

# GOD IN CHRIST JESUS

By  
John Peterson  
©1966 by John Paterson

## Appendix A

### “THE BEGINNING OF THE CREATION OF GOD” and “THE FIRSTBORN OF EVERY CREATURE”

To understand these expressions we only need to ponder these facts -- facts which are both Scriptural and reasonable, and which are admitted by nearly all Christian theologians:

(a) The Babe of Bethlehem had a created nature with a human will and human spirit -- in other words was a perfect man. You may recall that this was enunciated in the Creed of Chalcedon, to which reference was made under the subheading “Both God and Man.” This will be examined in greater detail in Appendix B.

(b) The reality of Christ’s humanity is an integral part of the Gospel Plan --acceptance of this fact and belief in the Virgin Birth are absolutely essential to salvation; yet such a belief does not in any way detract from Christ’s essential Deity -- it does not prevent us from declaring that Jesus of Nazareth, Who was perfect man in one nature, was, *at the same time*, perfect God in another! We cannot “explain” this coexistence of two natures, but we gladly confess it!

(c) Before the creation spoken of in Genesis 1:1, God, the eternal and invisible Spirit, chose to make known His eternal power and invisible Godhead by centering all authority and Lordship in a visible form. While no thoughtful person would suggest that He took flesh prior to Bethlehem, His appearances in bodily form from the dawn of human history certainly reflect a relationship to the highest orders of intelligent created beings, namely, angels and men, and indicate something *akin* to an incarnation. Space forbids an exhaustive examination at this time, but incidents from the life of Jacob may supply the reader with some light on the subject -- especially if he will take the trouble to turn up and examine in detail the Scripture references, which follow:

“Jehovah, the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac” appeared to Jacob at Bethel (Gen. 28:13), and 21 years later “the angel of God” announced to Jacob that He was “Jehovah” and “the God of Bethel” (Gen. 31:3,11,13). Shortly after this, “a man” wrestled with Jacob (Gen. 32:24), and the status of this heavenly messenger is reflected in words He spoke to Jacob – “as a prince has thou power with GOD and with MEN, and hast prevailed.” This “man” is called “the face of God” (Gen. 32:30) and “the angel” (Hos. 12:4). Furthermore, “the angel” is identified with the God of Bethel and is “even

Jehovah, God of hosts” (Hos. 12:4-5). If further identification is needed it is surely found in the word, “Jehovah is His memorial” (Hos. 12:5), directing our thoughts to the burning bush where “I AM” declared Himself “Jehovah, the God of Jacob: this is My name for ever, and this is My memorial unto all generations” (Ex. 3:13-15; Acts 7:30,38). In passing, I might mention that Jacob said of this “man,” “I have seen ELOHIM face to face” (Gen. 32:30); Trinitarians may not like to be reminded that this is not the only place in the Bible where the *plural* Elohim is applied to the singular Christ!

When Jacob was dying, he spoke of “the GOD Which fed me all my life long, the ANGEL Which redeemed me from all evil” (Gen. 48:15-16).

This visible Being Who appeared to Jacob and declared Himself to be God, and Who was recognized by Jacob as God, is variously described in the Bible as “the Angel of Jehovah” (over 50 references), “the Angel of the Covenant” (Mal. 3:1; 1 Cor. 10:9; Acts 7:38), “the Angel of the Presence of Jehovah” (Isa. 63:9), and “the Angel Who can refuse to pardon iniquity, because the name of Jehovah is in Him” (Ex. 23:21; Psalm 2:12). Surely no one will deny that the power to forgive, or the right to refuse pardon, belongs *solely* to God. Who is this Angel if He is not the pre-existent Christ?

At this point, someone is sure to quote Hebrews 2:16: “Verily, He taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham He taketh hold.” True – but the very wording of this verse and, indeed, of the entire chapter, indicates that this refers *ONLY* to the Incarnation at Bethlehem when He “was made A LITTLE LOWER than the angels for the suffering of death, that He by the grace of God should taste death for every MAN” (Heb. 2:9) -- it has not the faintest connection with His state of existence prior to Bethlehem.

The fact that Christ was not Joseph’s son (nor any other man’s son) did not prevent Him from being a *real man* -- THE Son of Man -- possessing all the attributes and characteristics of perfect manhood and adequately suited to represent humanity in His atoning death and to head up the New Creation through His resurrection. Likewise, the fact that Christ was not “just another angel” did not prevent Him from being THE Angel of God’s Presence and the Angel of the Covenant Who “suddenly came to His temple” (as foretold in Malachi 3:1 and fulfilled in John 2:13-16).

There are times when we are forced by our reason to admit the utter necessity of certain conditions even when we cannot explain “how.” For example, thoughtful Bible students believe that Christ was truly human, the seed of the woman. When they confess that the Galilean was fully God and fully man in two complete and distinct natures subsisting in one visible Being, they are giving expression to a doctrine that is “reasonable” as well as Scriptural. The finite mind cannot comprehend, let alone explain, “how” God became man -- but this does not deter these students from believing that which Scripture teaches and which a reasonable view of Christ’s Temptation and Atonement requires; neither does their acknowledgment of the created nature of the Babe of Bethlehem detract in any way from His essential Godhead. However, when we acknowledge a parallel situation in respect to the PRE-EXISTENT Christ, we are accused of teaching Arianism. **THIS IS NOT SO!** Arianism denies that Christ is, or ever was, God in any real or supreme sense;

furthermore, to Arius, Christ was somewhat less than completely human. Anyone who distorts our doctrine to make it appear that we believe or teach Arianism must be woefully ignorant with respect to our true beliefs, or willfully dishonest!

## Appendix B

### THE HUMANITY OF JESUS

Our comprehension of the plan of redemption and of Christ's own Personality, and our appreciation of His relation to us, depend largely upon our conception of "the Man Christ Jesus." How human *was* Jesus? How human *is* Jesus? I am convinced that failure to answer these questions correctly has caused much of the trouble which the Church has suffered for centuries. A review of Church history shows that some peculiar notions have been advanced about the humanity of Christ. As we rehearse some of these briefly, you will notice that they have their modern counterparts - there is nothing new in all this argument over the Personality of Christ; it has gone on for nearly 1,900 years.

One of the earliest heresies taught that Christ's humanity was only apparent -- that He had a phantom body! In other words, He was not truly born, did not truly suffer and die, and therefore was not truly resurrected! This idea was current even while Apostle John was still alive, and in his First and Second Epistles John denounced these heretics (the Docetae) as "anti-christ, deceivers, transgressors, evil-doers, and liars." John is very careful to set forth the *reality* of Christ's humanity. He speaks of the pre-existent Word, Who was "with God" in the beginning, Who "was God," and "through Whom all things were made;" Who "became flesh, and dwelt among us;" and Whose glory "we beheld;" and he declares no less than seven times in three verses that he had HEARD, had SEEN, had LOOKED UPON, and had HANDLED the manifested Word of Life! (John 1:1-14; I John 1:1-3).

The next heresy to appear was that of the Ebionites. They admitted the real humanity of Jesus, but taught that He was Joseph's son who became the Son of God by adoption when endued with the Spirit at age 30! We can dismiss that -- the pre-existence of Christ is too vividly portrayed by Christ Himself to be ignored!

Next we meet the Monarchians who were led by Praxeas and, whose teaching became known as "Patripassianism" -- the doctrine that "the Father suffered." While admitting that Jesus had a real body of flesh and blood, these men taught that it was activated, not by a human spirit, human mind, and human will, but solely and directly by the indwelling Spirit of God. The effect of such teaching is to reduce Christ to a mere body of clay pushed around by the Eternal Spirit. It is a virtual denial of the true humanity of our Lord, for it leaves no opportunity for the exercise of human free-will and is incompatible with that *voluntary* and *loving obedience* rendered by the Son to the Father -- an obedience such that He could say, "Lo, I am come; in the roll of the book it is written of Me: I DELIGHT to do Thy will, O My God" (Psalm 40:7-8 R.V.).

This is also a common error today. Extremists have said that “God died on the Cross;” “when Jesus was on earth there was no God in heaven;” “Jesus was His own Father;” “when Jesus was in the grave heaven was empty;” “when Jesus prayed He talked to Himself -- He prayed, not because He needed to, but merely to give us an example;” “when the Father spoke out of heaven it was Jesus’ own voice” -- in other words, He was a ventriloquist! But mark this -- *when properly taught*, the doctrine often alluded to as “Jesus Only,” “Jesus’ Name,” or “Oneness,” is nothing like this. It is NOT Patripassianism - it is NOT teaching that “the Father IS the Son” -- but that “the Father is IN the Son,” a very different matter.

Another belief -- one which had a tremendous following -- was that the Deity and the humanity of Christ were fused into one nature. This is also a common error now. Instead of confessing that Christ is fully God and fully man in two complete and distinct natures subsisting in the one visible Being, people use the term “God-man.” This is a coined word not found in the Scriptures and foreign to their teaching. The idea is that in some way Jesus was part God and part man in one composite nature, with the necessary conclusion that He had only one spirit and one will, also composite! How then was He “IN ALL THINGS made like unto His brethren?” How could He be identified with His brethren at baptism if His nature and will were not *completely* human? If part of this composite nature was God, what did He receive when the Spirit rested upon Him, and why did He need to receive it? How could He be tempted “IN ALL POINTS LIKE AS WE ARE,” since by nature He would not be “like as we are” at any point! How could He succor us when tempted, since it would be impossible for Him to be “touched with the feeling of our infirmities?”

Some Church leaders, notably Nestorius, recognized that the Temptation of Christ and the whole Atonement structure would be a farce unless He were as truly human as though only human. Nestorius taught that “with the one name Christ we designate at the same time two natures. The essential characteristics in the nature of the Divinity and in the humanity are from all eternity distinguished. By the highest and unmixed union both natures are adored in the one person of the Only-Begotten.” Earlier in this study we noticed that the Council of Chalcedon likewise insisted on a clear line of demarcation between Christ’s two natures. As we said before, it is a pity the Council viewed the divine nature through the colored glasses of the “three Persons” theory, for the solution to the whole Godhead controversy is found in the dual natures coexistent in Christ.

Now let us see what Scripture teaches about His absolute humanity. We might note the dependency of the infant Jesus on Joseph for protection (Matt. 2:13); His natural growth and increase of knowledge (Luke 2:40,52); His subjection to His parents (Luke 2:51); His identification with His own race in baptism (Matt. 3:13-15); His Temptation (Matt. 4:1); His hunger, thirst, and weariness (Matt. 4:2; John 4:6-7); His limited knowledge (Mark 13:32); His need of prayer (Mark 1:35; Luke 6:12); His sympathy (Luke 7:13; John 11:35); His sorrow, pain, tears, sweating, and death (Matt. 26:37; Acts 2:24; Heb. 5:7-8; Luke 22:44).

He is designated as “the seed of the woman” (Gen. 3:15); the Virgin Birth is foretold (Isa. 7:14); the Jewish people rejoice that unto them “a child is born,” unto them “a son is given” (Isa. 9:6); He is “the seed of David” (Rom. 1:3), “the offspring of David” (Rev. 22:16), “the son of David” (Matt. 1:1), and His lineage is traced back to David (Matt. 1; Luke 3); He is “the last Adam” and “the second Man” and the man by whom comes also the resurrection of the dead (I Cor. 15:21,45,47); He was “made of a woman, made under the law” Gal. 4:4), “made in the likeness of men and found in fashion as a man” (Phil. 2:7-8), and “made a little lower than the angels” (Heb. 2:9); He was made “perfect through sufferings” Heb. 2:10); He “partook of flesh and blood IN LIKE MANNER” (Heb. 2:14 R.V.), was “IN ALL THINGS made like unto His brethren, and hath suffered, being tempted” (Heb. 2:17-18); He “was IN ALL POINTS tempted LIKE AS WE ARE” (Heb. 4:15); He “learned obedience by the things which He suffered,” thus “being made perfect” (Heb. 5:8-9), “leaving us an example that we should follow His steps” (I Peter 2:21). He had a soul which became “exceeding sorrowful” and was “poured out unto death” and “was not left in hell” Matt. 26:38; Isa. 53:12; Acts 2:31). He had a distinct human spirit which He committed to His Father’s care at His death (Luke 23:46). He had a will distinct from His Father’s will – “not My will, but Thine, be done” (Luke 22:42). THIS WAS A HUMAN WILL -- the very idea of one divine person subordinating His divine will to that of another divine person is repugnant.

From the above we learn that He maintained His natural body by natural processes -- food, drink, rest. He developed His mental powers as we do -- gradually. He developed His spiritual life (as a man) by submission and obedience to God -- through baptism, through temptation, through persecution, through suffering, through fellowship, through prayer. In all of this, He received no help from the fact that He is God as well as man. He received only such assistance and blessing as is available to every child of God upon similar conditions or terms. Angels ministered to Him, but this also is the privilege of heirs of salvation. He dwelt unharmed with the wild beasts, but this was also Adam’s privilege before the Fall. Jesus exercised powers, as a man, which are beyond us, but which are only what a normal sinless man should exercise. Altogether -- He was as much a man as Adam was, and, *as such*, He was *a creature*, the seed of the woman; God reversed creation’s miracle, and, as Eve was taken from Adam, so Christ was taken from Mary! He was spirit and body, and His example was a very *real* one. He was born, and He lived out the ordinary stages of human life -- infancy, childhood, youth, maturity --that He might sanctify all of them.

We are forced to admit that Adam, as he came from the hand of God, was quite capable of maintaining his original innocency IN PERPETUITY regardless of the intensity or frequency of temptation -- otherwise, we would charge God with *direct* responsibility for the occurrence of sin! If this be true of the first Adam -a and who dares deny it? -- why do many theologians persist in assigning to the last Adam, Jesus Christ, some kind of super-humanity which is unreal and unscriptural? Why are they afraid that if Christ had a complete human personality He might have succumbed to temptation? Was He less capable of maintaining innocency than Adam was?

I am fully aware that some of my readers will recoil from and will question the use of the

word “creature” as applied above to the humanity of Christ. However, let me assure you that even Trinitarians find themselves obliged to acknowledge the created nature of the Son of Man. In “The Divinity of Our Lord,” Canon Liddon (whom we quoted previously) repeatedly refers to this subject, as the following extracts will show: “The Church has ever resisted the disposition to sacrifice the confession of *Christ’s created nature* to that of His uncreated Godhead;” “the Created Will which Christ assumed along with His Human Nature;” “Undoubtedly the Word Incarnate does not cease to be the Word; but He can and does assume a Nature which He has created, and in which He dwells, that in it He may manifest Himself;” “God is obviously able to create a Being who will reveal Him perfectly and of necessity, as expressing His perfect image and likeness before His creatures. Such a Being is the Archetypal Manhood, assumed by the Eternal Word. It is the climax of God’s creation; It is the climax also of God’s Self-revelation. At this point God’s creative activity becomes entirely one with His Self-revealing activity. The Sacred Manhood is a creature, yet It is indissolubly united to the Eternal Word. It differs from every other created being, in that God personally tenants It. So far then are Incarnation and Creation from being antagonistic conceptions of the activity of God, that the absolutely Perfect Creature only exists as a perfect reflection of the Divine glory. In the Incarnation, God creates only to reveal, and He reveals perfectly by That which He creates. ‘The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory’” (“The Divinity of Our Lord” -- pages 25, 266, 268, 269).

If this doctrine is conceded -- that in the Person of the Incarnate Christ there existed side by side two distinct and complete natures -- we confess the existence of a mystery which Scripture and our reason compel us to admit but which none of us can explain. This is equally true, whether Christ is regarded as “the Second Person in the Trinity” or whether we call Him “the everlasting Father;” and therefore we wonder what advantage is gained by the introduction of a second and *unrelated* mystery -- the “Second Person” theory -- a mystery produced by finite minds and involving the Infinity of the Godhead!

## **Appendix C**

### **“COMMENDING OURSELVES TO EVERY MAN’S CONSCIENCE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD”**

In II Corinthians 4:2, the Christian ministry is described as having “renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.” In the heat of religious controversy we must be on guard always to ensure that the impressions we convey to our audience really manifest the truth -- it is so easy to depart from the absolute truth through supposition, through suppression of facts, through exaggeration, through evasion, etc.

In 1961 I attended a service conducted by a Doctor of Philosophy whose scholastic attainments rank among the highest ever achieved at Princeton University. This man read I Cor. 14:26: “every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a TONGUE, hath a REVELATION, hath an interpretation.” Then he made this amazing pronouncement: “If I

were to admit that there is such a thing today as genuine 'speaking in tongues' I would have to admit the existence of 'revelation,' and we know there is no revelation (in this sense) today -- these things were only temporary aids to the early Church and they were withdrawn as soon as the New Testament was available to take their place." Even among opponents of the Pentecostal Movement we seldom meet anyone who declares, as this man, that *all* present-day tongues are false! Knowing the man's scholarship, knowing also that "speaking in tongues" persisted long after the Canon of Scripture was complete, I could only acknowledge the solemn truth of Jesus' words, "I thank Thee, Father, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent" (Matt. 11:25).

We may feel disposed to be charitable towards this man and others like him who never have experienced the operations of the Holy Spirit in the Pentecostal baptism. However, there is little excuse for *Pentecostal* preachers who have experienced the Spirit's workings and who, nevertheless, make pronouncements that are equally without foundation in Scripture or in historical fact.

In nearly half a century of association with the Pentecostal Movement I have been amazed at the tactics employed by overzealous opponents of "the Jesus' Name delusion." Saints, whose only "vice" is that they honor the sacred Name of Jesus, have been persecuted and abused. Furthermore, thousands of Pentecostal Trinitarians who are honest in their convictions, and who sincerely desire to know the truth and to do God's will, have been cruelly deceived and turned against our message by *assertions that have created impressions contrary to the naked truth*.

Among the clear-cut definitions enunciated by the lawyer-evangelist, C. G. Finney, there is one that all professing Christians should ponder: "Understand now what lying is. Any species of *designed* deception for a selfish reason is lying. If the deception is not a design it is not lying. But if you design to make an impression contrary to the naked truth, you lie" ("Revival Lectures," page 42). In a passage aimed at false religious teachers, the Bible also warns against "the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (Eph. 4:14). The expression "lying in wait to deceive" speaks of ambush, and clearly implies premeditated deception. The God-breathed Scriptures never tell us to beware of a condition that does not, or can not, exist; if we ignore the warning we do so at our peril.

However, this Appendix has not been written with a view to determining whether any designed deception attaches to any specific utterance by any of our opponents. I freely concede that there are many factors which, singly or in combination, can cause men to make assertions in all sincerity -- assertions which, nevertheless, are unsound. Whether deception is contemplated or is unintentional, the effect upon an audience is the same -- when a minister resorts to evasion, equivocation, or misrepresentation, simple-hearted believers are confused and deceived thereby.

Many years ago an internationally-known Pentecostal evangelist visited Montreal. Preaching in a Trinitarian church from Genesis 18 concerning the three Heavenly Visitors he said, "This is the only place in all the Bible where the Trinity has appeared in visible

form.” After the service I said, “You are a scholar, trained in one of the foremost universities; you know better than that! You know that only ONE of these visitors was called Jehovah and the others were angels. Only One *could* and only One *did* promise a son to Abraham and accepted Abraham’s prayer AFTER the angels had departed for Sodom.” He replied, “I know that as well as you do, but this congregation wants it that way, and I am going to accommodate them!”

Hard to believe? Well, the same preacher that same night said to me, “What do you mean by ‘the Name of Jesus’? Do you believe there is power in the five letters, J-E-S-U-S? There is no more power in those five letters than there is in the name ‘Cecil’ or ‘Charlie’. There are many ‘Jesuses’ in South America -- which one do you mean...? Why do intelligent men make such statements? Frequently, the answer is simply that they are unable to offer a valid argument against the position held by their opponent, and they hope to gain time by confusing him. “Half-truths” are “respectable;” like the unconverted church member, they have a form of godliness while they deny the power thereof. “Half-truths” are guaranteed to get folks confused and off on a tangent much more effectively than an obvious lie would ever do. The direct lie would be recognized instantly, but the “half-truth” diverts attention from the real issue!

I mentioned the non-Pentecostal scholar who repudiates all modern “speaking in tongues” on the basis that “revelation” has no place in the modern church. Let me tell you about a well-known Pentecostal Trinitarian who has published a book against the Oneness doctrine in the “hope... that a death blow will be dealt to this error.” I refer to the book “God in Three Persons,” by Carl Brumback, copyright 1959, by Pathway Press (the publisher), Cleveland, Tennessee. We cannot blame anyone for trying to overthrow what he considers error, but the right of free speech does not justify statements that are certain to mislead.

This writer spends much time ridiculing the “revelation” of the Name of God. Now the Bible does say, “Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God” (I John 4:1), and therefore we ought to recognize the folly of expecting *others* to be convinced merely on the basis of what God has revealed *to us*; however, after this author has decried and scorned “revelation,” it is still a basic truth that *every thing* we receive from God we receive through the operation of the Holy Spirit “revealing” Scripture to our hearts. For “the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God” and “God hath REVEALED them unto us by His Spirit;” “we have received the Spirit which is of God, THAT WE MIGHT KNOW the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, in words which THE HOLY GHOST teacheth; COMPARING SPIRITUAL THINGS WITH SPIRITUAL” (I Cor. 2:10-13). This is the work of the Holy Spirit – “He shall receive of Mine and shall show it unto you” (John 16:14). Furthermore, on this very subject -- the Godhead -- our Lord Himself declared, “...no man knoweth Who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will REVEAL Him” (Luke 10:22). So it would seem that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are concerned with this “revelation” -- therefore, opposers “fight against God” (Acts 5:39), a most dangerous game!

On page 183 Mr. Brumback says, “I have striven earnestly to present the Oneness



position clearly and fairly and to answer it in the same manner.” His presentation includes quotations from, and remarks attributed to, various Oneness authors, including myself. Others may speak for themselves, but I consider that his presentation of my position, if accepted at face value by his readers, would render me unacceptable on any truly Christian platform. As a traveling evangelist and Bible teacher, I cannot overlook this; I owe it to the public to whom I minister to clear up any misunderstanding.

To avoid misrepresentation, I shall quote verbatim from the book in several instances. Had the author quoted *me* completely, much of this rebuttal might have been unnecessary. In one instance (page 104) he abstracted 90 words from a 5,500 word dissertation. Because he omitted the qualifying and explanatory remarks which I had purposely inserted *in the very same paragraph*, it now appears that I teach the Arian heresy! The paragraph, as I wrote it, contained over 300 words. My article from which he made the abstraction also contained a brief but accurate definition of Arianism *and called it “heresy.”* When I gave him the article I requested that he would not publish extracts which, isolated from their context, would create impressions not in accordance with my actual beliefs. I use plain language, and my readers usually have no trouble understanding me; in this instance, since Mr. Brumback obviously felt that the omission of the clauses which I consider “qualifying and restrictive” would not result in a misrepresentation of my real views, I can only conclude that one of us slipped somewhere -- either I did not write as plainly as I usually do, or he did an inadequate job as a literary critic. In view of what I have already written in this present booklet, I do not feel that I need to defend myself further at this point against the charge of Arianism.

There are several statements in his book that I cannot allow to go unchallenged. I strongly resent the following remarks from page 170: “Mr. Paterson sought in our conversations to emphasize the necessity of baptism in Jesus’ name by minimizing the importance of repentance, stating that it was an Old Testament revelation and experience, whereas baptism was given as the new revelation and experience which became vital to salvation. The original propounders of the New Testament, apparently, did not agree with Mr. Paterson, for they were constantly referring to repentance as a prime necessity even in this dispensation.” These remarks leave thoughtful readers with the impression that I do not consider repentance “a prime necessity in this dispensation” -- indeed, they will almost certainly infer from the language which Mr. Brumback has used that I told him that repentance doesn’t matter now! *I told him no such thing!*

My discussions with him were supposed to relate only to the question of the Godhead; those who have read “The Real Truth about Baptism in Jesus’ Name” know that I try to avoid mixing the two questions. However, he got into the question of water baptism and said, “We Trinitarians believe that repentance alone brings remission of sins” (that is to say, without or prior to water baptism). I replied that I could not accept repentance alone *as the New Testament* standard of salvation, inasmuch as repentance is not a distinguishing feature of this dispensation *only, as it has been required in all the Old Testament dispensations as well* -- whereas the Name of Jesus and the Baptism of the Holy Ghost were introduced in the Gospel and DO distinguish this dispensation from all others.

The reader will observe that I merely insisted that *the New Testament standard* or Full Gospel consists of repentance, water baptism, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Now, this is only what *every branch of Pentecost used to preach* -- they insisted that a God Who *commanded* men to repent, Who *commanded* men to be baptized in water, Who *commanded* men to receive the Holy Ghost, would surely take a dim view of those who claim to repent while they neglect or refuse to obey the rest of the Commandment. Why, this was and still is the only justification for churches to exist as "Full Gospel" denominations! So far as I am concerned, the Bible does not authorize me to preach only one-third of the Commandment, nor does it authorize me to preach that Christ is one-third of God.

At the same time, this does NOT "minimize the importance of repentance." For 49 years I have been known as a fiery preacher of repentance, and I expect to continue to insist on it as "a prime necessity." I will never knowingly baptize anyone who has not repented; I say "knowingly," because even Evangelist Philip was deceived by Simon Magus! One thing can hardly be "minimized," that is, the serious injury inflicted on another minister by Mr. Brumback's dissemination through the printed page of this inaccurate account of our conversation.

He and I held two discussion periods, a week apart. At our first interview his introductory remarks gave me the impression that he had no serious objection to my view on baptism, and that he merely wished to ascertain if my belief about the Godhead was equally logical. The first interview was most cordial, and when it ended I was still under this impression. However, he opened the second discussion period with what is probably the strangest argument ever advanced against our baptismal formula. In my booklet, "The Real Truth about Baptism in Jesus' Name," I suggest two formulæ, either of which may quite properly be used in baptism. Both contain the clause, "I baptize you into the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ." Mr. Brumback took exception to this. Let me give you his printed but very incomplete version -- then I will fill in the details that he has omitted. "I asked Mr. Paterson to cite chapter and verse for the two formulas. He was speechless. I don't believe that it had ever occurred to him, or his Oneness brethren, that a Trinitarian might ask for a scriptural recitation of the formula which they seek to impose on the entire Church. Both of his formulas contain the threefold name 'Lord Jesus Christ,' which is not found in any reference to baptism, much less in an actual performance of the rite" (page 154). He had just written (on page 153) that my booklet, "The Real Truth About Baptism in Jesus' Name," is Oneness' "strongest work on the subject" -- then he proceeded to demolish this "strongest work" with one quick stroke by stating that he asked me a question and I was "speechless." To the casual or superficial reader it must appear that he has really taken care of me, my formula, and my booklet. However, I will show the unsound character of his argument -- then I will go further and will provide the reader with a list of Bible references where the complete expression, "in the Name of the LORD JESUS CHRIST," is found in connection with the baptismal formula.

Let me state, first, my honest recollection of the incident. I have no tape recording, but, substantially, his question and my reply were as follows: "Please show me, in this King

James Bible, in those verses that you say represent the baptismal formula, any place where the words ‘Lord Jesus Christ’ occur.” Now this was the very first sign of hostility to my position on baptism, and I listened with mixed and conflicting emotions: comprehension struggled against stunned disbelief as I perceived that I must reassess the impression I had received from his opening remarks at the first interview; also, in the question itself, I did not like the implication in the words, “that YOU say.” Furthermore, I did not expect even a Trinitarian to quibble over anyone calling Jesus by the definitive titles given Him by the angel in Luke 2:11 and by Apostle Peter in Acts 2:36. I had often met with those who try to sidestep truth when they ask “WHICH Jesus are you talking about?” and my use of His titles, “Lord and Christ,” is designed to silence *that* silly evasion. But *this* was a new wrinkle!

These three factors combined at the same moment to astound me. I was greatly perturbed and I asked Mr. Brumback to repeat his question. Then what I had vaguely suspected came out clearly – “YOU SAY that certain verses in the Book of Acts represent the formula; *I* do not admit this.” Now, I never waste my time on any person who insists that the Bible verses which say the Christians were baptized in Jesus’ Name really do not mean what they say! So I told him we might as well stop our discussion then and there. To this he replied, “Just forget that I said that, but answer my question, please.”

*Here is the answer I gave him* – “It is true that in the King James Version baptism is said to be ‘in the Name of the Lord,’ ‘in the Name of Jesus Christ,’ or ‘in the Name of the Lord Jesus;’ and the complete expression, ‘Lord Jesus Christ,’ is not shown – but suppose we look up modern versions and the ancient manuscripts.” He replied, “That will not be necessary; I am only concerned with Common Version (the King James) and you admit the expression is not found there.” I said, “Certainly, I admit that; but what does that prove? JESUS is His Name, and the titles merely distinguish Him from all others.” The subject was dropped at this point to permit resumption of our discussion of the Godhead doctrine; obviously, unless he could be induced to examine other versions of the Bible, further argument on the wording of the baptismal formula was pointless. But, from his standpoint, there is nothing to be gained by an examination of other versions; in his view, the “evidence” in the King James Version is sufficient to discredit “the strongest work” on baptism in Jesus’ Name. However, as I said before, what does this “evidence” *really* prove? Exactly nothing – for this entire argument is based on a worthless quibble!

I have observed that arguments against truth – especially those which are masked in plausibility – can become stepping-stones to a greater knowledge of the very truth they seek to destroy. So, as we separated, I informed Mr. Brumback that I intended to investigate his objection quite thoroughly. His challenge of the use of “the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ,” though palpably unsound, should be silenced; and what he was not interested in, namely, the verdict of the ancient manuscripts, I am here appending. At the time of the discussion I had some of this evidence in my library, but, since publication of his book, I have visited the libraries of several universities and have examined copies of the most important manuscripts and older versions.

My critic displays inordinate devotion to the King James Version; I do not share his

biased outlook. It is common knowledge that the scholars who prepared the King James Version relied on the Greek text published by Erasmus, and had access to about 15 Greek manuscripts, the majority of which belonged to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the earliest of which was a product of the tenth century A.D. Most of them were merely translations into Greek *from Latin versions*. Today we possess over 3,000 manuscripts, many of them fragmentary, but some of them containing almost the entire New Testament and antedating the earliest manuscripts used in the King James Version by six centuries.

Well, what evidence is found in the old manuscripts and versions for the use of the phrase “in the Name of the LORD JESUS CHRIST” in baptism? Keep in mind that the term “manuscript” refers to copies in the original tongue – in the case of the New Testament, Greek – whether they are single manuscripts or codices; while the term “versions” refers to translations from Greek into other languages. I have shown the century, or, if known, the exact date of these writings. ALL of them use the complete expression, LORD JESUS CHRIST, in the following passages which have a distinct bearing on water baptism:

VERSE	MANUSCRIPT	DATE	VERSIONS	DATE
Acts 2:38	Bezae Cantab. (D) Laudianus (E)	V VI	Old Latin Old Syriac Sahidic Vulgate (Jerome) Vulgate (R. de L.)	III III 350 385 1874
Acts 8:12 “the kingdom of God IN the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ”			Peshitta	V
Acts 8:16	Bezae Cantab. (D)	V		
Acts 10:48	Bezae Cantab. (D)	V	Old Latin Peshitta Wyclif Rheims-Douay Vulgate (Clem.) Ronald Knox	III V 1380 1582 1592 1955
Acts 18:8 “were baptized, believing in God through the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ”	Bezae Cantab. (D)	V		
Acts 19:5 “in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ” “into the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ for remission of sins”	Bezae Cantab. (D)	V	Peshitta  Syriac (Harclensis)	V  616

I Cor. 6:11	Chester Beatty (P-46)	225	Old Latin	III
	Vaticanus (B)	IV	Old Syriac	III
	Sinaiticus (Aleph)	IV	Vulgate (Jerome)	385
	Alexandrinus (A)	V	Peshitta	V
	Claromontanus (D <sub>2</sub> )	VI	Wyclif	1380
			Rheims-Douay	1582
			Vulgate (Clem.)	1592
			Vulgate (R. de L.)	1874
			English Revised	1885
			American Standard	1901
			Weymouth	1902
		Confraternity	1941	
Col. 3:17	Sinaiticus (Aleph)	IV	Peshitta	V
			Wyclif	1380
			Rheims-Douay	1582
			Vulgate (Clem.)	1592

So much for the manuscripts and translations which my questioner felt we did not need to look up! And the above list is by no means complete. Readers who are familiar with the New Testament text will observe that I have listed only the great Uncials of the sixth century or earlier - yet some of the Miniscules (614, etc.) of much later date also show that the believers were baptized “in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Mr. Brumback tries to pit some of these verses against others, asking on page 153, “Was Peter right? Or Philip? Or Paul?” I am happy to tell him that they ALL were right, for they ALL used the complete expression!

Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus, the “Western” manuscripts which figure prominently in the above list, are actually representative of a much earlier text -- a text which antedates the “Egyptian” Vaticanus and Sinaiticus by two centuries, and which is largely reflected in the early Latin and Syriac versions. Church Fathers of the second and third centuries were acquainted with this text, and thus we find Cyprian in A.D. 256 quoting Acts 2:38 as follows: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of the LORD JESUS CHRIST for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” I ask the reader to examine the rendering of Acts 19:5 in the Codex Bezae and in the Syriac Revision of A.D. 616 and answer this question: Under the Law, John’s baptism was a “baptism of repentance for the remission of sins” (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3); if, *in this dispensation*, as my critic contends, repentance *alone* brings remission of sins, WHY were the disciples of John the Baptist, baptized by him, required to be rebaptized “into the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ FOR REMISSION OF SINS?”

Mr. Brumback is scathing in his denunciation of Oneness exponents who dare to repudiate I John 5:7 as found in the King James Version: “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.” On page 30 of his book he admits that this passage is not found in the ancient manuscripts, but he trusts that an old manuscript will yet be found to validate this verse. Well! I have a

distinct recollection of a time when he was not interested in old manuscripts! While he is waiting for this to turn up, suppose we look at the *existing* evidence.

This passage is found only in two *modern* Greek manuscripts, the earlier of them no older than the fifteenth century. It has been rejected as spurious by every Protestant revision since the English Revised Version came out in 1885. In fact, one has only to read the surrounding verses to be convinced that this verse is an interpolation -- it has absolutely no place in the argument of John's First Epistle. But you need not take my word for this; here are the facts as stated by John Paterson Smyth, B.D., L.L.D., Litt. D., D.C.L., Rector of St. George's Anglican Church, Montreal, formerly Professor of Pastoral Theology in Dublin University: "Erasmus, not finding the words in any Greek manuscript, omitted them from the first two editions of his Greek Testament. An outcry was at once raised that he was tampering with the Bible. He insisted that no Greek manuscript contained the passage; 'and,' said he at last, when they pressed him, 'if you can show me even a single one in which they occur, I will insert them in the future.'

"Unfortunately, they did find one, the manuscript of Montford, now in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, but evidently no older than about the fifteenth century. The words had got into it probably from some corrupt Latin manuscript; and on this slight authority Erasmus admitted them into his text." The earliest *Latin* manuscript containing the disputed text belongs to the ninth century; in secular writings, Vigilius Tapsensis, who lived near the end of the fifth century, makes the first express reference to the spurious words and is believed to have been their author.

Dr. Paterson Smyth continues: "(1) Not a single Greek manuscript or church lesson-book before the fifteenth century has any trace of the passage. This in itself would be sufficient evidence against it. (2) It is omitted in almost every Ancient Version of any critical value, including the best copies of the Vulgate; and (3) no Greek Father quotes it, even in arguments about the Trinity, where it would have been of immense importance if it had been in their copies. There is other evidence against it also; but it must be quite clear, even from this, that the passage only lately got interpolated into our Greek Testament, and never had any right to its place in the English Bible. The Revisers therefore omit it from the text" ("How we got our Bible" - pp. 141,142).

In 1880, F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S., Archdeacon and Canon of Westminster, wrote concerning I John 5:7: "The spuriousness of that verse is as absolutely demonstrable as any critical conclusion can be... The demonstrable spuriousness of the verse renders it, then, unnecessary to show that it breaks and disfigures the reasoning of the passage, because it belongs to a totally different order of ideas. There can be little doubt that it will disappear, as it ought to disappear, from the text of any revised version of the English Bible" ("The Early Days of Christianity" - pp. 562, 563).

Martin Luther barred this text from his translation and from all editions thereof, as long as he lived. This prompted Professor Johann Michaelis (1717-1791) to remark: "It is uncandid in the extreme for one Protestant to condemn another for rejecting I John 5:7, since it was rejected by the author of our Reformation."

Even the Roman Catholic Church is preparing its followers for the shock when this verse will be completely dropped from Roman Catholic Bibles. In their Version, published in 1941, the "Bishops' Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine" placed this verse in brackets and indicated by footnote that most commentators have already eliminated it.

I must also take issue with statements on pages 149 and 150, where we are accused of "employing three titles" in the baptismal formula. The reference is, of course, to the expression "Lord Jesus Christ." I do not dispute that the words "Lord" and "Christ" are definitive titles -- I have already explained why these titles are used - but I challenge the statement that "the Bible does not specify... that 'Jesus' is the name." My critic's entire argument would be overthrown were he to admit that JESUS is the supreme Name of God, so he has attempted to reduce that sacred Name to a mere title! While admitting that "Jesus" means "Jehovah the Savior," he argues that "Jehovah" was derived from a *common* word and can be considered a title. On this basis, then, he reasons that "Jesus" is also a title! It ought to occur to his readers that he has talked himself into a ridiculous position where he now has a Savior WHO HAS NO NAME!

But there is a far more serious aspect to this manipulation of words. Personally, I would not dare to indulge in such reasoning, for I remember the solemn warning to "FEAR this glorious and fearful name, JEHOVAH THY GOD" (Deut. 28:58-59). When I stand before God in judgment, I want to rely on something more than Webster's Dictionary, for GOD (not Webster) has said, "JEHOVAH is My NAME FOR EVER and this is My memorial UNTO ALL GENERATIONS" (Ex. 3:15; Hos. 12:5). "Jesus" embodies the name JEHOVAH, and is the *supreme* Name of God. Furthermore, the Bible DOES specify that JESUS is "the Name above every name" (Phil. 2:9 R.V.). For a full examination of this topic -- the Name of God in Christ -- I refer the reader to my booklet on baptism. This fact is inescapable -- the Holy One Who declares that He "will not hold guiltless him that taketh His Name in vain" also says, "neither shalt thou profane (Hebrew - *chalal*, "make common") the Name of thy God: I AM JEHOVAH" (Lev. 19:12).

On page 159 Mr. Brumback suggests that I am mistaken when I state on page 6 of "The Real Truth about Baptism in Jesus" that there is not a single recorded instance in any genuine First Century book where any formula other than the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ was ever used in the first 100 years of the Christian era. He suggests I should read the Didache, which he claims dates between A.D. 70 and 100. *I did read it* -- away back in 1918. I have also read the opinions of competent researchers: Archbishop Bryennios, the discoverer of the Codex; von Harnack, Hilgenfeld, and Schaff among the earlier scholars; J. A. Robinson and Muilenburg among the more recent. They do not support Mr. Brumback's claims; on the contrary, the following facts will show that large sections of this book probably belong to the fourth century.

1. The original manuscript has never been found. Eusebius, the fourth-century historian, is the earliest writer to mention the Didache by name.
2. The only *copy* known, apart from two tiny fragments, was made in A.D. 1056. It



consists of three sections -- the first section embracing chapters 1 to 6. Portions of this section are also found in the so-called Epistle of Barnabas (second century), but no one can tell "who copied whom," or if both copied from a third work. Therefore the question of date can be judged *from internal evidence only*. From such evidence, nearly all authorities agree that this section represents an original that is older than the rest of the work. For this older portion of the work the previously-named experts have assigned "earliest" and "latest" possible dates, with the probable date lying between these extremes. The earliest *possible* date set by any one of these scholars is A.D. 120 and the latest A.D. 190.

3. Even this earliest section is marked by peculiarities of language which arose only in the second century.
4. The unknown author displays some knowledge of the Gospel and First Epistle of John. As these were written about A.D. 96, the claim that the Didache originated in the first century is not very convincing.
5. The author seems to have been a Jew embittered against his own race; yet he fails to mention the destruction of Jerusalem. Obviously he lived in a later generation -- long enough after that devastation that the event was no longer of paramount importance.
6. The reference to the baptismal formula occurs in chapter 7 -- in the "newer" portion of the work. The author permits baptism by "pouring out water thrice upon the head." I ask you, "*Is this first-century doctrine?*"
7. In the paragraph immediately following the reference to baptism, fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays is commanded. *Is this first-century doctrine?*
8. The "newer" sections contain coined words not found anywhere prior to the fourth century.
9. If you still think the original document belongs to the first century, please tell me how such corruption found its way into the only copy in existence -- written in A.D. 1056!

On page 183 our critic makes the utterly ridiculous assertion that some Oneness ministers teach that Jesus is ONLY a created being. Specifically, this charge of Arianism was leveled in earlier portions of the book against certain ministers of the United Pentecostal Church. I will not repeat what I have already said about the dual nature of Christ, but let me assure you that any person, whether clergy or lay member, who would assert that Jesus is ONLY a created being would be promptly disfellowshipped by the United Pentecostal Church, and would be disowned by every other Oneness organization. This charge is absolutely without foundation.

I cannot spare the time to analyze the general arguments for the Trinity, as set forth in "God in Three Persons;" actually there is nothing new in them, nothing of any value that has not been advanced years ago - and, in my opinion, satisfactorily answered. The idea of "three Persons IN ONE GODHEAD" is utterly indefensible from the standpoint either of divine revelation or of human philosophy; consequently, much of the argument offered by Trinitarian writers in proof of their theory is as mysterious as the "mystery" it professes to demonstrate! It frequently happens that readers who are unskilled in literary analysis do not recognize specious reasoning and captious criticism; they do not even notice when writers indulge in certain lines of argument which the same writers have

denied, elsewhere, to their opponents! However, when all is said, one plain fact will still remain: three can never be one *in the same sense* in which they are three, nor can one be three *in the sense* in which it is one. To illustrate: in the example of three sides of a triangle, it is obvious that no single side IS a triangle - would they have us believe that Christ is only one-third of God?!

Today, some Pentecostal organizations seem to be more concerned about pleasing non-Pentecostal denominations than they are about preaching the Pentecostal message. Fifty years ago all branches of the Movement preached that the baptism in the Holy Ghost was “given to ALL WHO OBEY God” (Acts 5:32); anyone who did not seek earnestly and receive speedily was considered “disobedient, and was told that “without the Baptism he could not be an overcomer, and therefore would not be ready when Jesus returns.” Today, the Baptism is a “fringe benefit -- you can have it or you can do without it, just as YOU please!”

How far the Trinitarian branch of the Movement has departed from the early Pentecostal message can be seen in the absurd doctrine of “The Two Baptizers,” outlined on page 180 of “God in Three Persons.” This doctrine teaches that there are *two* Baptizers and *two* elements into which we are baptized -- first; the Holy Spirit baptizes us, upon repentance, into the Church, “the body of Christ;” second, the Lord Jesus baptizes us with, or in, the Holy Ghost. Well, what did early Pentecost teach? Early Pentecost taught just what the Bible teaches - that there is only ONE Heavenly Baptizer, the Lord Jesus Christ. In the Bible, the Holy Spirit is always the medium or element - NEVER the Baptizer! Oh, you say, “By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.” Just hold on! On another matter Mr. Brumback has stated that “even a rudimentary knowledge of Greek” backs up his argument. Why does he not use that knowledge in this instance? Why does he say, “I Cor. 12:13 teaches us that we are placed BY the Spirit into one body; whereas, Matt. 3:11 teaches that the Lord Jesus Christ baptizes us WITH the Holy Ghost?” Does he not know that the Greek expression *in both verses* is “en pnevmati,” “IN the Spirit,” and that it is so translated in the Roman Catholic Rheims-Douay and also in practically every modern version -- English Revised, American Standard, Weymouth, New English, and Confraternity (Catholic), just to name a few. Ephesians 4 declares that “there is ONE body, ONE Spirit, and ONE baptism,” and the same book refers to the indwelling of the Spirit in this body in chapter 2:18,22. In both these verses (Eph. 2:18,22) the Greek is also “en pnevmati,” and again is translated “IN the Spirit” in the modern versions. I Cor. 12:13 and Eph. 2:22 are parallel passages and teach plainly that we are baptized by ONE Baptizer (Jesus Christ) with the ONE baptism in ONE medium (the Holy Spirit), and that it is only in this ONE medium that the ONE body consists.

The Church was born on the Day of Pentecost and consisted of 120 people baptized with or in the Holy Ghost; the Epistles were addressed in every instance to people baptized with or in the Holy Ghost; the New Testament standard for Church membership was, and still is, the baptism with or in the Holy Ghost.

Who started this idea of a second Baptizer, a second baptism, and a second Body -- the first “body” consisting of a church without a Pentecostal experience? Certainly not the

Lord Jesus Christ or His Apostles. Put in plain English, this doctrine teaches that, when one repents, the Third Person of the Trinity baptizes him into the body of the Second Person of the Trinity; then, at a later date, the Second Person of the Trinity baptizes him with or in the Third Person of the Trinity! What nonsense is this!

Some preachers have “discovered” that the Apostles received the Holy Ghost and the Church “began” on the evening of the Resurrection Day, when Jesus made the first of several pronouncements that we now call the Great Commission (John 20:21-23). If this is so, then the Spirit was given *before* Jesus was glorified (in direct contradiction of John 7:39) and the Church is NOT built upon the foundation of the Apostles, as stated in Eph. 2:20-22, for Thomas was absent (John 20:24)!

No one has any right to adulterate the Apostolic gospel - to preach that one can be a member of the New Testament Church without the baptism of the Holy Spirit, with the initial evidence of speaking in tongues. No Pentecostal minister has any authority to lower the standard for membership in the Church, the Bride of Christ. However, I wish at this point to make it very clear that an uncompromising stand for the original Pentecostal message does not give any one license to sneer at those who follow not us (Mark 9:38-42); it does not mean that we consign to hell those multitudes who, like Cornelius, fear God and work righteousness (Acts 10:35), but who have never yet felt the impact of the Full Gospel on their hearts and conscience. Why, even a cursory examination of the New Testament will convince all but the most obstinate that there will be other groups besides the Church, the Bride, at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb - who ever heard of a Wedding Feast attended only by the two principals? Twenty-five years after the Day of Pentecost, Paul found believers, disciples of John the Baptist, who had not heard that the Holy Spirit had been given. I do not read that Paul berated them; I do read that he preached to them baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ and the baptism in the Holy Ghost (Acts 19:1-7). Therefore, our business as Pentecostal ministers and New Testament believers is to insist on the New Testament message, regardless of how we may be criticized by the non-Pentecostal churches; at the same time, we should remember that our hearers must answer to God, and not to us, for the manner in which they treat this message.

Preachers have the honor of transmitting God’s message to the people; therefore, they are held responsible to a greater extent than the congregation. They need to heed the warning in Numbers 20:7-13; when Moses smote the rock instead of speaking to it, the people still got the water, but Moses lost his life. The merciful blessing of God on a needy assembly should not blind our eyes to the fact that God may punish the shepherd who fails to declare unto his flock the whole counsel of God, or who presumes to disobey Apostolic Doctrine or Apostolic practice.

This Appendix will come with particular pungency to my Trinitarian readers, and I could wish that it had not been necessary to publish this critical review. I have done so only after long and serious consideration. Over the years I have known and appreciated many ministers as well as lay members of Trinitarian Pentecost - in fact, the Chief Executive of a large organization has been a personal friend for over thirty years. The chief concern of

all Pentecostal ministers, regardless of doctrinal differences, should be the edification and advancement of the Church of Jesus Christ through a full and effective ministry. Indeed, if we have the mind of Christ, we will rejoice when God's people are blessed, whether within our particular sphere or not. However, when a man's ministry has been hindered by mistrust, engendered by misunderstanding, he is duty bound to set the record straight.