

# Studies on **CHRISTOLOGY**

**A Contrast between Biblical Theology and Pagan,  
Papal and Reformed Theology  
Concerning Christ's Generation.**

By

**One who has a reason to Hope He has an interest in Christ's glorious  
Resurrection and Eternal Kingdom**

## **Thoughts on Christ's Generation Eternal or Timely?**

**What is Eternal Generation?**

**Introduction:** In the science of systematic theology, the generation of Jesus Christ is usually presented as *eternal generation*. The doctrine states that in eternity past, the Father generated Christ to be His eternal Son. That is, the Father birthed Christ into existence in His divine nature. The reason Christ is a Divine Being is because He is the Divine Father's divine offspring. In order to escape many difficulties, theologians have urged that this act does not imply superiority or inferiority, or previous existence or resultant existence. We feel this is theological double-talk. Words have meanings. The meaning is very clear when we analyze the Pagan, Papal and Reformed concept of eternal generation. In this dogma Christ is merely a Divine offspring from the Eternal Father. To make matters worse, the Papists usually condemned to eternal damnation those who opposed or even questioned this concept.

### **The Conflict between the Papists and their Children and the True Churches**

The question of the Father's Generation of Jesus Christ has troubled professed Christianity since the early days of the Roman Catholic Church and its conflicts with those whom she considered as heretics. The churches of Jesus Christ, those true churches that have never been a part of the Papal system, have often been condemned as heretics on the Holy Trinity. This is because they have not held to the Pagan, Papal and later Protestant concepts of the Holy Trinity in general and the eternal generation of Christ in Particular.

## **The Essential Difference Stated**

We must be careful to note the difference between systematic theology and its teaching of **eternal generation** and Biblical theology and its teaching of Christ's **timely generation**. Systematic theology teaches the **eternal generation** of Christ's **deity** and/or **Godhead**. Biblical theology teaches the timely generation of Christ's humanity in its glorified form at His resurrection. Simply, is Christ a self-existent, self-sufficient Deity in His own Godhead, or is He a derived Deity, owing His all to the Father?

## **The Eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ**

In addition, the question of Christ's eternal Sonship is involved. Exactly how is Christ the eternal Son of God? It is because of His own divine nature and Godhead or is it due to a generated or derived Godhead, nature and Sonship? Systematic theology also is forced into teaching that Christ's Eternal Sonship is a **derived** Sonship coming from His eternal generation. It should be noted that they deny this, however. This is but one of their many absurdities on this point. Biblical theology maintains that Christ's eternal Sonship is not a derived Sonship, but is eternal and properly an **incommunicable personal and relative property or attribute** distinguishing Him from the Father and the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ, in His deity, is self-existent and self-sufficient, but not in His humanity. In Christ's humanity, as the Son of Man and Son of God, He is neither self-existent nor self-sufficient. He owes His humanity to God the Father, even His Father. As to His timely sufficiency, in His humanity, Christ owes all things to God the Father, by the power and ministry of the Holy Spirit. So systematic theology, which has come from the Papists and Protestants, and Biblical theology, which mainly comes from the old school saints, **both teach the eternal Sonship of Jesus Christ**. The Question is HOW IS HE THE ETERNAL SON OF GOD? Is he the Eternal Son of God due to a generated and derived Sonship or due to His Self-sufficient and Self-existent Sonship as a part of His self-sufficient and Self-existent deity? We hold the latter.

## **CHAPTER I**

### **Historical Theology Considered**

While history is not our final authority, it is a very good witness, Hebrews 11. Therefore, we will treat this issue a bit from history.

In early church history this question may have been discussed, but to no great extent. The churches of Jesus Christ maintained the simple Biblical doctrine of Christ's deity. As Jewish and Pagan influence grew and began to make inroads into the professed churches, the entire visible order of professed Christianity began to undergo serious changes, except for a few of the simple and despised believers and their churches. As the man of sin became enthroned in the visible and outward Temple of God more and more and the Roman Catholic Church began to develop, disputations rose within her fold. Church historians know one of these Catholic controversies as the Arian controversy. In order to formulate a creed for the entire Catholic Church, and to defend what the Catholics believed to be the true faith, the Catholics summoned a national council that produced the Athanasian Creed, about AD 430.

## The Athanasian Creed, about AD 430

Here are the statements in question from The Athanasian Creed:

21. The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.
22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten.
23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding.
24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers, one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts;
25. And in this Trinity no one is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another (there is nothing before, or after: nothing greater or less).
26. But the whole three Persons are coeternal, and coequal.

Taken from Philip Schaff's **Creeds of Christendom**, New York, Harper and Brothers; 1889, Volume 2, pages 67, 68.

You will note the clear expression:

22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten.

In order to cover up this terrible concept, the Papists tried to resort to theological double talk. But the fact remains that this Pagan, Papal and later Protestant concept teaches that:

1) The Father is the ONLY One Who is of Himself, neither made or begotten. It is true that the Father is indeed of Himself, neither made nor begotten.

2) However, note the following closely: The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created:

but begotten. Now, laying aside the theological hot air we note the following:

a. Christ Jesus, herein referred unto as The Son, is not of Himself, however, He is not made nor created, but only begotten.

b. This concept is one step above the terrible blasphemy of the Arians who taught that Christ Jesus is a made or created being.

c. However, it still denies the eternal self-existence and self-sufficiency of the Lord Jesus Christ, for He, in His eternal deity, according to this statement, is of the Father and the Father alone is of no other.

The Athanasian Creed, in the early 400s, set forth for the first time in church history the terrible concept of a Trinity of Divine Persons, in opposition to the Biblical view of a Trinity of Divine Spirits, and the equally terrible concept of Christ's eternal generation. From that time on, dissenters, especially the hated Anabaptists, who did oppose the Catholic dogma of the Athanasian Creed, have been labeled under various names, primary Arians. However, the

majority of Anabaptists have never been Arians. They simply deny the Pagan, Roman Catholic and later Protestant concepts of a Trinity of Divine Persons or People and Christ's eternal Generation. They have held to a Trinity of Divine Spirits, self-sufficient and self-existent, but distinguished by several relative personal properties or attributes.

### **The Westminster Confession 1644**

Here is this terrible doctrine from the Westminster Confession of English Presbyterians, issued in 1644, shortly following the Particular Baptist's First London Confession, edition of 1644:

III. In the unity of the Godhead, there be three persons, of one substance, power and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.

1. Observe that these Calvinists included the term substance, from the original Greek of Hebrews 1:3. They had enough sense, due to the terrible debates that had raged for nearly 1,200 years since the Athanasian Creed, to realize they needed to deal with the nature of God.

2. Also note, they made a distinction between substance and person. Making a distinction between Person and Nature.

3. But also, that they still held to eternal generation, and affirmed that the Father is the only person in their trinity Who is of Himself.

### **Baptist Confessions and Fellowships**

During the 1600s, the Particular Baptists in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland issued two basic Confessions of Faith. They are known as The First London Confession and the Second London Confession. While they may appear the same, they are very different, even coming from different Particular Baptists. Both of these Confessions underwent several later editions. The early American Particular Baptists issued the Second London Confession under the title of The Philadelphia Baptist Confession in 1743. It is only slightly different from the Second London Confession.

### **The First London Confession**

The First London Confession issued in five different editions from 1644-1653, did not maintain either a Trinity of Divine Persons or People, or eternal generation. In fact, they opposed these concepts. See Samuel Richardson's **Answer to Daniel Featly's The Dippers Dipt**, in 1646. The First London Confession is a Particular Baptist document, influenced by the earlier and older different Anabaptist doctrines and statements. It is not a Calvinistic confession, but a true Biblical and Particular Baptist Confession.

Here is their statement:

### **Edition of 1644.**

II. That God is of Himself, that is, neither from another, nor of another, nor by another, nor for another; But is a Spirit, Who as His being is of Himself, so He gives being, moving, and

preservation to all other things, being in Himself, eternal, most holy, every way infinite in greatness, wisdom, power, justice, goodness, truth, &c. In this God-head, there is the Father, the Son, and the Spirit; being every one of them one and the same God; and therefor not divided, but distinguished one from another by their several properties; the Father being from Himself, the Son of the Father from everlasting, the holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son.

This statement, while denying that the Holy Trinity is a Trinity of Divine Persons or People still listed the terrible doctrines of eternal generation and eternal procession in a mild way. This caused debate among these old Baptists and they modified that concept in the 1646 edition. Please note the following endorsement about Samuel Richard's work against Daniel Featly:

*And as for the other things where of we are accused, we refer those who desire further satisfaction to the answers of them. (In a small treatise, entitled, **Briefe Considerations on Dr. Featley's Book, entitled, The Dipper Dipt**, by Samuel Richardson. ( 4 to. London, 1645.)*

Here are Richardson's remarks about eternal generation and eternal procession:

*Also the Doctor saith,*

*that Christ is the Son of God, not only in respect of His temporal generation, but also in respect of his eternal generation, p. 3,*

*and that the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, because He proceeds from the Father originally; and that the Spirit hath a dependence from both, p. 23.*

*But if Christ, as He was God, had a beginning, He could not be God if He had no beginning.*

*How can Christ, as He is God, be the Son of God in respect of His eternal generation any more than the Father is His Son by eternal generation?*

*Secondly, if the Spirit of God be God, (as He is) equal with the Father and the Son, all Three infinite, without beginning, each having the whole divine essence and yet there is but one essence: how can the Spirit proceed from the Father originally, any more then the Father from the Spirit? And how can the Spirit of God have any more dependence upon the Father and the Son, then they have upon Him, seeing whatsoever is infinite can have no dependence upon any thing?*

*Therefore the Doctor's words contain in them the nature of blasphemy; and to define how one can be three, and three but one, & always so remains, is above the reach of any man: I may say to him as, Mat. 7:3; Luke 6:41, 42.*

When the first generation of London Particular Baptists issued their first edition of the First London Confession of Faith, it contained hints at the terrible concept of eternal generation and eternal procession. In due time, this was corrected. Here are the statements issued in 1646:

**.1.**

The Lord our God is but one God, whose subsistence is in Himself; Whose essence cannot be comprehended by any but Himself; Who only hath immortality dwelling in the light which no

man can approach unto; Who is in Himself most holy, every way infinite, in greatness, wisdom, power, love; merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, Who giveth being, moving, and preservation to all creatures.

.2.

In this divine and infinite Being, there is the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided; all infinite, without any beginning, therefore but one God, Who is not to be divided in nature and being, but distinguished by several peculiar relative properties.

### **The final London Edition, 1652:**

.1.

THE Lord our God is but one God, whose substance is in Himself; whose essence cannot be comprehended by any but Himself; Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light, which no man can approach unto; Who is in Himself most holy, every way infinite, in greatness, in wisdom, power, love, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, Who gives being, moving and preservation to all creatures.

.2.

In this divine and infinite Being, there is the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, Each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided; All infinite without any beginning, therefore but one God, Who is not to be divided in nature, and being, but distinguished by several peculiar relative properties.

### **Summation about the Second London Edition**

The Second London Confession was first issued in 1677. Then again, in 1689, and then later as the Philadelphia Baptist Confession, issued in 1743, sets forth a Trinity of Three Subsistences, not Persons. However, these Calvinized Baptist Creeds did set forth the Pagan, Papal and Protestant concept of a Divine Son by Eternal Generation. This is because the earlier First London Confession was largely unknown and its original drafters were now mostly dead or away from the center of Baptist influence. As time went on, many Biblical doctrines and expressions gave way to impure Calvinized Baptist thought concepts and expressions. Many of those who issued the First London Confession did not issue the Second London. There is a New Generation about in the Israel of God. Here are the remarks:

3. In this divine and infinite Being there are three Subsistences, the Father, the Word (or Son) and Holy Spirit, of one substance, power and Eternity, each having the whole Divine Essence, yet the essence undivided, the Father is of none neither begotten nor proceeding, the Son is eternally begotten of the Father, the holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, all infinite, without beginning, therefore but one God, who is not to be divided in nature and Being; but distinguished by several peculiar, relative properties, and personal relations; which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our Communion with God, and comfortable dependence on Him. **A Confession of Faith put forth by the Elders and Brethren of Many Congregations of Christians (baptized upon Profession of their Faith) in London and the Country, Printed in**

the year 1677.

There are little differences between this statement and the General Assembly Confession made in 1689 or 91 and still later the Philadelphia Confession of 1743. There are some differences:

1. The Baptists did not use PERSONS, but did use the term Subsistences.
2. Is there an essential difference between the terms persons and subsistences? Here is the definition of subsistence:

#### **Definition of Substances:**

a. Subsistence, 1. real being, actual existence. 2. that which furnishes support to animal life; means of support; support; livelihood, that which supplies the means of living; as a scanty subsistence. 3. Inherence in something else; as the subsistence of qualities in bodies. 4. In theology, same as hypostasis; **Webster's Unabridged**, page 1699.

#### **Definition of Hypostasis**

What means the term hypostasis: (Gr. hypostasis, a supporting, foundation, from hypistanai, to set under, pass, to stand under; hypo, under, and hisanai, to stand, make to stand.)

1. An underlying principle; some fact or supposition which lies at the foundation of a course of reasoning; in theology, substance, entity, or personality, especially of any member of the Trinity.
2. In alchemy, a principle or basic substance;
3. In medicine, any morbid deposition or setting down, as the sediment of urine. Webster. *ibid.* page 850.

Please note the following:

1. The Calvinized Particular Baptists who issued the Second London Confession tried to avoid calling God a person. They wanted the Trinity in three subsistences. This led into further difficulties and helped paved the way for semi-Unitarianism to be introduced among the English Baptists in less than one generation following this document.
2. The theological usage of terms, which comes by giving them a special meaning, is called **sacred meaning**. It is a trick of the devil. Any time that theologians take terms, give them a private meaning, a sacred meaning, and leave the language of the common people, it is deceitful. Try this with the terms church and baptism.
3. Still, in spite of not using the concept that God is a Trinity of Persons or divine people, these new Particular Baptists retained the Pagan, Papal and now Protestant theories or blasphemies of eternal generation and eternal procession.
4. This is a clear departure from the First London Confession and their answer by Samuel Richardson to Daniel Featly about several things in general and these points in particular.
5. The Calvinized Particular Baptists who issued the Second London Confession were apostates from the former position of the older Particular Baptists and the still older Anabaptists on these

points.

6. The newer generation in Israel were now embracing the terrible heresies that the older Particular Baptists and still older and historic Anabaptists denied

7. Also, remember, one definition of subsistence, as it relates to the new theological double talk, or hot air, is PERSONALITY, not person, but personality.

8. These Calvinized Baptists were laying the easy street to semi-Unitarianism, with their cloaked Sabellianism.

9. The first London edition of 1644 has some Sabellian traits. These were eliminated when the Particular Baptists rejected Thomas Collier and his followers.

10. Later Thomas Collier and his followers were back among the Particular Baptists, by their influence and through the many new converts from the General Baptists who were now coming over to the Particular Baptists after the Particulars had left their former ways.

John Gill and John Brine reigned supreme among Baptists theologians during the mid and late 1700s in England and in America. They represent a mixture of Baptist, Biblical and Calvinistic theology.

### **The English Downgraders**

In England, during the late 1800s the terrible downgrading controversy developed and came to a head. It was so named because it downgraded the entire concepts of revealed Christianity in general and Jesus Christ in particular. Among the English Particular Baptists, Christ was not downgraded. However, J. C. Philpot, then the editor of **The Gospel Standard** considered anyone who differed from the Calvinized concept of the Westminster Theology as suspect on the Deity of Christ and His eternal Sonship. He opposed other Particular Baptists in England who held to Biblical theology rather than Calvinized theology. They rallied about their publication called **The Earthen Vessel**. Philpot, an Angelized Particular Baptist, who was still more Anglican than Baptist, felt sure it was his called duty to expose what he considered as non-orthodox views held by those **Earthen Vessel** Baptists. *The sad part of all this is that Philpot assumed that a denial of eternal generation equaled a denial of eternal Sonship. It does not.* He never seemed to understand that Christ's true and proper Sonship is one of His personal properties rather than a derived Sonship by the Father's act of generating Him. Philpot never *understood the Biblical Doctrine of Christ's timely generation in His glorified humanity.*

### **The America Old School and New School**

In the late 1700s and early 1800s, Baptists in America divided themselves into Old School and New School fellowships. Biblical theologians such as Gilbert Beebe and Samuel Trott represented The Old School. Systematic theologians such as John L. Dagg of Mercer University in Georgia and J. P. Boyce founder of the Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, Ky. represented the New School. The Old School men represented the older John Gill theological views, yet without holding to his Calvinized views. The New School theologians held to modern Calvinized views, that is mostly Fullerism or semi-Fullrism, and clearly departed from the older Gill views. Yet, both Gill and the New School held to the Calvinized, Papal and Pagan views of



the Trinity of Divine Persons or People and eternal generation.

### **Not Christ's Eternal Sonship but How?**

These remarks bring us up to date. We are *not* dealing with the *fact of Christ's eternal Sonship*, but the *how of His eternal Sonship*. Is His eternal Sonship a generated and derived Sonship, or a self-existent and self-sufficient Sonship? In addition, we are not denying Christ's true and proper generation. Did the Father generate Christ into His divine essence and Godhead in eternity past, or did the Father generate Christ's earthly body into a glorified resurrected body at His resurrection in time? Which does the Bible teach, *the eternal generation of Christ's deity and Godhead* or *the timely generation of His humanity into a glorified humanity*? This is the issue.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **What Does the Bible Teach About the Generation of Jesus Christ?**

The Father has generated Jesus Christ. There is no controversy about this fact, but **when** and **unto what**? Is this a timely generation **relating only to Christ's humanity**, or is it an **eternal generation relating unto His Deity and Sonship**? We hold that the Bible teaches **that the Father's generation of Jesus Christ is a timely generation relating only to His sacred and blessed humanity**. We believe this generation occurred at His resurrection. We do admit, however, that in a sense this was done in the Virgin Birth and still later, figured out in His baptism.

To clear this subject even further, note Elder Gilbert Beebe's words from his Editorials in the **Signs of the Times**:

### **ETERNAL GENERATION**

Sir: - will you do a reader of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES the favor to give your opinion of the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God?

Reply. - The above note came to us by mail, precisely as we have copied it above, without place or date, but post-marked on the envelope by the stamp, Baltimore, Md., Feb. 11, and directed to us at New Vernon, in this County; thence it was forwarded to us at this place. Who the querist is, and what is desired, and for what purpose, we do not fully comprehend, but as we desire always to oblige, as far as we have ability, the readers of the SIGNS, we will inform the inquirer frankly, that we do not know what the doctrine is, on which our opinion is requested. We have found no mention made, in our version of the Scriptures, of the eternal generation of the Son of God, in so many words, therefore we suppose the inquiry relates to some theory or doctrine so designated, as held and taught by men. As we do not know what the theory or doctrine is, we have no other opinion than this, that the Scriptures contain all that it is essential for the saints to understand in regard to the doctrine of God our Savior. That he is the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, and that he was the Son of God before he was sent into the world,

and is the same yesterday, today and forever, and that he who is the Son of God, is also the eternal, underived, independent God, we also firmly believe. That in his Mediatorial union with his body, his church, he is the only begotten of the Father, while in his supreme Godhead, he is the fullness of the Godhead, underived and unbegotten.

The New Testament begins with the words, "The book of the generations of Jesus Christ, the Son of David,"- Matt ii. Of his generation in this sense, we are told that he was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. (Rom. i. 3, 4.) Of his generation as the seed of David, we find no record of its being called eternal. The inspired psalmist, in prophesying of him, says: "The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations," &c. "A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation."- Psalms xxii. 28, 30. This prophetic declaration of the royal prophet, compared with 1 Peter ii. 9: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," &c., very clearly presents to us, the generation of Jesus Christ the Son of God. The life, that is, the eternal life or immortality of this generation, was with the Father, (1 John i. 2:) "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life."-1 John v.11,12. This generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as we have proven by 1 Peter ii. 9, is a chosen generation, and Paul testifies, Eph. i. 4' that they were "chosen in him," that is, in Jesus Christ the Son of God, "before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love." Thus far we have the testimony that the life which was given to the generation of Jesus Christ the Son of God, was Eternal Life, and that it was, and still is so in Jesus Christ the Son of God, that no man can have the one without having the other, and no one can be destitute of the one without being destitute of the other. Such, then, is the seminal union and relationship of vitality, of immortality, that indissoluble unites the Head and Body of the church of God, that we are compelled to regard it as eternal.

The book of the complete generations of the earthly Adam was given in the day that God created man, (Gen. V. 1,) consequently before any of the children of Adam were born of the flesh. And as the earthly Adam is the figure of the heavenly Adam, (Rom. v.14; 1 Cor. xv. 47, 48,) we infer that the seed or generation of Jesus Christ the Son of God, is just as ancient as his Sonship. That is, we cannot from the Scriptures learn that our Lord Jesus Christ held the office, or occupied the position of Mediator, before the eternal life, which was with the Father, was given to us in him. That this is what constitutes the relationship between Christ, the seminal Head, and his seed, the Progenitor and the chosen generation.

We believe there are some who have held the idea that the flesh of our Redeemer, in which he was born of the Virgin, which suffered on the cross, was laid in the tomb, and which was raised from the dead, was begotten and brought forth by what they call an eternal generation, and so existed a human body and soul, from the ancients of eternity. If that theory be true, we have not so learned it, and must wait for clearer light on that subject. If what is called the humanity of Christ was also generated and did so exist before all time, then, instead of his assumption of our flesh, instead of his taking on him the seed of Abraham, or being made of a woman in his advent to this world, the whole race of mankind must have assumed his human nature when they were born of the flesh. And furthermore, we see no reason why it was expedient for him to be made of a woman, in order to be made under that law which the human family were under, as that law

was binding on all human beings, until they are redeemed from its do-minion by his one offering of himself without spot unto God. Until these difficulties which, to a very little mind like ours, are insuperable, are obviated, we are unable to endorse this speculation.

Another, to us, equally untenable theory, called eternal generation of the Son of God, sets forth, that his supreme Godhead is a derivative Godhead; that it is not original, self-existent, independent and eternal. This theory, as it appears to us, seems to deny all that is essential to his Godhead. How can we conceive of absolute Godhead that has descended by generation or otherwise from any producing source higher than himself. That Christ exists in a Sonship which is begotten of the Father, is clearly demonstrated in the Scriptures, and confirmed by his own declarations, but this we understand to be in relation to what he is as Head and life of his church. But that he also is the eternal, self-existent God, the Jehovah, is equally demonstrated in the Scriptures, and in the personal experience of every saint. For if he is not God in an absolute and unrestricted sense, he cannot be the Savior. He says'. "I am God, and beside me there is no Savior." We must, therefore, be excused from endorsing a doctrine, however popular or plausible, that would rob us of a Savior, or present him in a character in which we are forbidden to worship him. This doctrine of a begotten Godhead is, to us, equivalent to a denial of his Godhead in all but a nominal sense. Nor does the fine-spun reasoning of his being eternally begotten, remove the difficulty. The effect would be the same, whether begotten in eternity or in time. A like it must and would imply a begetting or producing God, anterior to his development as God; while, to our view, the denial of his self-existence is a denial that he exists at all, as an absolute, eternal, independent and self-existent God. The argument, that the son is as old as his father, that a father cannot exist without a son, is quite too feeble to bring conviction to our mind. Stripped of all artificial verbiage, the naked question returns; Is Jesus Christ absolutely, eternally, independently, underivedly, the very supreme and eternal God? To this question, we emphatically answer, Yes! And as such we hope to worship and adore him when the earth and heavens shall be no more; and even now we have no sweeter song to sing than, "Jesus, my God, I know his name, His name is all my trust; Nor will he put my soul to shame, Nor let my hope be lost." Middletown, N.Y., February 15, 1860. From Bebee's **Editorials of the Signs of the Times**, vol. 4, pages 305-308.

Elder James Poole from Welsh Tract Publications furnished these excellent notes to us. See our link to The Remnant for more of these valuable studies.

### **The Biblical Teaching**

The Heavenly Father's generation of Jesus Christ is set forth in the Sacred Scriptures in four clear passages, one in the Old Testament and three in the New Testament, Psa. 2:7; Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5 and 5:5. In addition, please note that Christ is called the Only Begotten Son before His resurrection. There is indeed therefore, a sense in which He is generated or begotten even before His resurrection. That also is in His humanity at His Virgin Birth. More will be on this later.

### **Definition of the Term Generation**

The basic Greek term for begotten is *gennao γεννω*. It is used in Acts 13:33, Hebrews 1:5; and

5:5. In the Greek New Testament, there are 11 forms of gen, γεν, the primary root word. Gennao is defined in this way:

Used of men-to beget, generate; Of women, to bring forth, bear, give birth to; to be a parent to any one, to be a son or child to anyone. **The Analytical Greek Lexicon** pages 78, 79.

Ginomai, γινομαι, is the major word in this family:to come into existence, to be created, exist by creation, to be born, produced, grow . . . **Ibid.** pages 78, 79. Vine, on beget, bear, begetting, born, lists 8 Greek words coming from the word family, see pages 111-112. *Gennaw is a Greek Term that speaks of a parent's reproductive act in producing a child.*

### **Biblical Usages of Christ's Generation or Begetting**

In the Pre-Christ Greek Old Testament, γεγεννεκα is used in Psalms 2:7. Paul quotes from this verse three times in his sermons and writings. This is translated in the English Bible as begotten. Strong lists 24 usages of the English word Begotten. The first is in Genesis 5:4 and the last is in Revelation 1:5. The first reference to Christ is in Psalms 2:7. Paul quotes from Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33; Hebrews 1:5; and 5:5.

Taking our leave from the English Scriptures, we now go into the original Greek language. In the Greek Scriptures, γεννω occurs in about 70 verses. Look well at Matthew 1:16, Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was BORN Jesus. This is a regular term and it is used in such places as John 3:6 and 7. In Biblical theology, the term generation can also mean born.

### **Psalms 2:7 the Foundation for Christ's Timely Generation**

In Psalms 2:7 the Father's generation of Christ's is timely. Note the word, this DAY. This is the normal Greek word translated consistently in the New Testament as DAY. "*This Day have I begotten thee*". Therefore, the Bible clearly teaches the Father's timely generation of Jesus Christ. *In the absence of any Biblical teaching showing the Father's eternal generation of Jesus Christ, we deny such a concept.*

### **The New Testament Interpretation of Psalms 2:7**

Paul quotes from Psalms 2:7 three times in the New Testament. This Scripture that **may not** be considered as of Private Interpretation. Paul applies this statement to Christ's bodily resurrection, or the glorification of His humanity in each of these three cases.

#### **Acts 13:33**

In this message, Paul's central theme is Christ's bodily resurrection. Paul relies upon Psalms 2:7 to enforce the doctrine of the Bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ. Clearly then, Psalms 2:7 is a reference to the Father's timely generation of Christ. This generation of Christ in time is at His bodily resurrection and only refers to His blessed and sacred humanity in its resurrected state.

#### **Hebrews 1:5**

Paul is holding forth Christ's glorious resurrected state and exaltation. It is very clear that Paul is referring unto Christ, after His death, burial and resurrection. He relies upon several Messianic O. T. passages to prove this point. Clearly, then, Psalms 2:7 is used again to refer to the blessed

humanity of Jesus Christ in its resurrected and glorified form.

The Roman Catholics have reported that some heretical groups in the dark ages have made this apply to Christ's becoming divine following His resurrection. If they believed that or not, we don't know. However, **if Christ's deity** is what the Father has generated, then clearly, it was not in eternity past, but in time, at Christ's resurrection. **We deny this is a generation of deity and maintain that it is only a generation of Christ's resurrection humanity.**

Before we pass, please note what is said in verse 6. Here Christ is called the *First Begotten*. In Revelation 1:5 we note this phrase as *The First Begotten out of the Dead*. Here Paul says that when the Father brings the first begotten into the world, He says, let all the angles of God worship Him. At first glance, this may appear to refer unto Christ's Virgin Birth. If it does it certainly does not teach an eternal generation of Christ's deity, but the timely generation of His humanity as it came from the Virgin Mary.

### **The Resurrection of Christ and the New World of the Second Covenant**

Yet, upon closer examination, is this the case? Please read this from the Greek text and note the term *world*. This term is not kosmos but oikois. Kosmos is the normal term that is translated as world in such places as John 1:29 and 3:16. However, oikois is also translated world and inhabited earth. Oikois, in its primary meaning, refers to a house or household. Please note Hebrews 2:5. Here the term world, that is, in the world to come, is the same as in Hebrews 1:6. The old Baptists understood this House to be the House of God, or the Gospel church and church age. See for example Hansard Knollys work, **The World that now is and the World that is to Come**, published in the 1670s. As you consider Hebrews chapters 1 and 2 you can see that the entire setting refers to the **resurrection of Jesus Christ in His glorified humanity and His resulting exaltation to the Father's right hand**. Herein is the subjection of all things unto Him in that state during this great and unending age of His glorious kingdom.

### **The Glorification of Christ's Humanity at His Resurrection**

The meaning of Hebrews 1:7 is not the Virgin Birth of Christ, but the glorification of Christ and His exaltation in the World that Now is, the Household of God, or the Gospel Church. The angles are explained as spirits, not human beings. His ministers are a flame of fire. This is explained further in verse 14. These angels are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister unto those who are the heirs of salvation.

### **Hebrews 5:5**

In this wonderful passage, we have three main points. First is Christ's exaltation as a High Priest not according to Aaron, and the Father's begetting of His Son. The Second is His fleshly obedience unto death. The third is His eternal priesthood identified; it is according to Melchisedec's priesthood.

### **This Explained**

In this wonderful passage, Paul is showing us that Christ, in His resurrected and glorified humanity is now exalted as a King, Priest and Prophet. He is exalted into the Melchisedec type of priesthood. What do we know about Melchisedec and his kingly priesthood?

## The Melchisedec Priesthood

First, the Melchisedec priesthood is not of human origin. Secondly, It will not end. Thirdly, it is not of succession, as was Aaron's. Melchisedec was also the King of Salem. Where was Salem? It later became known as Jerusalem. Melchisedec was the King-Priest of Salem or the early city of Jerusalem.

### Hebrews 3:2-6

Please remember Paul's statement in Hebrews 3:2-6. In the English text, the term house is used seven times. In the Greek text, the term house is used 6 times with a pronoun once. In each case translated as house, except where the pronoun is used, it is the same Greek term translated word in Hebrews 1:6. What is the meaning of all of this?

### Whose House We are

The exalted and glorified Jesus Christ, in His glorified state has a City and a House as well as a Kingdom which is unending. When Christ was caught up into the heaven and exalted at the right hand of God, there He entered into His Melchisedec King-Priesthood. He is now the King-Priest over the Heavenly Jerusalem, the Heavenly Household, the Gospel Church, the Kingdom of God, all those who are under the baptism of heaven brought into this world by John the Baptist, Dan. 2:40-44 and Luke 7:22-35.

### Conclusions from these Scriptures

In conclusion to these four scriptures teaching us about the Father's begetting of Jesus Christ we note the following:

1. This is a timely generation, for it said, **this day have I begotten thee**;
2. It refers to His **glorified humanity** at His resurrection, not His deity;
3. It is a **begetting into His glorified state and His exaltation** to the Right hand of God in the heavens, not some eternal generation of Christ's deity from His Father.
4. In this exalted state, the result of His begetting, He enters upon His established throne and rule as the great Melchisedec High Priest. This is now over the New and Heavenly City of God, the New Jerusalem, the New House, the Gospel Church and the unending Kingdom of God, those under the baptism of heaven, or the baptism of John the Baptist.
5. The Melchisedec Priesthood of Christ is His meditorial, glorified, exalted Priesthood entered in at His exaltation following His accession into the Heavens 40 days following His resurrection.

### I Conclude about Eternal Generation

Therefore, *there is no Biblical doctrine such as the Father's eternal generation of His Son, in His deity or Godhead*, taught in the Sacred Scriptures. To deny Christ's timely generation, in His

resurrection body, is to deny the teachings of these wonderful and clear Scriptures about Christ, His resurrection, exaltation and entrance into His great high priesthood.

### **The Only Begotten Son**

Jesus referred unto Himself, and others referred to Him as the Only Begotten Son of the Father in many different places during His personal ministry. One such place is in John 3:16, and John 1:14 and 1:18. There is a sense in which the Father generated Jesus Christ in His Virgin Birth. This, however, refers only to His humanity and is a timely generation. It is not a generation of His deity in eternity. In addition, this was recorded years after Christ's resurrection and identifies Him.

In John 1:14 the entire concept of the Only Begotten Son is set forth as when the Word Became Flesh. The first instance of this is in His Virgin Birth. The Second instance of this is in His glorified flesh at His resurrection. So, in this wonderful sense, God the Father, by the powers of the Holy Spirit, did generate Christ's humanity at His Virgin Birth. This is true and wonderful. However, remember that Psalms 2 is never quoted to support the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ **only His resurrection state.**

### **The Second Adam or Christ's Generated Flesh**

As the Second Adam, Christ is the heavenly Adam or man. The Holy Trinity made the first Adam out of the dust of the earth. The Holy Trinity made the Second Adam out of the generated Humanity of Jesus Christ. The humanity of Jesus Christ is the only humanity that is generated and not created.

### **Christ is the Second Adam and the Everlasting Father of our New Bodies**

Christ is the Second Adam fully and completely in His Resurrected state. He is the Father of all the Elect in their new Humanity. This includes all the family of God in their resurrected state. In this sense, as the Father or Second Adam (**not God the Father**) of those in union with Him in their glorified state, He is in His fullest, their Second Adam, the heavenly man, I Cor. 15:35-58. As the first Adam was our natural and federal earthly father in the created flesh, even so Christ Jesus, in His generated flesh, is the Second Adam from Whom we receive our resurrected flesh. In this way, the way of the resurrected flesh, He is also the everlasting Father or the New and Everlasting Second Adam, Isaiah 9:6 and 7. We are not saying that Christ is God the Father, but that Christ is the Everlasting Father of our new and glorified humanity as the second federal and covenanted Adam.

### **In Conclusion to the Whole**

The Word of God points us to Christ's resurrection as the Father's Begetting or generation. This is Biblical Theology. Why should we forsake it for Pagan, Papal and Reformed concepts? We hope we never shall.