture. To put two others on the same par w/God, if they were not in fact God, would be blasphemous.

The HS possesses the attributes of God and does the works of God.

H.S. is eternal (Heb. 9:14); Omnipresent (Psa. 139:7-10); Omniscient (1 Cor. 2:10-11); Omnipotent (Luke 1:35).

He is the creator (Gen. 1:2; Psa. 33:6); He works to forgive sin (John 3:5; Titus 3:5).

The temple of God, our bodies, is called the TOHS. 1 Cor. 3:16 [=>]

2 Cor. 3:17 Now the Lord is the Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, *there* is liberty.

Parallel is to Exodus 34:34 about how Moses, when he would encounter t/Lord God, would have to put a veil on his face so that t/Israelites would not see the glory of God on his face. That's the context of 2 Cor. 3 [^]

Attributes and Works by all three: H.S. is everlasting (Heb. 9:14); Omnipresent (Psa. 139:7-10); Omniscient (1 Cor. 2:10-11); Omnipotent (Luke 1:35).

Called God in Acts 5:3-4;

1 Cor. 3:16.

Hebrews 3:7-11 “The Holy Spirit Says” quoting the Old Testament where God is speaking (cf. 10:15-17)

Baptism formula. and other trinitarian formulas.

Work of the H.S. (Gen. 1:2; Judges 6:34)

2 Cor. 3:17 ==>

“Interpreters often assume that ‘the Lord’ here must mean Christ, because Paul frequently uses ‘the Lord’ to refer to Christ. But that is probably not the case here, for a good argument can be made from grammar and context to say that this verse is better translated with the Holy Spirit as subject . . . In this case, Paul would be saying that the Holy Spirit is also ‘Yahwah’ . . . the Lord of the Old Testament . . . Theologically this would be quite acceptable, for it could truly be said that just as God the Father is ‘Lord’ and God the Son is ‘Lord’ . . . so also the Holy Spirit is the one called ‘Lord’ in the Old Testament—and it is the Holy Spirit who especially manifests the presence of the Lord to us in the new covenant age.” (Grammatically, both ‘the Spirit’ (to pneuma) and ‘the Lord (ho kyrios) are in the nominative case, which is the case taken both by the subject and by the predicate noun in a sentence with the verb ‘to be.’ . . . The definite article (ho, the) before ‘Lord’ here is probably anaphoric (that is, it refers back to the previous mention of ‘Lord’ in v. 16 and says that the Spirit is ‘the Lord’ who was just mentioned in the previous sentence.”). [Grudem, 233, also fn.]

(4) The Three Are One God and Work in Unity

Not a three slice pie.

Work of creation: Father (Psa. 102:25; Gen. 1:1); Son (Col. 1:16; John 1:3); Spirit (Gen. 1:2; Job 33:4). Jesus Baptism; Atonement (Heb. 9:14); Res. of X (Father in Acts 2:32; Son Jn. 10:17-18); Spirit (Rom. 1:4). Trinitarian formula in Eph. 1. Salvation as a work of all three; Scripture as a work of all three.

“ . . . the Father creates (1 Cor. 8:6; 2 Cor. 4:6), the Son redeems (Eph. 1:7; Titus 3:6), and the Spirit sanctifies (Rom. 15:16; 2 Cor. 3:18; 2 Thess. 2:13). Yet by virtue of the common essence, what one divine person performs each may be said to perform (the principle of *perichoresis*). Accordingly, the Son creates (1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16) and the Spirit creates (Job. 33:4; Psa. 33:6); the Father redeems (2 Cor. 5:18-19; Eph. 2:4-5,8) and the Spirit redeems (Rom. 8:4; Titus 3:5); and the Father sanctifies (Eph. 1:3-4; 1 Thess. 5:23) and the Son sanctifies (Eph. 4:15-16; 5:25-27).” [Lewis, 267]

“The Father is eternal (Gen. 21:33; 1 Tim. 1:17), the Son is eternal (John 1:1; 8:58; 17:5,24; Heb. 7:3; Rev. 22:13), and the Spirit is eternal (Heb. 9:14). The Father is omnipresent (Jer. 23:24; Acts 17:27), the Son is omnipresent (Matt. 28:20), and the Spirit is omnipresent (Psa. 139:7-10). The Father is holy (Lev. 11:45; John 17:11), the Son is holy (John 6:69; Acts 4:27), and the Spirit is holy (Rom. 1:4; Eph. 4:30). The Father is love (Psa. 136:1-26; Jer. 31:3; John 3:16; 1 John 4:8, 16), the Son is love (John 15:9,13; 1 John 3:16), the Spirit is love (Rom. 5:5; Gal. 5:22; Col. 1:8). The Father is omnipotent (Mar. 14:36; Luke 1:37), the Son is omnipotent (Matt. 9:6; Luke 8:25; John 10:18), and the Spirit is omnipotent

(Luke 1:35; Acts 1:8; 2:2-4,17-21; 4:31-33).” [Lewis, 273]

Within the sphere of God's unity there is clear evidence for Triunity. Examples include: each Person of the Godhead is revealed to be God (Deuteronomy 6:4; John 1:1; Acts 5:3-4); the three members of the Godhead are given equal status in passages such as 2 Corinthians 13:14 and in the baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 (cf. singular use of "name"); parallel passages that attribute the same work to different Persons such as creating (Genesis 1:2; Colossians 1:17; Hebrews 11:4) and regenerating (John 3:5-8,17; Mark 2:5-11); plural personal pronouns, verbs, and adjectives attributed to God (Genesis 1:26, 3:22, 11:7; Isaiah 6:8; Genesis 1:26, 11:7; Joshua 24:19; Psalm 58:11).

“The Nicene trinitarians endeavored to illustrate the simultaneous existence of the undivided and total nature in each of the three persons by the figure of circumincession . . . There is a continual in-being and indwelling of one person in another. This is taught in John 14:10-11; 17:21,23 . . . This, the Nicene writers described metaphorically as an unceasing circulation of the essence, whereby there is an eternal intercommunion and interaction of being in the Godhead so that each person coinheres in the others and the others in each.” [Shedd, 249-50]

“Each [person] is in each [person], and all [three persons] are in each [person], and each [person] is in all [three persons], and all [three persons] are one being.” [Augustine, On The Trinity, 6.10]

(1) Implications as to Prayer

“The hypostatic or trinitarian paternity of God the Father as related to the Son must not be confounded with the providential paternity of God the Trinity as related to the creation. Only one of the divine persons is the trinitarian Father; but the three persons in one essence constitute the providential and universal Father. The triune God is generally the Father of men and angels by creation and specially of the elect by redemption. Hence, the term *father* applied to God has two significations. It may denote divine essence in all three modes or in only one mode. The first clause in the Lord’s prayer is an example of the former. When men say, ‘Our Father who is in heaven.’ they do not address the first person of the Godhead to the exclusion of the second and third. They address, not the untriune God of deism and natural religion, but the God of revelation, who is triune and as such the providential Father of all men and the redemptive Father of believers. If a man deliberately and consciously intends in his supplication to exclude from his worship the Son and the Holy Spirit, his petition is not acceptable . . . (John 5:23). A man may not have the three persons distinctly and formally in his mind when he utters this petition, and in this case, he does not intentionally exclude any trinitarian person or persons; but the petition, nevertheless, ascends to the divine three, not to a single person exclusively; and the answer returns to him from the triune God, not from any solitary person exclusively. Says Witsius (*Lord’s Prayer*, diss. 7):

It is a doctrine firmly maintained by all orthodox divines, that the Father cannot be invoked in a proper manner, without at the same time invoking the Son and Holy Spirit, because they are one in nature and in honor . . .

Says Augustine (*On the Trinity* 5:2), ‘That which is written, “Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord,” ought not to be understood as if the Son were excepted or the Holy Spirit were excepted. This one Lord our God, we rightly call, also , our Father.’” [Shedd, 253-54]

3. Pulling it all together: What do we mean by “Essence” and “Person” and how do these relate to each other in the unity of the Godhead

a. What We Mean

(1) Introduction

Law of non-contradiction says that two identical things cannot differ in the same way at the same time in the same place. Not saying that God is one god and yet three gods // one essence and three essence // one person and three persons // One God in Three Persons (possible because we are talking about a spiritual eternal omnipotent God, not something that is temporal or physical. Not limited to space-time, or to our understanding of physics. Even the fact that God can indwell so many person at once and yet be one God shows that we are talking about something spiritually possible.

(2) Explanation

“The basic assertion of this doctrine is that the unity of the one God is complex. The three personal subsistences’ (as they are called) are coequal and coeternal centers of self-awareness, each being ‘I’ in relation to two who are ‘you’ and each partaking of the full divine essence . . . along with the other two. They are not three roles played by one person (that is *modalism*), nor are they three gods in a cluster (that is *tritheism*); the one God (‘he’) is also and equally, ‘they,’ and ‘they’ are always together and always cooperating, with the Father initiating, the Son complying, and the Spirit executing the will of both, which is his will also.” [Packer, 42]

“The three persons of the Godhead are to be distinguished by personal properties. These do not involved attributes of essence which are common to all. Rather, it refers to properties which are not true of the three persons jointly. These are incommunicable among the Godhead or true of one person only. Generation (paternity) is true of the Father only; filiation belongs to the Son only; and procession is ascribed to the Holy Spirit only.” [Cook 130]

“The clue to the right construction of the doctrine of the Trinity lies in the accurate distinction and definition of essence and person. The doctrine is logically consistent because it affirms that God is one in another sense than he is three and that he is three in another sense than he is one.” [Shedd, 230]

Athanasius, (Against the Arians, 4.10)==>

“We assert the unity of the Godhead as expressly and strenuously as the distinction and diversity of the person. We believe the Father and the Son to be two, perfectly distinct from one another in their relative and personal characters; but withal we believe these two to be one God, one infinite essence or nature, the Son or Word begotten of the Father, united with him and inseparable from him in essence. And that illustration which we have so often made use of before, serves very well to explain our meaning, though by no means to explain the thing itself. Fire and light are truly distinct. The one is a body differently modified from the other, as is evident from their acting differently upon us. And yet, they are one as to substance and general properties. For light is the issue of fire and cannot subsist separate from it.”

Cf. also sun and sunshine. Also attributes of God which cannot be separated from who He is as God.

God is fully in each of his attributes (love, holiness, grace, justice). Yet his attributes are distinct from Him in that He is more than the sum total of how we describe Him. [cf. Shedd, 221-22]

Essence - God is one undivided essence. that is how He exists, as a triunity of one undivided essence. The one undivided essence subsists in three forms or persons simultaneously and eternally. This, again, is possible only because we are talking about God, who is spirit (not matter) and infinite (not finite). [Shedd, 234]

“In the instance of matter, three simultaneous forms necessarily imply three different things or substances. One and the same piece of clay cannot have three forms simultaneously. . . . In order that there may be three different forms of clay simultaneously, there must be three different pieces of clay. But in the instance of mind or immaterial substance, three simultaneous forms or modes do not necessarily imply three different minds or substances. One and the same entire mind may remember, understand, and will simultaneously. Memory, understanding and will are three simultaneous forms of modes of one and the same mind or spirit.” [Shedd, 234-35]

Each person has an “I, you, he” awareness. The Son knows he is not the Father (John 17:5); the Father knows He is not the Son (Heb. 1:5). The Spirit knows that He is neither the Father, nor the Son (Acts 13:2).

Issues of Christology in the Trinity==>

One person, therefore, the humanity and divinity of Christ cannot be separated, or isolated. Jesus does not operate out of one or the other (i.e. he forgives sin in his deity, he weeps in his humanity). The entire person does these things as one. What about his death on the cross? Did God die? Did all of God die? Isn't JC all of God.

The God-man died on the cross as a person. Death is separation, not cessation of existence. Jesus, as the 2nd person of the Trinity was, momentarily, spiritually separated from the Godhead, although ontologically, he remained an inseparable part of it.

Did all of God “die?” The second person died as the God-man. While Jesus is 100% God, He is not all the of the Godhead?

“A trinitarian person is not so comprehensive as the Godhead, because he does not possess the personal characteristics belonging to the other two persons. He is the essence with one personal peculiarity, while the Godhead is the essence with three personal peculiarities. A trinitarian person includes all that is in the unity, but not all that is in the trinity of God; all that is in the essence, but not all that is in the three modes of the essence.” [Shedd, 238]

“A trinitarian person is the entire divine nature subsisting in a particular manner, namely, as Father or as Son or as Holy Spirit.” [Shedd, 233]

God can be in a billion places at once, but he is not a billion gods, he is one God. God can indwell a million Xns at the same time, but he is not a million gods, he is one God. ISW - God can subsist as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and yet be one God, not three gods.

b. How do these relate to each other in the unity of the Godhead?

John Calvin, The Institutes, 1.13.

Calvin goes on to say:

“Let us not, then, be led to imagine a trinity of person that keeps our thoughts distracted and does not at once lead them back to that unity. Indeed the words, ‘Father,’ ‘Son, and ‘Spirit’ imply a real distinction—let no one think that these titles, whereby God is variously designated from his works, are empty—but a distinction, not a division.” [1.13.17]

“For in each hypostasis the whole divine nature is understood, with this qualification—that to each belongs his own peculiar quality. The Father is wholly in the Son, the Son wholly in the Father, even as he himself declares: ‘I am in the Father and the Father is in me.’” [1.18.19]

As Augustine wrote:

“Christ, as it relates to himself is called God; as he relates to the Father, he is called Son. The Father, as it relates to who he is, is called God; as he relates to the Son, he is the Father. In so far as he is called Father with respect to the Son, he is not the Son; in so far as he is called the Son with respect to the Father, he is not the Father; in so far as he is called both Father with respect to himself, and Son with respect to himself, he is the same God.” [1.13.19]

“Indeed, if we hold fast to what has been sufficiently shown above from Scripture—that the essence of the one God is simple and undivided, and that it belongs to the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; and on the other hand that by a certain characteristic the Father differs from the Son, and the Son from the Spirit—the gates will be closed not only to Arius and Sabellius but to other ancient authors of errors.” [1.13.22]

Not a three slice pie.

Work of creation: Father (Psa. 102:25; Gen. 1:1); Son (Col. 1:16; John 1:3); Spirit (Gen. 1:2; Job 33:4). Jesus Baptism; Atonement (Heb. 9:14); Res. of X (Father in Acts 2:32; Son Jn. 10:17-18); Spirit (Rom. 1:4). Trinitarian formula in Eph. 1. Salvation as a work of all three; Scripture as a work of all three.

“ . . . the Father creates (1 Cor. 8:6; 2 Cor. 4:6), the Son redeems (Eph. 1:7; Titus 3:6), and the Spirit sanctifies (Rom. 15:16; 2 Cor. 3:18; 2 Thess. 2:13). Yet by virtue of the common essence, what one divine person performs each may be said to perform (the principle of *perichoresis*). Accordingly, the Son creates (1 Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16) and the Spirit creates (Job. 33:4; Psa. 33:6); the Father redeems (2 Cor. 5:18-19; Eph. 2:4-5,8) and the Spirit redeems (Rom. 8:4; Titus 3:5); and the Father sanctifies (Eph. 1:3-4; 1 Thess. 5:23) and the Son sanctifies (Eph. 4:15-16; 5:25-27).” [Lewis, 267]

“The Father is eternal (Gen. 21:33; 1 Tim. 1:17), the Son is eternal (John 1:1; 8:58; 17:5,24; Heb. 7:3; Rev. 22:13), and the Spirit is eternal (Heb. 9:14). The Father is omnipresent (Jer. 23:24; Acts 17:27), the Son is omnipresent (Matt. 28:20), and the Spirit is omnipresent (Psa. 139:7-10). The Father is holy (Lev. 11:45; John 17:11), the Son is holy (John 6:69; Acts 4:27), and the Spirit is holy (Rom. 1:4; Eph. 4:30). The Father is love (Psa. 136:1-26; Jer. 31:3; John 3:16; 1 John 4:8, 16), the Son is love (John 15:9,13; 1 John 3:16), the Spirit is love (Rom. 5:5; Gal. 5:22; Col. 1:8). The Father is omnipotent (Mar. 14:36; Luke 1:37), the Son is omnipotent (Matt. 9:6; Luke 8:25; John 10:18), and the Spirit is omnipotent

(Luke 1:35; Acts 1:8; 2:2-4,17-21; 4:31-33).” [Lewis, 273]

“The external characteristics, *notae externae*, of the three persons are transitive acts: *opera ad extra*. They are activities and effects by which the Trinity is manifested outwardly. They are the following: 1) creation, preservation, and government of the universe; 2) redemption; and 3) inspiration, regeneration, and sanctification. The first belongs officially and eminently to the Father; the second to the Son; the third to the Holy Spirit. The Father creates, yet by and through the Son (Ps. 33:6; Prov. 3:19; 30:4; John 5:17; Acts 4:24,27). The Son redeems, yet commissioned by the Father (Rom. 3:24; 5:11; Gal. 3:13; Rev. 5:9). The Spirit inspires and sanctifies, yet as sent by the Father and Son: he inspires the prophets (2 Sam. 23:2,19; 2 Peter 1:21) and sanctifies the elect (1 Pet. 1:2).” [Shedd, 252]

Within the sphere of God's unity there is clear evidence for Triunity. Examples include: each Person of the Godhead is revealed to be God (Deuteronomy 6:4; John 1:1; Acts 5:3-4); the three members of the Godhead are given equal status in passages such as 2 Corinthians 13:14 and in the baptismal formula of Matthew 28:19 (cf. singular use of "name"); parallel passages that attribute the same work to different Persons such as creating (Genesis 1:2; Colossians 1:17; Hebrews 11:4) and regenerating (John 3:5-8,17; Mark 2:5-11); plural personal pronouns, verbs, and adjectives attributed to God (Genesis 1:26, 3:22, 11:7; Isaiah 6:8; Genesis 1:26, 11:7; Joshua 24:19; Psalm 58:11).

Yet, there are distinctions: The Son is begotten of the Father and the Spirit is sent by the Father and the Son. The usual pattern we see in Bible is that the Father works through the Son in the Power of the Holy Spirit. Yet, the persons never work apart from one another because it is impossible for them to do so.

So, while the attributes of deity are held in common by all three membs of t/Godhead, there are attributes that are distinctly and uniquely held by one member of the Trintiy to the exclusion of the others. We call these “properties.” Usually referred to as “Paternity, filiation, and procession.”

Distinction in person doesn’t mean independence. The persons are not independent from each other. What the father does the son does, Spirit, etc. You cannot take a person away and have any of God left and each of the persons is fully God. We’re talking about a distinction of what makes God, God in his essence, or mode of being. There’s a distinction, but never a separation. Each of t/members of t/Trinity are in one another, yet they are distinct persons. (have more to say about that later.

Distinct Doesn’t Mean Separate. They are distinct, but not separate. They work in unity. Each is fully and completely in the other (Father in t/Son, Son in t/Father, Spirit in F&S).

You can’t take one away & still have God. They’re not each 1/3 of God. The Father is 100% God; Son // HS //

Yet, they each have personality (intellect, emotion, will). They each relate to the other on a me-you-he basis.

Why theologians say that even though it is lacking, word “person” is the best that we have in the English language. It still falls short because when we think of a “person” we think of someone with a bodily existence. We can’t think in terms of three persons who make up one essential being. Keep in mind, we are talking about God who is an eternal, omnipotent, infinite, omnipresent Spirit.

Augustine and the Latin term “person” which meant “mask” and was insufficient (Gk. terms were better, such as one οὐσια in three ὑποστάσεις).

c. The Insufficiency of Analogies

Glimpses of the Trinity in the marriage relationship (Gen. 2:24; 1 Cor. 6:16-20; 11:3; Eph. 5:31)); and in the relationship of the members to the one body, the church (1 Cor. 12:12-26). These fall short.

(1) Best Illustration from History

Some have brought up an intriguing illust. “triple point” of water, which is t/point where water can co-exist in all three states of matter (solid, liquid, gas). That happens at a particular ambient temperature coupled w/a particular barometric pressure. At 32 deg. F and 4.62 mm Hg pressure H₂O coexists as all three. “The triple point shows that one substance (God) can have three coexisting phases (persons) all having identical intrinsic characteristics . . .” [Cook, 126]

But even this illustration has its limitations, as they all do because we are t/finite trying to comprehend t/infinite.

Council of Constantinople, 12th Century.

d. Ontological Trinity vs. Economical Trinity (cf. Cook 130).

The whole undivided essence of God belongs equally and fully to each person. Simply put, each person is fully and completely God, even though each person is not the entirety of the Godhead. Ontological equality (co-equal, co-eternal persons).

However, there is an ordering among the members of the Trinity.

JOH 3:35 "The Father loves the Son, and has given all things into His hand.

JOH 5:22-23 "For not even the Father judges anyone, but He has given all judgment to the Son, in order that all may honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent Him.

JOH 5:30 "I can do nothing on My own initiative. As I hear, I judge; and My judgment is just, because I do not seek My own will, but the will of Him who sent Me.

JOH 14:28 "You heard that I said to you, 'I go away, and I will come to you.' If you loved Me, you would have rejoiced, because I go to the Father; for the Father is greater than I.

1CO 3:23 and you belong to Christ; and Christ belongs to God.

1CO 11:3 But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.

1CO 15:28 And when all things are subjected to Him, then the Son Himself also will be subjected to the One who subjected all things to Him, that God may be all in all.

JOH 10:18 "No one has taken it away from Me, but I lay it down on My own initiative. I have authority

to lay it down, and I have authority to take it up again. This commandment I received from My Father."

JOH 8:49 Jesus answered, "I do not have a demon; but I honor My Father, and you dishonor Me.

MAR 14:36 And He was saying, "Abba! Father! All things are possible for Thee; remove this cup from Me; yet not what I will, but what Thou wilt."

Not subordinationism which teaches inequality. What Jesus meant when he said that the Father was greater. The Father is in a place of greater authority, which does not imply inequality. Like me saying "The President of the USA is greater than me." what we call an economic or administrative order. Same thing when we read "Wive's submit to your own husbands." Or, in Heb. 13:17, 1 Peter 2:13. (Illust. of bro. woodard).

Implied in the "Father/Son" relationship.

Father and the Son send the Spirit (cf. John 14-15).

The father is always the first person who sends the Son and the Spirit. The father is not begotten or proceeding. The son is always the second person who is eternally begotten of the Father, but not proceeding. The HS is always the 3rd person who eternally proceeds from the Father and the Son. Order, that the Father works through the Son in the Power of the Spirit. Relational order.

All things are out of (ἐκ) the Father (1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 2:8, 3:14-15) through (διὰ) the Son (John 1:3; Rom. 1:5; 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 1:5, 2:18; Heb. 1:12) and by (ἐν) the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:11; Eph. 2:18, 22; 3:5). The Father is the author, or source of all things. The Son brings them to pass and is the. The Spirit makes them known and applies them.

Some things are related more to one person than another (Creation = Father; Redemption = Son; Sanctification = Spirit).

4. Hairsplitting or Heresy? (Arianism and Modalism and Confusion, Oh My!)

a. Arianism / Watchtowerism

Arius of Alexandria (d. 336) believed that the Son and the Spirit were beings willed into existence by the Father. Therefore, speaking of the Son, "there was a time when he was not."

Some cultists & false teachers will say that t/CH made up t/doctrine of t/Deity of JC and t/Trinity in 3rd or 4th c. - even claiming that t/CH borrowed from pagan Gk. thought or from Hinduism or Buddhism. Simply not true. For 1 thing t/test of any teaching is whether it is found in Scripture. God's Word always trumps CH history & councils. However, we do find that t/post-apostolic CH did uphold t/Xs Deity & His humanity - we have evidence that dates as early as t/first part of t/2nd c. (a generation w/i t/Apostles).

The Letter of Barnabas, dated to t/early 2nd c. affirms "a Trinity of God t/Father, Christ t/preexisting Lord and Judge, and the Holy Spirit who prepares hearts for salvation." [cited in Lewis, 255]

Irenaeus (c. 190) wrote against t/heresy of t/Gnostics and claimed that the one Creator and Redeemer God who subsists as Father, Son, and Spirit.

Tertullian (c. 200) wrote extensively on the Trinity. He claimed that God is a unity of substance, with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit distinct divine persons w/i t/substance of the one God. [cited in Lewis, 255]

Early in 4th c. a man by name of Arius shows up. He was an elder in Alexandria who came to t/false conclusion that, “If the Father begat t/Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence: and from this is it evident that there was a time when the Son was not. It therefore necessarily follows that he had his subsistence from nothing.”

[New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, s.v. Arianism]

Arius was quite a promoter so he had his favorite slogan set to a popular tune and soon half of Alexandria was singing “There was a time when the Son was not.”

Arius had his thorn in the flesh, a dwarfly-looking young man w/dark skin and a red beard by name of Athanasius. It’s been said that Athanasius could have been the patron saint of stubbornness. Athanasius, only in his early 20s, was Bishop of Alexandria. According to history, Athanasius never gave up on anything. He once grabbed the bridle of the Roman Emperor Constantine’s horse and refused to let it go until Constantine conceded a theological point.

By God’s providential plan, Athanasius also would not give up his opposition to Arius and Council of Nicea set up by Rom. Emperor Constantine to help decide the issue in 325. The council sided w/Athanasius. Much of the issue revolved around the meaning of the Gk. words homo (same) and homoi (like). Was JC the same (ὁμο) as God or like (ὅμοι) God? “ὁμο” demands Jesus’ deity, “ὅμοι” does not.

Teachings of Arius, known as “Arianism” were rightly identified as heresy at the councils of Nicea (325) and Constantinople (381)

The result was a statement that reads==>

“We believe in One God, the Father almighty . . . ; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten from the Father before all ages, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father. . . . And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, who proceeds from the Father. Together with the Father and the Son he is worshiped and glorified.”

Refer you to part X on a rebuttal of Arianism (deity of JC - 6 reasons)

(1) Importance and use of creeds and councils

Not equal to scripture, but they carry authority in as much as they are reflective of Scripture. Principle that God is sovereign and that the CH is t/pillar and support of t/truth. Cf. my message on 1 Tim. 3:15.

b. Modalism (dynamic/modalistic/oneness)

(1) Historic Background

Sebellius - “Sebellius interpreted *came forth* to mean *came forth as a cause expressing itself in an effect*, saying that the Father himself is Son as taking flesh and Holy Sprit as giving life and holiness. [Aquinas, 65]

Sabellius tried to mediate between modalism and orthodoxy, responding to t/claim that modalism results in

Patricianism. So Seb. posited two poles of opposition and attraction in God, the Father and the Son. Both, said Seb. become incarnate in Jesus, but on the cross they separated, as the Son cried out “MY God, My God . . . ?” The love of the Father could not endure the separation, so He brought forth the H.S. as a kind of glue, to weld the Son back to him. [NDT, sv. Trinity]

This is a common view that denies t/Trinity by claiming that t/difference between t/Father, Son, HS is one of different manifestations of t/Father. Some of these false teachers contended t/3 aspects of God reflect three ages (F = OT; Son = Gospels; HS = Acts forward). Modalism denies a distinction of persons in t/Godhead. Rem. our definition: “God is one as to essence and three as to person.” According to Modalism, or Oneness theology, God is one as to essence and one as to person. The difference between t/F/S/HS is a matter of One God playing 3 different roles, like an actor changing between three different characters.

Origin of this heresy goes back to a man by the name of Sabellius (back in the early 3d century) in Rome. Actually goes back a little before that w/men in Asia Minor by name of Praxeas and Noetus, but Sabellius was t/one who really pushed t/movt. forward.

Sabellius claimed that t/Father himself is t/Son who took on flesh and also t/Holy Sprit who gives life & holiness. [Aquinas, 65]

It was a godly man by name of Tertullian, t/CH father from N. Africa who vigorously opposed Sabellius & Sabellianism was roundly condemned by t/CH as heresy, culminating at t/Councils of Nicea in 325, Constantinople in 381, and Chalcedon in 451.

(2) Background to the Modern Oneness Movt.

At t/turn of t/20th c. t/Assemblies of God found themselves in a bit of controversy over t/Trinity. About 25% of their pastors were modalists (they had bought t/heresy of Sabellius that there was no distinction of persons in t/Godhead and thus no Trinity). To their credit, AG addressed t/issue, stood their ground & booted 150 of their pastors from t/group.

This is basically the background to the Modern Oneness Movement (1914) which eventually became the United Pentecostal Church. UPC isn't t/only Oneness denomination, it is t/largest. Unfort., these perversions of t/Triunity are not limited to any 1 or more denominations. Modalistic views on t/Trinity have found their way into all segments of Xnty, being espoused by laymen and leader alike. Seems to be a movt. that has grown of late, esp. in light of t/fact that t/CH has lost its interest in caring about theology & biblical truth. So while t/shepherds have been sleeping, the wolves have infiltrated t/sheepfold.

This is by No Means a Monolithic Movement. There are some differences between those who consider themselves oneness in theology. What they all have in common, however, is a denial of t/Trinity, or a re-definition of it which, in reality, is a denial.

David K. Bernard, perhaps t/most prolific oneness writer==>

“The Bible does not teach the doctrine of the trinity, and Trinitarianism actually contradicts the Bible. It does not add any positive benefit to the Christian message. . . the doctrine of the trinity does detract from the important biblical themes of the oneness of God and the absolute deity of Jesus Christ.”
[Oneness writer, David K. Bernard, cited in “The Trinity, the Definition of Chalcedon, and Oneness

Bernard goes on to say==>

“If there is only one God and that God is the Father (Mal. 2:10), and if Jesus is God, then it logically follows that Jesus is the Father.” [David Bernard, cited in Boyd, 28]

I have actually read a Oneness author who denied that Jesus was t/Father. I thought to myself, “Hmmm. self, this is interesting, I wonder what he means?” I found out a little later that what he meant was that t/humanity of Jesus isn’t t/Father, but t/divinity of Jesus is. Political double-speak.

(3) Modalism/Oneness Belief

Here’s the key for modalists: Distinction between Jesus’ humanity & deity (his 2 natures) is t/same as t/distinction between t/Father & t/Son. So, for X to be fully God & fully man means that he is fully t/Father & fully t/Son. Which is, as we will see, a perversion of t/incarnation & thus t/atonement.

In orthodox theology we talk about JCt being t/eternal SOG. IOW - He was, is, always will be God t/Son, t/2d person of t/Trinity. 2k yrs. ago (Gal. 4:4) he took on flesh and became man, Fully God & fully Man.

Oneness proponents believe that Jesus is t/non-eternal SOG in that t/Son began at t/incarnation when t/Father became man.

The “Son” is the flesh, t/”Father” is t/God – & t/God (t/Father) took on flesh, & in effect became his own Son.

So Jesus Christ is BOTH the Father and the Son. He is t/Father in His Deity & t/Son in His humanity. Being both F & S, J. could alternate between his 2 natures. This, for modalists, is how you understand t/”difficult” Scriptures.

Sometimes J. is acting as t/Son (man) & sometimes as t/Father (God). When you see Jesus acting or speaking, according to Oneness writers, t/exegetical or interpretational key is asking t/? “Is he acting as t/Father or as t/Son (God or a man)?

In t/Garden of Gethsamane, when Jesus prayed to t/Father he was acting in t/role of t/Son (man). When he raised Lazarus from t/dead, he was acting in t/role of t/Father (God).

When he was hungry or thirsty or tired, that was Jesus acting as t/Son. When he performed miracles or forgave sin, he was acting as t/Father.

Oneness theologians will even admit that Jesus sometimes morphed back and forth between his 2 roles in t/same passage or even verse.

The problem is that this portrays Jesus as a Jekyll& Hyde character who could sleep 1 moment because his humanity was tired, then calm a raging storm t/next, acting, now, not as t/Son, but as t/Father.

This is in contradiction to orthodoxy which has historically maintained that Jesus has two natures but acts as one person.

So, as crazy as it sounds, Jesus was & is both t/Father who loved & sent his Son & t/Son who loved & obeyed t/Father. He was both t/Son who prayed to t/Father & t/Father who answered t/Son. He was both t/man who was forsaken at t/cross & t/God who appeared to forsake t/man.

Here is the issue & the error. Relationship between t/Father & t/Son is not a relationship between the two natures of one person. Jesus wasn't a schizoid who had two natures w/i him communicating to one another. In fact, natures don't communicate; persons do! Yet, for those who hold to modalism, Jesus becomes two persons w/i himself (ancient heresy of Nestorianism).

Because this modalistic view denies that there are three persons who are God it also denies that any but the Father pre-existed in eternity. IOW - Only One God & Only One Person. Since t/Father became incarnated in t/Son, Son didn't exist until that first Christmas 2k yrs. ago. They also contend that JC role as t/Son will someday end when all things are delivered over to t/Father that God be all in all. So JC as t/SOG is a temporal, not an eternal role.

CH t/o its history has taught & believed that the X is the eternal SOG (eternal sonship). The relationship between t/three members of t/Trinity is eternal in nature.

If fact, if X isn't eternally t/Son then t/Father is not eternally the Father. Fatherhood requires Sonship. If Jesus is not t/eternal Son, then t/Father is not t/eternal Father, but a singular monad who become t/Father. Can't have it both ways. Can't have a temporal Son and an Eternal Father. They both stand or fall together & this is one reason why theologians believe that these are eternal relationships.

“The fatal shortcoming of modalism is the fact that it must deny the personal relationships within the Trinity that appear in so many places in Scripture . . . it must deny three separate persons at the baptism of Jesus, where the Father speaks from heaven and the Spirit descends on Jesus like a dove. And it must say that all those instances where Jesus is praying to the Father are an illusion or a charade. The idea of the Son or the Holy Spirit interceding for us before God the Father is lost. Finally, modalism ultimately loses the heart of the doctrine of the atonement—that is, the idea that God sent His Son as a substitutionary sacrifice, and that the Son bore the wrath of God in our place, and that the Father, representing the interests of the Trinity, saw the suffering of Christ and was satisfied (Isa. 53:11). Moreover, modalism denies the independence of God, for if God is only one person, then he has no ability to love and to communicate with other persons in his creation. Therefore, it was necessary for God to create the world and God would no longer be independent of creation.” [Grudem, 242]

Speaking of Oneness Pentecostals (specifically, the UPC), Wayne Grudem writes: “because of [their] denial of the three distinct persons in God, [they] should not be considered evangelical, and it is doubtful whether [they] should be considered genuinely Christian at all.” [Grudem, 243 fn.]

(b) Denial of the Preexistence of the Son

Go back to the Exodus. Three Persons of the One Essence of God who deliver Israel from Egypt: God (Father), the Angel of God (Son), and the Spirit of God (HS) - Exo. chapters 3, 23, 32 and Isa. 63).

We've talked about the Plural Pronouns used in the Book of Genesis for Example.

Gen.1:26 (let us make man in our own image)

Gen. 3:22 (man, in knowing good and evil has become like us)

Gen. 11:7 (let us go down and confuse their language)

Indicates a distinction of persons and if one of those persons is JC then he obv. existed before His incarnation.

Redundancy of the name YHWH in Gen. 19:24==>

Then the \Lord\ rained on Sodom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the \Lord\ out of heaven,

Psalm 110:1 (Messianic Psalm)

The \Lord\ says to my Lord: "Sit at My right hand, Until I make Thine enemies a footstool for Thy feet."

You might remember that Jesus asked the Pharisees about t/ramifications of this Psalm in Matt. chapter 22. Jesus asked those Pharisees who were gathered around Him, "What do you think about the Christ [Messiah], whose son is He?" They replied, "The son of David."

The Scriptures taught that Messiah would be the son of David, which simply means that Messiah would be of Davidic Ancestry (true). Jesus fulfilled that, of course. But, the Jews expected the Messiah to be a mere man, a superman of sorts, but a mere man. Certainly not God.

So Jesus asks them another question: "Then how does David in the Spirit call him, that is the Messiah, 'Lord,' saying, 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at My right hand, Until I put Thine enemies beneath Thy feet"' "If David then calls Him 'Lord,' how is He his son?"

IOW - if the Messiah is no more than the human son of David, why would David use a divine name in referring to him as "my Lord?"

Matthew concludes the story by saying that==>

no one was able to answer Him a word, nor did anyone dare from that day on to ask Him another question.

Point is, you have two persons here.

The \Lord\ says to my Lord:

Or we could paraphrase the thought as,

"God the Father said to God the Son" "Sit at My right hand, Until I make Thine enemies a footstool for Thy feet

Angel of the LORD

The Angel of the Lord is a person who appears in the OT. Lit. "The Angel of YHWH." We see that this

messenger is no mere angel. He receives worship, He speaks for God and as God. He is even called God.

We see the Angel of the Lord for 1st time in Gen. 16 following Hagar's banishment from t/presence of Sarah. TAL encourages Hagar & tells her that her descendants will one day be too many to count. After this encounter it says in v. 13 that Hagar called the name of the LORD who spoke to her "Thou art a God who sees" for "Have I remained alive after seeing Him?"

This is what we call a Theophany or a Christophany. This is an appearance of God, or more specifically Christ, in tangible form.

It was TAL who stopped Abraham from offering up his son, Isaac, in Gen. 22. TAL is there identified as being YHWH or Jehovah.

It was TAL who appeared as a burning bush before Moses in Exo. 3:2. Again, not an angel, but God Himself.

Yet, while TAL is clearly Jehovah God, he is sometimes distinguished as 2 persons w/i t/essence of the one God.

ZEC 1:12 (a vision of Zechariah) . . . the angel of the LORD . . . said, "O LORD of hosts, how long wilt Thou have no compassion for Jerusalem and the cities of Judah. . .

ZEC 3:1-2 (another vision of Zechariah) Then he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the \Lord,\ and Satan standing at his right hand to accuse him. And the \Lord\ said to Satan, "The \Lord\ rebuke you, Satan! Indeed, the \Lord\ who has chosen Jerusalem rebuke you! Is this not a brand plucked from the fire?"

BTW - TAL ceases to appear after incarnation of JC which leads me to believe that TAL was what we call a pre-incarnate appearance of Christ.

Psalms 45:6-7 and Hebrews 1:8-9.

PSA 45:6-7 Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of uprightness is the scepter of Thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness; Therefore God, Thy God, has anointed Thee

Who's being referred to here? "Your throne O God is forever . . . Therefore God, your God has anointed you."

The writer to the Hebrews tells us in Hebrews 1:8-9==>

But of t/Son He says, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever, And t/righteous scepter is the scepter of His kingdom. "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated lawlessness; Therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee . . .

Not only do we see that the Son is eternal, but also that He is God the Son who is distinct in person from God the Father.

I see all three eternal persons of the Trinity in one OT passage Isa. 48:16. I believe that Jesus is speaking here in the first person.

"Come near to Me, listen to this: From the first I have not spoken in secret, From the time it took place, I was there. And now the Lord \God\ has sent Me, and His Spirit."

Daniel 7 and Colossians 1 and Philippians 2. You have the Son of Man who comes to the Ancient of Days in Dan. 7 (clearly the pre-existent X before the Father)

You have Colossians 1:15-17 which says that the Son was the agent of creation – the One who created all things & if that's true then he pre-existed.

You have Phil. 2 (Kenosis Passage) which claims that JC pre-existed in the very morph of God.

You have several passages in John's Gospel.

In John 6 Jesus refers to himself as the Bread of life that comes from the Father. After t/Jews complained about what Jesus was saying, He replied in v. 62==>

"What then if you should behold the Son of Man ascending where He was before?"

JOH 13:3 Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He had come forth from God, and was going back to God,

JOH 16:28 "I came forth from the Father, and have come into the world; I am leaving the world again, and going to the Father."

JOH 17:5 "And now, glorify Thou Me together with Thyself, Father, with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was.

Also add Isaiah 6

John 8:58 "Before Abraham was Born, I AM" (cf. Jn 12:41)

Last, but not least, the Prologue to John's Gospel which we will look at more closely next week, which is an exegetical slam dunk against both Arianism and Oneness denials of the Trinity.

How do modalists address this evidence?

Some claim that God was working through his foreknowledge. For example, passages that speak of JC as t/Creator, such as John 1, Colossians 1, mean that, though Jesus didn't exist, the Father created the world, "with a view towards" or "for the sake of" JC.

In other passages, such as John 8:58, they go back to their "key" - the two communicating natures w/i X and claim that when Jesus said "Before Abraham was born, I AM" this was t/Father speaking, not t/Son.

Problem of the terms son of, begotten, first-born. Note that if Jesus isn't eternally the son then the Father is not eternally the Father. These are eternal relationships. Note how modalists try to wiggle around saying that Jesus is the Father ("No, we don't believe that Jesus is the same person as the Father" - when you press the issue, what they mean is that Jesus, in his humanity, isn't the Father. But He is the Father in His divinity).

Jesus is referred to as “The Son” over 200 x in t/NT and never once referred to as “The Father.” Over 200 x “The Father” is referred to by Jesus or someone else as being clearly distinct from Jesus. Over 50 x the juxtaposition of Jesus and the Father is found in the same verse (Rom. 15:5-6; Phil. 2:10-11). [Boyd, 68]

(c) Problem Passages (dealing with the main three)

(a) Isaiah 9:6

For a child will be born to us, a son will be given to us; and the government will rest on His shoulders; And His name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Eternal Father, Prince of Peace.

There it is, the name of Jesus is “Eternal Father” - so Jesus must be the Father! Not so fast, my name may be Bartolucci, but I’m not my dad!

There are a couple of different ways to look at this verse. 1) It may be referring to the “Fatherhood” of t/Messiah (descriptive) which does not mean that it is a title in t/sense of saying that He is “The Father.” 2) Isaiah’s use of the Hebrew word “Ab” (father) has nothing to do w/the NT use of t/term Father as it is used as a title for t/First Person, The Father. Name “Father” wasn’t not a common title for God in t/OT & wasn’t used much by t/Jews until later in time. 3) These two nouns could be better translated “Father of eternity” which would reveal t/Messiah’s role as Creator, the Lord of time & eternity (Col. 1). Lastly:
Basic rule of biblical interpretation is: Never build a good doctrine on bad evidence (one verse, cf. 1 Cor. 15:29) - especially when the concept isn’t taught elsewhere. This would not be a passage, everything considered, that you would appeal to prove that Jesus is same person as t/Father.

(b) John 14:7-10 {turn there}

Philip’s question in v. 8 + Jesus response in v. 9 {read}

Let’s add a little theological light on this. As far as Philip’s question is concerned [^] Jesus might well have said what John records earlier in 1:18 “No man has seen God (Father) at any time . . .”

God is essentially a spirit & cannot be seen unless He assumes a visible form & even then t/power of His glory & holiness would consume any who saw it (Exo. 33 - Moses, “Show me your glory” - “No man can see me and live!”)

That’s where the rest of John 1:18 comes in ==>

No man has seen God (the Father) at any time; [but] the only begotten God (the Son), who is in the bosom of the Father, He has explained Him.

Explained = ἐξηγήσατο (*explain, interpret, tell, report, describe*). Where we get t/word “exegesis.” (In-depth study of a biblical passage where you look at language, history, context, grammar & t/like). Jesus has exegeted t/Father for us!

Have to ask t/Question, “How would t/disciples have understood this?” If I were talking to someone & said regarding a family business transaction, “I can’t make a decision until I clear it with my father” & someone asks, “Can we meet your father?” I reply, “Hey, if you’ve seen me you’ve seen my father” they aren’t going to think I’m my own father! No! they’re going to think that we are very much alike in our personalities and character. Jesus is certainly saying more than that here; He and the Father are of the same identical essence as

God. (1 as to essence, 3 as to person).

If you go beyond this passage & look at t/context there is no way that Jesus was saying that he was the same Person as the Father (implied in t/Titles Father/Son). Look at: v. 1-2, 6-7, 12, 16, 23.

BTW - might also note vv. 10-11 (perichoresis). Isn't saying that the Father is in the father! Could it be any clearer that Jesus, the Father & t/Spirit are distinct persons?

One verse int/middle of Jn. can't overwrite the entirety of t/Gospel, much less t/Bible. (Cf. John 14:10-13) - Isn't saying that the Father is in the father? Note the connection of the context to vv. 7-10. Look at the rest of the Gospel ==> J. comes in t/F. name, does his works (John 5:43; 10:25; 14:10; 17:26), teaches t/things of t/Father and testifies to Him (John 7:16; 8:28; 14:24), receives all things from t/F. and submits to t/F. autho. (John 5:19, 30; 8:28-29; 15:10), and intercedes for us before t/F. (17:1ff.). Could it be any clearer that Jesus and the Father are distinct persons?

(c) John 10:30

Certainly in saying that Jesus and the Father are "One" Jesus is saying that He and the Father are the same person? Right? Wrong! In fact, this verse supports t/Trinity, especially when you look at it in the Grk. text. Jesus uses the 1st person neuter plural of εἶμι (to be). Lit. ==>

"I and the Father, we are one (in essence)." Rem. "God is one as to essence, three as to person."

Also a wonderful OT twist to this. The Law required that at least two persons serve as witnesses to legal matters (Num. 35:30; Deut. 17:6; Matt. 18:16). Turn to John chapter 8 (vv. 12-18).

John 5:31-32 "If I *alone* bear witness of Myself, My testimony is not true. "There is another who bears witness of Me, and I know that the testimony which He bears of Me is true. (two witnesses).

Also add Jesus' baptism (Matt. 3) & transfiguration (Matt. 17). At Jesus' baptism, you have THREE witnesses, F/S,HS.

Concept of having 2 or 3 witnesses to legal matters which comes out so richly completely unravels apart from t/Trinity.

Oneness writers have picked up on this and claim that the two witnesses are the two natures of Jesus. Try that in court sometime. Judge: "So, you claim you are innocent. Do you have any witnesses?" Reply, "Your honor, I do. My body and my spirit both testify that I am not guilty." Even Johnnie Cochran & Alan Dershiwitz can't get you out of that one. "If the Trinity does not fit you CANNOT acquit!"

(4) Issues of Christology in the Trinity

One person, therefore, the humanity and divinity of Christ cannot be separated, or isolated. Jesus does not cut and dry operate out of one or the other (i.e. he forgives sin solely in his deity, he weeps solely in his humanity). The entire person does these things as one. What about his death on the cross? Did God die? Did all of God die? Isn't JC all of God.

The God-man died on the cross as a person. Death is separation, not cessation of existence. Jesus, as the 2nd person of the Trinity was, momentarily, spiritually separated from the Godhead, although ontologically, he

remained an inseparable part of it.

“A belief in the incarnation means that everything Christ went through and did, God went through and did; otherwise it is a meaningless belief. The one person for Jesus Christ cannot be split in two . . . “ [Boyd, 58]

When Jesus suffered, God experienced suffering. When Jesus was hungry, God experienced hunger and when Jesus experienced death, God experienced death. [Boyd, 58]

“The Oneness insistence that it was not as God, but only as a man, that Christ did these things splits Christ in two and is tantamount to denying the incarnation altogether.” [Boyd, 58-59] “. . . to affirm that ‘the Word became flesh’ either means that what the man Jesus experiences, God experiences—or it means nothing at all. If Jesus the dependent man is not in fact God experiencing human dependency on the independent Father, in what sense did the Word really become flesh? And if Jesus the praying man is to in fact God as a man praying to God, in what sense did God really become a man? Either God became a man or he did not; if he did, then everything that the man Jesus does, God does. This is why Christians have always called him ‘the God-man.’ To assert anything less—like sometimes Jesus is ‘acting like’ a man and sometimes ‘acting like’ God—is to assert something far less than what John 1:14 affirms: ‘The Word became flesh . . .’” [Boyd, 65]

Did all of God “die?” The second person died as the God-man. While Jesus is 100% God, He is not all of the Godhead?

“A trinitarian person is not so comprehensive as the Godhead, because he does not possess the personal characteristics belonging to the other two persons. He is the essence with one personal peculiarity, while the Godhead is the essence with three personal peculiarities. A trinitarian person includes all that is in the unity, but not all that is in the trinity of God; all that is in the essence, but not all that is in the three modes of the essence.” [Shedd, 238]

“A trinitarian person is the entire divine nature subsisting in a particular manner, namely, as Father or as Son or as Holy Spirit.” [Shedd, 233]

God can be in a billion places at once, but he is not a billion gods, he is one God. God can indwell a million Xns at the same time, but he is not a million gods, he is one God. ISW - God can subsist as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and yet be one God, not three gods.

“There are many illustrations which have been offered to help us understand the Trinity. While there are some illustrations which are helpful, we should recognize that no illustration is perfect. Unfortunately, there are many illustrations which are not simply imperfect, but in error. One illustration to beware of is the one which says “I am one person, but I am a student, son, and brother. This explains how God can be both one and three.” The problem with this is that it reflects a heresy called *modalism*. God is not one person who plays three different roles, as this illustration suggests. He is one Being in three Persons (centers of consciousness), not merely three roles. This analogy ignores the personal distinctions within God and mitigates them to mere roles.” [desiring God website]

(1) The Contribution of John chapter 1

i. Greek word that’s translated the “Word”(twice in v. 1) is *λογος*

What this v. is saying that t/Logos was w/God & was God. Some will claim that the *λογος* isn’t a person, but

an idea or concept (goes back to Gk. philosophy); laughable. Masc. personal p.n.s. used t/o (v. 2/he, 3/him/him, 4/him) ==> end of passage. We're talking about a person, context tells us that this person is JC, the Son of God, himself God.

Watchtower people claim that t/verse should be translated [read]. No reputable Gk. scholar would agree that for reasons we will see. But the wording, as inspired by t/HS, is perfectly succinct. Called by some a "lit. masterpiece."

ii. Difference between Greek and English

English is a language built on word order. IOW - we don't say "And ran to the dog the man" (not unless you have been dipping into the cooking sherry or you haven't slept much all night like me!). English depends on word order. Normally, we structure our sentences w/subject or predicate first, then t/verb, then the object ("The brown dog bit a man"). Subject, "dog" - predicate nominative "brown" - - verb "bit" & an object "a man" (Roger, you listening?!).

Koine Greek does not depend on word order. Might be imp. for emphasis, but not for understanding the parts of the sentence (one reason why it's difficult for native Eng. speakers to learn...). Structure in Gk. is determined by case endings & articles (def. or indef.) & verb tenses & t/like, not word order. So, in Gk could have "And ran to the dog the man" (perfectly sober!).

iii. All this to say ==>

Lit. in t/Gk. text, v. 1 reads καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. (and God was the Word). We have what is called a predicate nominative construction, the passage is telling us what the Word (nominative/subject) is like as to nature (here, God).

iv. Little word that could - word "was" 4x {read}

In English we don't think much of this word. In fact, I take it so much for granted that when I was looking at it (W-A-S) it started to look a bit strange to me, like it was misspelled or I had never seen it before (what's was?). BUT IN THE GREEK HERE IN JOHN 1 the word is essential. It tells us something about 'The Word' - how long the Person of the Word existed.

Rem. Arius, the heretic of the 3d c. who said of JC "There was a time when He was not." This word "was" speaks to that very issue. The word was in this verse is in the imperfect tense. This is continuous action in the past. If you look at v. 3 you see a diff. word in a diff. tense - t/word "ἔγενετο" translated "came into being" {read}. Aorist = simple past-tense. This word gives us a point of reference - something happened in time - The Word Created. But the word "was" in the imperfect tense doesn't contain this element. There is no point of origin; it doesn't tell us when. Doesn't tell us when because there is no when.

As one scholar puts it==>

"... as far back as you wish to put 'the beginning,' [v. 1a] the Word is already in existence. The Word does not come into existence at the 'beginning,' but is already in existence when the 'beginning' takes place. If we take the beginning of John 1:1, the Word is already there. If we push it back further (if one can even do so!), say, a year, the Word is already there. A thousand years, the Word is there. A billion years, the Word is there." [White, 51]

What's the point of all this? What is John BWO H.S. telling us? THAT THE WORD IS ETERNAL. New English Bible puts it this way==>

"When all things began, the Word already was."

v. There's More - The Word is eternal (yes) but not alone

Next phrase of 1:1 tells us something else: While the Word (JC) is eternal, He was not alone in eternity. It says that ==>

... the Word was WITH God ...

The word "with" is the Grk. preposition $\pi\rho\sigma$ (also used in v. 2). $\pi\rho\sigma$ like many words, has a wide range of meanings. In this context, the word speaks of relationship, even intimacy. Same word that TAP uses in 1 Cor. 13:12 when he talks about how our knowledge of t/truth is somewhat dim in this life, but one day it will be clear==>

For now we see in a mirror dimly, but then face to face ...

The word "to" that's between the words "face" and "face" is this Gk. prep. $\pi\rho\sigma$. Intimacy/relationship. If we can extrapolate the idea back to John – The Word, JC, has had an eternal relationship w/God, The F.

Commenting on this passage, t/great Presbyterian Theologian, B.B. Warfield==>

"The language is pregnant [with meaning]. It is not merely coexistence with God that is asserted, as of two beings standing side by side . . . What is suggested is an active relation[ship] . . . From all eternity the Word has been with God as a fellow: He who in the very beginning already 'was', 'was' also in communion with God. . . . He was nevertheless not a separate being from God . . . In some sense distinguishable from God, He was in an equally true sense identical with [Him]." [The Person and Work of Christ, cited in White, 199]

In the beginning (parallel to Gen. 1:1) was the Word (eternally), and the Word was with God (relationship), AND THE WORD WAS GOD.

vi. Two Big Questions on this last phrase {read}

Why is it in the word order that it is in (Gk. not English) where we have:

... and God was the Word."

Why does the word "God" not have the definite article ("the"), but the "Word" does (it's "The Word", but it's not "The God").

*** Watchtower Witnesses and Others who Deny Deity of Christ (that He is Himself God)==>**

Claim that because the word "God" does not have the def. article ("the") before it, it should be translated "a god." Of course, that begs the ? "what sort of lesser god is Jesus?" That's not only theologically impossible, but it's also grammatically impossible (why I said no recognized Gk. scholar would translate it that way). Just because a word doesn't have t/def. article doesn't mean it's indefinite. Word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma$ (God) is found many times in t/NT w/o t/def. article & never is it translated "a god" (cf. vv. 6,12,13,18).

*** It is commonly known that the structure here follows a regular rule of Greek Grammar known as "Colwell's Rule"**

Absence of t/article shows that t/word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma$ is t/predicate, rather than the subject, of the sentence. [Grudem, 234]

IOW - it's telling us something about the nature/character/essence of t/Word, JC. Gk. scholar Kenneth Wuest puts it this way==>

... **and the Word was as to His essence absolute deity.**

That's also brought out by t/word order. This is why t/word "God" is 1st **"And God was the Word"** - emphasis. **"What God was, the Word was also.**

*** Take a Step Back (what we've learn so far)**

1. The Word is eternal

In the beginning was the Word . . . (imperfect tense)

2. The Word is personal

... **the Word was WITH God . . .** (προς - intimacy of relationship)

3. The Word is God

... **and the Word was God.** (pred. nom. - Word is of the same essence as God).

Remember==>

vi. Two Big Questions on this last phrase {read}

Why is it in the word order that it is in & why does the word "God" not have the definite article? This is where we nail it all down.

If this phrase would have been any different than what it is it would support either Arianism (denying t/deity of X) or Sabellianism (denying t/Trinity). The Word order and the structure only supports what we have been upholding all along: Trinitarianism.

*** Let's look at how it would be translated . . .**

If, in the Greek text, it was==>

"And the Word was the God" (two def. articles) ==> modalism (telling us that the person of the word was the same person as the Father).

If, in the Greek text, it was ==>

"And the Word was God" (Gk. word order) ==> support the reading "And the Word was a god" (some kind of a lesser deity).

BUT IT'S NEITHER OF THOSE!

Here is what the H.S. inspired TAJ to write==>

"And God was the Word" - that is, "What God was, the Word was also." Or, as we have it in our English Bibles **"and the Word was God."**

NT scholar Daniel Wallace: "Jesus Christ is God and has all the attributes the Father has, but He is not the First Person of the Trinity. All this is concisely confirmed in [the sentence structure of John 1:1]." [cited in Mounce, Basics of Biblical Greek, 29]

The word order tells us that JC has all of the essential attributes of the Father, the lack of the article tells us that

he is not the same person as the Father.

Does that fit our definition of the Trinity? “God is one as to essence, three as to person.”

As the great reformer Martin Luther remarked: “The lack of an article is against Sabellianism (modalism), the word order is against Arianism (watchtowerism).” [cited by Daniel Wallace in Mounce, Basics of Biblical Greek, 29]

2 He was in the beginning with God.

προς always denotes relationship w/someone. [Beisner, 21] (προς also used in v. 1).

“St. John does not, here, say that the Logos was the Godhead or the Trinity, but that he was divine. Hence, *theos* is anarthrous (1) to denote divine nature in the abstract (cf. anarthrous *pneuma* in John 4:24) and (2) in order not to confound the person of the Logos with that of the Father, who in the preceding clause is designate by *theion* with the article. When the Father or Son or Spirit is denominated *theos*, the word is used in the sense of deity, not of Trinity.” [Shedd, 240]

Other common oneness beliefs (tongues/baptismal regeneration). Jesus only as to baptism in t”Name”

c. Four essential affirmations of an orthodox understanding of the person of Jesus Christ

(1) HIS FULL AND TRUE DEITY

100% God, Coequal w/the Father and the Holy Spirit.

(2) HIS FULL AND TRUE HUMANITY

100% man, perfect and w/o sin. Jesus Christ was tempted in all things, and yet lived a perfect and sinless life (Hebrews 4:15). He fulfilled all righteousness (Matthew 3:15; John 4:34, 8:29); He could not be charged with any sin (John 8:46); and those who knew Him testified of His sinlessness (1 John 3:5; 1 Peter 2:22). His sinlessness confirmed His deity, made His sacrifice perfect, and secured His eternal priesthood (Hebrews 7:26-27).

(3) ONE COMPLETE PERSON

Not two persons in one, but one person, the God-man, Jesus Christ. Not a split personality working as God one moment and man the next. We must not attribute an action of X to one nature or the other: “He wept in his humanity, he forgave sin in his deity.” He was one person and acted as one person.

(4) TWO NATURES

Two distinct natures, fully God and fully man.

6. So What? What Difference Does It Make?

Why is it essential to understand what it means to worship a triune God?

Certainly we've already touched on many reasons as we've progressed thru this study tog. But let me sort of boil it down . . .

a. The Trinity is Essential Because:

(1) The Very Nature of God is at stake

We're talking about t/highest revelation of who God is - how God has revealed himself to us. To pervert or deny t/Triunity of God is to pervert t/very nature/character of God. That's to tread upon t/Third commandment & to take his name in vain (n. = embodiment of his character or nature - who He is).

Isaiah 42:8 "I am the LORD, that is My name; I will not give My glory to another, Nor My praise to . . . images. (includes false images of who He is made up in t/minds of fallen men)

(a) Think a moment about the doctrine of modalism

This is a false doctrine, a heresy, as it relates to t/Trinity. Rem. modalists believe that there is one God who alternately manifests himself in three ways - F/S/HS. No distinction of persons. The F = S, etc.

Sometimes we liken this to an Actor Wearing Three Masks. In ancient Greece t/theater was quite pop. There were outdoor theaters that could seat some 10k people that were so well designed acoustically that a whisper from t/stage could be heard in t/entire aud. filled w/ppl. Back in t/days before JC t/actors who often wore masks were known as "hupocrites" (hypocrites). That's t/origin of t/word. It's someone acting out an artificial role - being who they aren't.

One oneness writer, "All visible projections of God to the eyes are manifestations of God and not God's original nature that is seen." [Reeves, Dimensions, 37, as cited by Boyd, 180]. Did you hear that? {restate}

If God is just appearing in three manifestations like t/ancient hypocrites of Greece, we have to ask, "Will the real God please stand?" Like the old game show, To Tell the Truth. But at least in t/game show you get to finally see the real guy, in a modalistic perversion of t/Trinity you never get to see t/real God, just a masked illusion.

One wonders how anything can be a genuine manifestation of God if it isn't a genuine manifestation of his original nature? Where is t/original God? God ends up being an illusion, a hologram that looks like something it isn't. It's hard to see how, in the modalistic/oneness view of things, God isn't just an illusion wearing a mask.

In t/biblical view of things we see God thru His Son JC. We see t/real thing, not just a "manifestation" or an "illusion." John 1:1,14,18 {read}

Even t/drama of t/cross becomes illusionary if you deny that t/Father & Son are distinct persons. Apart from that t/NT revelation of t/pain Father experienced in t/sacrifice of His Son is lost. It all becomes a charade.

At least one oneness writer admits the illusion, when commenting on Rev. chaps. 4 and 5 and the picture John paints of God on the throne and the lamb next to it, he calls the two 'persons' "two roles performed by God" and how Jesus can occasionally "project" the Father as though he looked to be distinct from himself, even though this isn't really true. [Boyd, 182].

A leading oneness proponent writes:

“John 3:35, 5:20, and 15:9 state that the Father loves the Son . . . and John 17:24 says the Father loved Jesus before the foundation of the world. In John 14:31 Jesus expresses love for the Father . . . All of these statements do not mean separate persons. . . .What these verses express is the relationship between the two natures of Christ. The Spirit of Jesus loved the humanity and vice versa. . . . remember, the Son came to the world to show us how much God loves us and also to be our example. For these two objectives to be achieved, the Father and the Son showed love for each other.” [Bernard, Oneness, 186, cited in Boyd, 183]

(2) The Very Nature of Jesus Christ is at Stake

All other views pervert the incarnation of Jesus Christ (doctrine central to t/Gospel). w/o t/incarnation there is no Gospel.

(a) Certainly this is true if you deny that Jesus Christ is God

If you make him out to be a created being, angelic or otherwise, you have cut t/head off of the body (head being X t/body being t/gospel).

i. Remember - This was something the church addressed early on

Arius who was a pastor in Alexandria came to t/heretical conclusion that

“If the Father begat t/Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence: and from this is it evident that there was a time when the Son was not. It therefore necessarily follows that he had his subsistence from nothing.” [New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, s.v. Arianism]

Arius was quite a promoter so he had his favorite slogan set to a popular tune and soon half of Alexandria was singing “There was a time when the Son was not.” In denying t/deity of X they denied t/only means by which they could be saved. Sort of like throwing t/pilot off t/plane & no one else can fly - everyone is going down to disaster.

Of course, all of this was based on an false understanding of what t/word “begotten” means. Rem. I’ve warned you before about t/dangers of making biblical words mean something they don’t. Begotten doesn’t mean having a beginning. The word means totally unique, w/o any like or equal. Very special. (μονογενής - “mono” = “one” + genos = “kind”)

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.

“only begotten” (two words in English come from one word in Gk.) means unique or special. We could read it like this {re-read}

What about “begotten?” What about eternal sonship (Grudem, page 250; White article, page 6ff. and page 12ff.)?

Of course, the CH understood what t/Bible taught & how essential t/deity of X was, and t/views of Arius were rejected at Nicea in 325 (have been to this day). As Jesus Himself said in John 8:24 {read}

ii. So What Does God’s Word Teach?

Teaches that JC is both God and man, fully God and fully man (hypostatic union). He had to be God to pay an eternal price for our sin (writer to t/Hebrews addresses that) he had to be man to stand in our place. We also see that in Hebrews ==>

Hebrews 2:17 **Therefore, He had to be made like His brethren in all things, that He might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people.**

If you deny his humanity or his divinity there is no grounds for salvation. Why we call departures from these truths “heresy.”

(b) But what about modalism or oneness views?

Don't they believe that JC is both God and Man? Yes and no. They believe that he is God, but not God the Son. They believe that JC is t/father incarnate, not the eternal Son incarnate. For them, t/Father became incarnate & became Jesus (this happened in Bethlehem in 4 BC). Father = God part; Jesus = man part. They effectively divide him into two (5th c. heresy of Nestorianism). JC has two natures (divine and human) but these two natures are not two separate persons w/i him.

Council of Chalcedon dealt w/this in 451 AD & these early theologians put together a statement on t/person of JC that has not been matched in over 1500 yrs. & that is believed by all ortho. theologians everywhere=> Following, then, the holy fathers, we unite in teaching all men to confess the one and only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. This selfsame one is perfect both in deity and also in humanness; this selfsame one is also actually God and actually man, with a rational soul and a body. He is of the same reality as God as far as his deity is concerned and of the same reality as we are ourselves as far as his humanness is concerned; thus like us in all respects, sin only excepted. Before time began he was begotten of the father, in respect of his deity, and now in these ‘last days,’ for us and on behalf of our salvation, this selfsame one was born of Mary the virgin, who is God-bearer in respect of his humanness. We also teach that we apprehend this one and only Christ–Son, Lord, only-begotten–in two natures [divine/human]; and we do this without confusing the two natures, without transmuting one nature into the other, without dividing them into two separate categories. . . . The distinctiveness of each nature is not nullified by the union [IOW - as t/God-Man he is not less than fully God or less than fully man]. Instead the ‘properties’ of each nature are conserved and both natures concur in one ‘person’ They are not divided or cut into two . . . but are together the one and only and only-begotten Logos of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus have the prophets of old testified; thus the Lord Jesus Christ Himself taught us; thus the [creed] of the Fathers has handed down to us.

Denial of t/Trinity is a perversion the incarnation and a retreat of Nestorianism and Apollinarianism.

This logically leads us to our next point==>

(3) The Nature of the Gospel is at Stake

Already said that “If you deny his humanity or his divinity there is no grounds for salvation.” But what about other views? What about view of t/modalist - a view that's today tolerated—even embraced in t/CH? A view that's held by men who have great influence in t/CH (T.D. Jakes; Tommy Tenny; Rod Parsley among them)? I know a lot of people who hold these views haven't thot this all thru. Many who ignorantly hold these views even in evang. CH's haven't. The issue arises when people do think these things thru and take them to their logical ends.

(a) Follow me:

Modalism divides X into two persons, making his two natures (human & divine) essentially two different persons w/i X who communicate w/each other. One nature is t/Father; the other nature is man (Son). Question

becomes: “What happened on the cross? Who died?” Those who deny t/Trinity contend that when JC died, He ONLY died as a man, not as God. Ask t/? “After all, How can God die?” “If God died (Father), who was running t/universe?”

i. That’s a misunderstanding of the issue

#1 - God t/Father didn’t die; God the Son did. #2 Death does not mean to cease to exist. Death means separation (spiritual death = S. from God temporally ; physical death = S. from physical life; eternal death = S. from God eternally). JC as Man and as God could die in that when He took upon himself t/sins of the world He was for a moment in time separated from t/F & t/Spirit. He not only experienced phys. death, he experienced spiritual death.

The God-man died on the cross as a person. Jesus, as the 2nd person of the Trinity was, momentarily, spiritually separated from the Godhead, although ontologically, he remained an inseparable part of it. Practically speaking, there was a brief fracture in t/fellowship of t/Trinity.

You can’t have only t/humanity of JC suffering for sin & not t/deity. Yet, that’s what modalists do when they have JC on t/cross dying only in his humanity (as t/son), not in his divinity (for them that means as t/Father). A man died on t/cross.

One writer points out the error of this when he writes==>

“A belief in the incarnation means that everything Christ went through and did, God went through and did; otherwise it is a meaningless belief. The one person of Jesus Christ cannot be split in two . . . When Jesus suffered, God experienced suffering. When Jesus was hungry, God experienced hunger and when Jesus experienced death, God experienced death. [Boyd, 58]

That same writer goes on to say==>

“The Oneness insistence that it was not as God, but only as a man, that Christ did these things [I would include his death] splits Christ in two and is tantamount to denying the incarnation altogether.” [Boyd, 58-59]

TAP, in Acts 20, called t/elders of Eph. together and said in v.28 to guard not only themselves, but also t/CH which God purchased w/His own blood. Wasn’t just t/blood of a man, it was t/blood of t/God-man (certainly as far as blood goes, it would have retained t/props. of human blood). But concept of blood in t/Bible looks past t/bleeding to t/concept of death. (Life is in t/blood, Lev. 17:11). JC died as t/God-Man. God t/father didn’t die; God t/Spirit didn’t die. God the Son died for your sin. He had to die as man and as God. As one theologian writes==>

“By denying that Christ died for men’s sins as God (not merely as man), Oneness theology implies an atonement and redemption inadequate for man’s salvation, for: 1) No other sacrifice would be adequate to pay the infinite debt for man’s sin, for no other sacrifice would have been of infinite value. It is impossible for a mere human to make full atonement and ransom for sin; God must do it (Ps. 49:7-9, 15). 2) Therefore, it was essential that the one who died as a ransom and satisfaction for man’s sins be both human (to represent human beings properly; 1 Tim. 2:5; Rom. 5:12-19) and God. 3) Any other redeemer would put people in debt and servitude to someone other than God, for we belong to whoever redeems us (1 Cor. 6:19-20; see also 7:22-23; Rev. 5:9).” [E. Calvin Beisner, Jesus Only Churches, 16]

This is why modalism ultimately loses the heart of t/doctrine of t/atonement. God sent His Son as a substitutionary sacrifice. The Son bore the wrath of God in our place, & t/Father, representing the interests of t/Trinity, saw t/suffering of Christ and was satisfied (Isa. 53:11).

All of that is lost if JC didn’t die as a complete person. If God the Son didn’t die on the cross you have no

eternal, effective substitute for sin. You only have half t/equation: a man who died for men, not t/other half: God who died for men.

You can't sing with Charles Wesley - Amazing Love, How Can it Be, That Thou My God Shouldst Die for Me!

(b) BTW - for you theologians out there:

This is why t/doctrine of imputation is crucial. Imputation is having something credited to you that you don't yourself deserve. As far as t/cross is concerned, Imputation means that our sin was credited to JC. He didn't inherently become sinful. He wasn't a sinner on t/cross; no - he was t/sinless lamb of God. God made a transaction by crediting our sin to Him who knew not sin. I believe this was necessary because that was the only way that JC as God could die. He could not become a sinful person (that was imp. for him as God). But sin could be imputed to him as a legal transaction. {pause}

(3) The Nature of the Gospel is at Stake

This is why we are not talking about some sort of negotiable issue. Why those who know better take this issue so seriously even at a time when so many w/i t/CH don't. Also why one of t/foremost systematic theologians of our day, Dr. Wayne Grudem, can categorically state that those who reject t/Trinity as oneness and modalists do, ". . . should not be considered evangelical, and it is doubtful whether [they] should be considered genuinely Christian at all." [Grudem, 243 fn.]

Modalistic interpretation destroys the NT revelation of the pain the Father experienced in the sacrifice of JC. Cf. Rom. 8:32 and John 3:16. Yet, for oneness people, the "Son" isn't a person, it's a nature, or a human body. How emotionally attached can one become to a nature or a body?

Rather, what JC endured, the totality of the Godhead endured. The fulness of the Godhead was in Christ (Col. 2:9).

Very last point that I wanted to cover this AM is this==>

7. Why Should We Love the Trinity?

Let me give you a single answer followed by three additional thoughts

a. Because This is Who God is!

God exists and has revealed himself to his chosen people as a Trinal being, or as a Triunity of F/S/HS.

This is t/One who ordained, purchased, and completed our salvation from sin. That's where we began in 1 Peter 1:2 {read}

Jesus in John 17:3 {read}

So we love t/Trinity because we love God. The Trinity isn't a sterile concept stuffed in between t/dry covers of a theology text. The Trinity is God - God our all-in-all.

b. Here are three additional thoughts==>

(1) Loving The Trinity Encourages our Prayer

The general pattern of prayer in the Bible is to pray to the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit.

We see that in Eph. 2:18==>

for through Him [Christ] we both have our access in one Spirit to the Father.

Jesus prays to t/Father for us (John 17). The Spirit also intercedes for us w/groaning too deep for words & in keeping w/God's will (Rom. 8:26-27)

(2) Loving The Trinity Deepens our Love and Fellowship

Think about this statement: "Love and fellowship can only exist eternally if God is Triune." {repeat}

(a) What does 1 John 4:8 say? God is (what)?

LOVE - This is part and parcel of his nature.

Have to ask t/? "How could God have been love if for all eternity there was no one for him to love?"

Apart from t/Trinity 1 John 4:8 should have read "God became love."

As Augustine wrote centuries ago==>

If God is love, there has to be someone who is loving, someone who is being loved, and a spirit of love [SWC notes]

(b) There was eternal love and fellowship w/i the Trinity.

If God were a singular wooden monad He could not have experienced either love or fellowship until he created. He couldn't have. Both love and fellowship ring hallow w/o an object (like trying to clap w/one hand). And to contend that God had to created in order for him to exp. L&F makes him dependent on t/creation & therefore imperfect.

Sometimes inquiring minds ask, "What was God doing before He created the world?" (He wasn't sitting alone whistling in t/dark).

What was He doing? He was enjoying unbroken fellowship.

Jesus spoke of that in John 17:5 when he talked about t/glory he had w/the Father from before t/creation of t/world. Or in 17:24 when he spoke of t/love t/Father had for him from before t/found. of t/world.

Before the world was, before any creative activity (angels or otherwise), the F/S/HS enjoyed unbroken and harmonious fellowship in perfect love.

(c) Might be asking the Question:

"How does Loving The Trinity Deepen OUR Love and Fellowship?"

i. It starts w/how God created us

Man created in the image of God means that man is relational. There is a social aspect of man that evidences itself in the CH and in Family and in our love relationships. We are never complete in solitude. Yet, the Bible teaches that God is essentially & eternally loving, as well as essentially and eternally a God of fellowship. As we've said, these things can't exist apart from t/Trinity.

God created us to be relational. Integrity of our relationships has a direct correlation to our joy - beginning first w/our relationship w/God through X, and our relationships w/our family (spouses, kids, siblings), then our

relationships in t/local CH. This is part of what it means to be created in God's image. God can only be truly relational if He eternally exists in a Triunity (note "unity") of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

ii. This is then an example for us

Do you realize that God has never had a problem w/disunity? The Son never threatened to move out of t/KD because He was tired of submitting to t/Father. The HS never complained because He was in t/background giving glory to t/Father & t/Son. That's an example for us. Why Jesus could twice pray in John 17 that we, his disciples, are to be one (unified) even as the three members of t/Trinity are one.

Are you willing to imitate t/highest example of love and unity you could ever have in God's relational Triunity in order that you may model that pattern in your life?

(3) Loving The Trinity Fuels our Worship

We exist to worship God. And God seeks people to worship Him in "spirit and truth" (John 4:24). Therefore we must always endeavor to deepen our worship of God--in truth as well as in our hearts.

This really caps it all off. You cannot worship God w/o worshipping him in His Triunity.

The Swiss Reformer John Calvin quoting Gregory of Nazianzus:

"I cannot think of the one without quickly being encircled by the splendor of the three; nor can I discern the three without being straightway carried back to the one." [1.13.17]

This is no insignificant issue

It touches upon the nature of God, the incarnation, and even t/sufficiency of t/person of JC in his role as Savior.

Can't separate t/truth of who God is (Trinity) from t/Gospel. It is inseparably part of t/faith "once for all delivered from t/saints."

Melito, Bishop of ancient Sardis, died around the year 180 AD. Recently a sermon Melito wrote on the Passover was discovered. Here's a CH leader writing about t/Passover Lamb, JC & doing so only a scant few years from t/lives of t/Apostles. Close your eyes & worship as we close with this. Speaking of t/eternal Son of God, Jesus Christ he wrote==>

He who hung the earth in place is hanged.
He who fixed the heavens in place is fixed in place.
He who made all things fast is made fast on a tree.
The sovereign is insulted.
God is murdered.
The King of Israel is destroyed by an Israelite hand.

This is the One who made the heavens and the earth, and formed mankind in the beginning,
The One proclaimed by the Law and the Prophets,
The One enfleshed in a virgin,
The One hanged on a tree,
The One buried in the earth,

The One raised from the dead and who went up into the heights of heaven
The One sitting at the right hand of the Father,
The One having all authority to judge and save,
Through Whom the Father made the things which exist from the beginning of time.
This One is “the Alpha and Omega,”
This One is “the beginning and the end” . . . the beginning indescribable and the end incomprehensible.
This One is the Christ.
This One is the King.
This One is Jesus.
This One is the Leader.
This One is the Lord.
This One is the One who rose from the dead.
This One is the One sitting on the right hand of the Father.
He bears the Father and is borne by the Father.
“To him be the glory and the power forever. Amen.”