

COURSEWORK FOR
TH501 SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY I
THEISM, BIBLIOLOGY, THEOLOGY

A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO

LOUISIANA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

SEMINARY DEAN: DR STEVEN R PETTEY spettey@lbu.edu
318.688.2360 318.688.2148 FAX

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE COURSE
TH501 SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY I

BY
EDWARD G. RICE
9511 W. WANETA LAKE ROAD
HAMMONDSPORT NY 14840

Table of Contents

Assignment.....	2
Supp. Req. Reading Report - The Nature, Being and Attributes of God.....	3
Supp. Req. Reading Report - The Doctrine of the Trinity.....	5
Supp. Req. Reading Report - The The Nature of Theology.....	8
Supp. Req. Reading Report - The Scriptures as Verbally Inspired.....	11
Q&A From Chapter 1 The Nature and Necessity of Theology	14
Q&A From Chapter 2 The Possibility and Divisions of Theology	16
Q&A From Chapter 3 The Definition and Existence of God	19
Q&A From Chapter 4 The Non-Christian World Views	21
Q&A From Chapter 5 The Scriptures: The Embodiment of a Divine Revelation	24
Q&A From Chapter 6 The Genuineness, Credibility, and Canonicity of the Books of the Bible.....	27
Q&A From Chapter 7 The Inspiration of the Scriptures	30
Q&A From Chapter 8 The Nature of God: Essence and Attributes	35
Q&A From Chapter 9 The Nature of God: Unity and Trinity	38
Q&A From Chapter 10 The Decrees of God:	41
Q&A From Chapter 11 The Works of God: Creation	45
Q&A From Chapter 12 The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule	49
Detailed Chapter Outlines – TH501 Systematic Theology I.....	53
Outlines of Chapter 1 The Nature and Necessity of Theology	54
Outlines of Chapter 2 The Possibility and Divisions of Theology	58
Outlines of Chapter 3 The Definition and Existence of God.....	62
Outlines of Chapter 4 The Non-Christian World Views.....	69
Outlines of Chapter 5 The Scriptures: The Embodiment of a Divine Revelation	74
Outlines of Chapter 6 The Genuineness, Credibility, and Canonicity	77
Outlines of Chapter 7 The Inspiration of the Scriptures.....	86
Outlines of Chapter 8 The Nature of God: Essence and Attributes.....	94
Outlines of Chapter 9 The Nature of God: Unity and Trinity.....	101
Outlines of Chapter 10 The Decrees of God.....	107
Outlines of Chapter 11 The Works of God: Creation.....	112
Outlines of Chapter 12 The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule.....	116

Assignment

TH501 SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY I

TEXT: Theissen, Henry (rev. by Doerksen), **LECTURES IN SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY**, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., any date is acceptable

COURSE OBJECTIVE: To learn more about the nature, Being and attributes of God, the doctrine of the Trinity, an in-depth examination of the nature of theology and of the Scriptures as verbally inspired.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

- (1) Read chapters one through twelve (1-12) of the textbook for understanding. Mark listings, Scriptures and information you wish to quickly locate for outlining each of the above chapters and for preparing the required questions and answers which are described below.
- (2) Prepare a detailed outline of each chapter (at least three or four full pages per chapter) in such a way that it can be used for teaching a series of lessons about these theological subjects to your college class, church congregation, staff members, or Sunday school class. Attach at the end of your other materials.
- (3) Select another conservative theology or doctrine book and read what the author teaches about the subjects shown above under "Course Objective". Document what you learned from this reading on the enclosed "Required Supplemental Reading Report" and submit with your course.
- (4) From each of the above chapters, prepare and show the answers to at least eight (8) questions (true or false, fill in the blank, multiple choice or listings of important facts) which you feel could be an appropriate final exam if you were actually developing this course for a college or Christian school. Indicate the page number where you found each question and its answer, and place these questions and answers after your reading report.

SEND ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
LOUISIANA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY
6301 WESTPORT AVENUE
SHREVEPORT, LA 71129

BE SURE TO ALWAYS KEEP A FILE COPY OF EVERYTHING!

REQUIRED SUPPLEMENTAL READING REPORT

Select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject and fill in the following bibliographical information about the book.

AUTHOR:

TITLE:

PUBLISHED BY:

YEAR PUBLISHED:

I have read pages _____ and found that this author and Thiessen disagree on the following points: (Be sure to state which you agree with, and why, and fill this entire page with discussion. Do not say, "I could not find any major differences in what they said.")

Supp. Req. Reading Report - The Nature, Being and Attributes of God

Required Supplemental Reading Report 1 of 4

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:August Hopkins Strongs, D. D., LL. D.

TITLE:Systematic Theology: The Doctrine of God (Volume I)

PUBLISHED BY:Philadelphia: The Judson Press YEAR PUBLISHED: 1907

I have read pages 243-370 (128 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree on the following points:

Augustus H. Strong (1836-1921) is the only Baptist who had his volumes of systematic theology attain any recognition. Like Thiessen, and the Presbyterian theologians preceding him, however, Strong presents just another rendition of the Reformed Theology which always envelopes the essence and attributes of God in a thick unresponsive development of 'decrees.' His Baptist backgrounds, however, seems to make his coverage of the decrees of God a little more responsive to mans free will than is Thiessen, or Shedd or Hodge.

While Thiessen only adds a consideration of mans free will as an apologetic afterthought of his decree and providence developments, Strong attempts to deal with the conflict throughout his development. God's decrees and the free agency of man mix like oil and water. Reformed theology has swollen the 'Sovereign Decrees' of a Sovereign Omniscient Infinite God to such a state that there is no free agency of man included in Thiessen's regurgitated Reformed Theology. Strong at least states that "No undecreed event can be foreseen." and then grapples with the Bible reality that man has a free agency given by God which, if it is real, has events which are unforeseeable, ergo are undecreed. It is refreshing to read a work about the nature, being and attributes of God that deals with mans free agency. One that addresses with reality that God tested Job with a real test not an orchestrated review of his foreknowledge, that God knew Abraham's heart "That he will command his children and keep the way of the LORD" NOT by

his future-knowing, omniscient, infinite, foreknowledge, but by knowing Abraham as “a friend of God.” Hodge Shedd and Thiessen, develop a stodgy Sovereign God all boxed in by decrees and unable to offer the seed line to Moses in stead of Judah, (Exod 32:9-10), unable to change the successful conquests against Syria base on Joash's zeal at smacking arrows on the ground (2Kings 13), unable to change the length of Hezekiah's days because of his prayer (2Kin 20, 2Ch 32, Isa 38) and unable to change the judgment due to Nineveh because of their repentance (Jonah 3) Strong indeed provides a refreshing breeze to the stale air of Reformed Theology, he includes a free agency of man.

But alas Strong never jumps out of the stale old deepening ruts of Reformed Theology and he too centers his development of the nature and attributes of God on those muddied ruts. Ruts that insist that God must have decreed all that comes to pass and predetermined, before the foundation of the earth, who would be saved and who would be damned to hell for eternity. Even Strong, our best chance at a Baptist leap from the Reformed Theology ruts of error, falls back into their system of error. Would to God someone would author a systematic theology that breaks free from Reformed and Augustinian Theology and gives a clear picture of the nature and attributes of God without majoring on those 'Sovereign Decrees of God.'

Supp. Req. Reading Report - The Doctrine of the Trinity

Required Supplemental Reading Report 2 of 4

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:Erickson, Millard J. pg 199-258

TITLE:Christian Theology

PUBLISHED BY:Baker Book House, Grand Rapids Mi.

YEAR PUBLISHED: © 1983 I have read pages 263-344 (82 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree as discussed below.

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:Ryrie, Charles C.

TITLE:Basic Theology

PUBLISHED BY: Victor Books of Scripture Press Publications Inc.

YEAR PUBLISHED: © 1960 I have read pages 25-51 (27 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree as discussed below.

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:August Hopkins Strongs, D. D., LL. D.

TITLE:Systematic Theology: The Doctrine of God (Volume I)

PUBLISHED BY: Philadelphia: The Judson Press

YEAR PUBLISHED: 1907 I have read pages 304-352 (49 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree on the following points:

The doctrine of the trinity would seem to be as stable a doctrine to be found in orthodox Christianity, but Thiessen's reviser even let the influence of Bible Criticism sway his presentat6ion of this aged doctrine. Previous theologians had already well established that the plural names of God used with plural pronouns and plural verbs clearly portray the trinity and the unity of the Godhead. Thiessen calls this important Old Testament intimation 'note worthy' and even includes the linguistic evidence that the plural implies not just dual but three or more. Doerksen, however, Thiessen's 1979 reviser, says "The name for God (*Elohim*) is plural and may imply plurality, though this is dubious. The plural form is probably used for intensifying rather than for expressing plurality." This denigration of the evidence supporting the trinity is directly from the play book of the Deist camp which assisted in the translation of Doerksen's favorite

Bible version. Compromise is always a subtle but slippery slope and one is curious if this one 'leaked' into other theology books.

Augustus Strong leans on this standard linguistic development of plurality¹ but Erickson does not even broach the subject in his 1983 development of the trinity.² Charles Ryrie, however in 1960³ spends considerable effort in developing the “polytheistic plural form” as a powerful indication of God's plurality. He does recognize that only a plurality and not a trinity is denoted and that this is only an indicator not a complete development of a triune doctrine. He also uses Doerksen's favored word 'dubious' in describing the linguistic marvel and was likely hobnobbing with him or his Deist friends.

Another telling lack in the development of the doctrine of the trinity is the use, or lack of use of 1 John 5:7, which reads “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.” It is supposed by the Bible Critic, infidel, that this verse was added by 'Church Fathers' who wanted to bolster a teaching of the trinity. They considered these 'Church Fathers' to be active editors and creators of the Bible and will not trust the orthodox manuscripts or versions of the Bible used by the Greek speaking Church that contain this verse, even though there is ample evidence that this verse came from the Apostle John himself. It readily dates to the 1st century but they hate it and remove it from all modernist Bibles. The extent to which a theologian uses or denies this verse is intimation of the influence Bible critics have had on their thinking. Thiessen and Doerksen give it never so much as a mention, as would be expected, as it is not found in their favorite Bible versions. Hodge, who uses very little Scripture in any case, uses the verse without reservation. Augustus Strong says of

1 Ibid Strong, pg 318

2 Erickson, Millard J., “Christian Theology”, © 1983, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids Mi., pg 263-344

3 Ryrie, Charles C., “Basic Theology:”, © 1960, Victor Books of Scripture Press Publications Inc. pg 45

it “We do not here allude to 1 John 5:7 (the three heavenly witnesses), for the later part of this verse is unquestionably spurious.”⁴ Even though Strong is usually agile against Tischendorf, Westcott, and Hort, here he surrenders unashamedly to their ploy. Erickson appeals to the verse as a clarifying of the trinity, but then states “Unfortunately, however, the textual basis is so weak that some recent translations (e.g. NIV) include this statement only in an italicized foot note, and others omit it altogether (e.g. RSV). If there is a Biblical basis for the trinity it must be sought elsewhere.”⁵ Ryrie also succumbs to the Bible Critic, infidel, and says “1 John 5:7 is apparently not a part of the genuine text of Scripture.”⁶ It is interesting to me that Polycarp, who knew the Apostle John personally, gives testimony that this verse is legitimate, yet all their 'Scholarly' theologians bow to the diabolic attack of the Bible Critics who rip verses out of the Holy Scriptures without apology. Shame on each.

4 Ibid, Strong, pg 312

5 Erickson, Millard J., “Christian Theology”, © 1983, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids Mi., pg 327

6 Ibid, Ryrie, pg 52

Supp. Req. Reading Report - The The Nature of Theology

Required Supplemental Reading Report 3 of 4

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of these supplemental books on this subject: AUTHOR:Hodge, Charles (1797-1878) D.D.
TITLE: Systematic Theology - Volume I
PUBLISHED BY: WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO., GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.
YEAR PUBLISHED: 1940 I have read pages 1-100 and found that this author and Thiessen disagree as presented below.

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR: August Hopkins Strongs, D. D., LL. D.
TITLE: Systematic Theology: The Doctrine of God (Volume I)
PUBLISHED BY: Philadelphia: The Judson Press
YEAR PUBLISHED: 1907 I have read pages 1-50 (51 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree on the following points:

A progressive growth of systematic theology can be found by comparing works of Charles Hodge (1797-1878), to Augustus H. Strong (1836-1921), and a digressive decline begins with Henry C. Thiessen (b.-1947). Then the modernist theologian Vernon D. Doerksen, who revised Thiessen's work, moves this decline along as he 'dummies down' theology and intermixes modernist ecumenical ideas and Bible translations degrading an otherwise excellent and well developed systematic theology. Hodge states that:

“The duty of Christian theologians is to ascertain, collect and combine all the facts which God has revealed concerning himself and our relation to Him. These facts are all in the Bible. This is true, because, everything revealed in nature, and in the constitution of man concerning God and our relation to Him, is contained and authenticated in Scripture.⁷”

7 Hodge, Charles, “Systematic Theology”, Vol I, Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids Mi., © 1940, pg 9

Strong states that “That Christ is the one and only revealer of God, in nature, in humanity, in history, in science, in Scripture, is in my judgment the key to theology.”⁸ Thiessen then declares that:

“Science, we know, is beginning to question the regularity even of the laws of nature; but the experienced believer in God sees in these apparent irregularities the intervention of God and the manifestation of His miraculous power. ... while the apprehension of the divine revelation is progressive, the revelation itself is as stable as the righteousness and truth of God themselves.”⁹

Thiessen here is making a marked departure from the authority of 'authenticated Scripture' and even goes on to declare that only the original autographs of Scripture are inspired.¹⁰ And Doerksen more completely marking Thiessen's departure from the authority of Scripture declares that only the “original manuscripts” are without error, that all existent Bibles have error, and inspiration was lost when the “original autographa” were lost¹¹ (ergo there is no, and never has been, a verbal, plenary, inerrant, infallible, inspired Holy Bible.)

These mark significant deviations in the development of a systematic theology. From Shedd, published in 1888, to Hodge, from Hodge to Strong, from Strong to Thiessen, and from Thiessen to Erickson, there is a epoch that rises system and depth up to Strong, then falls in both system and depth to modern theologians. Such a progression can be seen in the prolegomena outlines of Hodge, Strong and Thiessen in the table below. Such a rise can be traced to the dumming down of our society, the creep of modernism into our thinking, and the effect of Bible Criticism and the demise of the Authority of Holy Scripture as the final authority.

8 Strong, Augustus H. , “Systematic Theology”, Vol I, Judson Press, Valley Forge, Pa., © 1907, pg vii

9 Thiessen, Henry C., “Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology”, Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, Mi., © 1949, pg 24

10 Ibid, pg 107

11 Thiessen, Henry C., “Lectures in Systematic Theology”, Revised by Vernon D. Doerksen, Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, Mi., © 1979, pg 62, 66

Comparison of Prolegomena Development

Charles Hodge (1797-1878)	Augustus H. Strong (1836 - 1921)	Henry C. Thiessen (b. - 1947)
<p>CHAPTER I. ON METHOD.</p> <p>§ 1. Theology a Science 1</p> <p>§ 2. Theological Method 3</p> <p>§ 3. The Speculative Method 4</p> <p>§ 4. The Mystical Method 6</p> <p>§ 5. The Inductive Method 9</p> <p>§ 6. The Scriptures contain all the Facts of Theology 15</p> <p>CHAPTER II. THEOLOGY.</p> <p>§ 1. Its Nature 18</p> <p> Definitions of Theology 9</p> <p> Natural Theology 21</p> <p>§ 2. Facts of Nature reveal God 22</p> <p> Scriptural Argument for Natural Theology 24</p> <p>§ 3. Insufficiency of Natural Theology 25</p> <p>§ 4. Christian Theology 32, Theology Proper, Anthropology, Soteriology, Eschatology, Ecclesiology 32</p> <p>CHAPTER III. RATIONALISM.</p> <p>§ 1. Meaning and Usage of the word 34</p> <p>§ 2. Deistical Rationalism 35</p> <p>§ 3. Second Form of Rationalism.--Its Nature, Refutation, History 39</p> <p>§ 4. Dogmatism 44</p> <p>§ 5. Proper Office of Reason in Matters of Religion 49</p> <p>§ 6. Relation of Philosophy and Revelation 55</p> <p>§ 7. Office of the Senses in Matters of Faith 59</p> <p>CHAPTER IV. MYSTICISM.</p> <p>§ 1. Meaning of the Word 61</p> <p> Philosophical Use of the Word 61</p> <p> Mysticism as known in Church History 66</p> <p>§ 2. Mysticism in the Early Church 69</p> <p> Montanism.--The so-called Dionysius.--New Platonism 71</p> <p>§ 3. Mysticism during the Middle Ages 73</p> <p>§ 4. Mysticism at and after the Reformation 79</p> <p>§ 5. Quietism 84</p> <p>§ 6. The Quakers or Friends 88</p> <p>§ 7. Objections to the Mystical Theory 97</p>	<p>Chapter 1 Idea of Theology</p> <p>I. Definition of Theology 1</p> <p>II. Aim of Theology 2</p> <p>III. Possibility of Theology -grounded in, 2</p> <p>A. Existence of God 3</p> <p>B. Man's capacity for the knowledge of God 5</p> <p>C. God's revelation of himself to man 11</p> <p>IV. Necessity of Theology 15</p> <p>V. Relation of Theology to Religion 19</p> <p>Chapter 2 Material of Theology 25</p> <p>I. Sources of Theology 25</p> <p>A. Scripture and Nature 26</p> <p>B. Scripture and Rationalism 29</p> <p>C. Scripture and Mysticism 31</p> <p>D. Scripture and Romanism 33</p> <p>II. Limitations of Theology 34</p> <p>III. Relations of Material to Progress in Theology 36</p> <p>Chapter 3 Method of Theology 38</p> <p>I. Requisites to the study of Theology 38</p> <p>II. Divisions of Theology 41</p> <p>III. History of Systematic Theology 44</p> <p>IV. Order of Treatment 49</p> <p>V. Text - Books in Theology 50</p>	<p>Chapter 1 The Nature and Necessity of Theology 23</p> <p>I. The Nature of Theology 24</p> <p>A. Theology and Ethics 24</p> <p>B. Theology and Religion 25</p> <p>C. Theology and Philosophy 26</p> <p>II. The Necessity of Theology 27</p> <p>A. The Organizing Instinct of the Intellect 27</p> <p>B. The Pervasive Character of the Unbelief of This Age. 27</p> <p>C. The Character of Scripture. 28</p> <p>D. The Development of an Intelligent Christian Character. 29</p> <p>E. The Conditions to Effective Christian Service 29</p> <p>Chapter 2 The Possibility and Divisions of Theology 31</p> <p>I. The Possibility of Theology 31</p> <p>A. The Revelation of God 31</p> <p> 1. The General Revelation 32</p> <p> 2. The Special Revelation 35</p> <p>B. The Endowments of Man 42</p> <p> 1. His Mental Endowment 43</p> <p> 2. His Spiritual Endowment 44</p> <p>II. The Divisions of Theology 46</p> <p>A. Exegetical Theology 46</p> <p>B. Historical Theology 46</p> <p>C. Systematic Theology 46</p> <p>D. Practical Theology 46</p>

The development and disintegration of our systematic theology, and its inability to pull away from the error of Augustinian Theology and then Reformed Theology is a fertile theme for additional study.

Supp. Req. Reading Report - The Scriptures as Verbally Inspired

Required Supplemental Reading Report 4 of 4

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:Erickson, Millard J.

TITLE: Christian Theology

PUBLISHED BY: Baker Book House, Grand Rapids Mi.

YEAR PUBLISHED: © 1983 I have read pages 199-258 (60 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree as discussed below.

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:Ryrie, Charles C.

TITLE: Basic Theology

PUBLISHED BY: Victor Books of Scripture Press Publications Inc.

YEAR PUBLISHED: © 1960 I have read pages 61-110 (50 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree as discussed below.

I have select and read for understanding the appropriate portions of a supplemental book on this subject: AUTHOR:August Hopkins Strongs, D. D., LL. D.

TITLE: Systematic Theology: The Doctrine of God (Volume I)

PUBLISHED BY: Philadelphia: The Judson Press

YEAR PUBLISHED: 1907 I have read pages 196-242 (47 pages) and found that this author and Thiessen disagree on the following points:

It has been stated that attacks against the inspiration and accuracy of God's Holy Word are cyclic through generations. If so, Thiessen incorporates the absolute low of the muddiest, low life, neo-evangelical compromise by stating that only the original autographs are inspired, only the original autographs are without error , only the originals are infallible, and that there is no copy or availability of any inspired inerrant infallible Bible today. Rather than correcting this descent into ugly compromise Doerksen's 20 year later revision fully agrees with Thiessen and then plunges the doctrine of inspiration even deeper under the mud of 'original autograph only-ism!' Comparing ANY earlier works or ANY later works to Thiessen's wretched compromise is refreshing and enlightening.

Although Augustus H. Strong, a lonely Baptist Theologian, wrote 100 years earlier than Thiessen, but 100 years after Barth developed his diabolical scheme of 'Higher Criticism' and 'Lower Criticism', Strong allowed none of the folly to invade his defense of Bible inspiration and inerrancy. His whole development of Bible accuracy and inspiration is more extensive and more thorough than Thiessen's shallow 'Barthian' consideration. Not one time does Strong, (or Gausson, the premier defender of inspiration) ever mention the original manuscripts or the autographa.

So to Erickson's 1983¹² defense of Bible inspiration and accuracy shows a finer development and defense than does Thiessen. Erickson writes as an evangelical and supposes that his work “responds to the recent developments in theology and other developments.” As such he spends considerable effort defending the Bible's accuracy and, like Strong, shows strong dependence on and corresponds well with Gausson's earlier exhaustive work. Thiessen (and Doerksen) abandon Gausson and follow Barth's shallow preference for only the unobtainable original autographa being inspired. Erickson, addressing Thiessen and Barth's folly as an 'inerrancy phenomena' gives clarification that a true inerrancy definition has nothing to do with 'scribal errors', original manuscripts, autographa or even lower criticism and the exaggerated textual accuracy dilemma pursued for English Bible copy right riches. [Today the lucrative Bible copyright business has all but depleted all English options and is now in hot pursuit of every Spanish deviation they could exploit! Ref. Shane Rice, Missionary to Peru, www.rices2peru.com] Erickson does point out that all the hubbub about inerrancy has made it easier to draw lines through the ranks of evangelicals and discern who holds emphatically to Bible inspiration and accuracy and who follows along

12 Erickson, Millard J., “Christian Theology”, © 1983, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids Mi. pg 199-258

with Barth and the neo-evangelicals. Thiessen is out there leading the pack into neo-evangelical compromise on Bible accuracy.

Thiessen does include Gausson's best definition includes in all the previous theology books, but left off by Doerksen in his revision of Thiessen. That best definition is:

Inspiration is “that inexplicable power which the divine Spirit put forth of old on the authors of Holy Scripture, in order to their guidance even in the employment of the words they used, and to preserve them alike from all error and from all omission.”

Erickson utilizes Evan's rendition of that definition as follows:

“Inspiration is the strong, conscious in-breathing of God into men, qualifying them to give utterance to truth. It is God speaking through men, and the Old Testament is therefore just as much the Word of God as though God spake ever single word of it with His own lips.(p 194) ... inspiration is not necessarily verbatim reporting. ... Verbatim reporting is, in a sense, a mere mechanical operation. It would have robbed the writers of their individuality, and made them mere machines. But no; the Holy Spirit used the memories, the intuitions, the judgments, and indeed the idiosyncrasies of the writers, so that while each recoded that part of the event or discourse which (as we may express it) adhered to himself, he was enabled to give it with accuracy.”¹³

Comparison of these systematic theology books reveals that Thiessen reached a new low in compromise concerning Biblical authority. And Doerksen, who plunged deeper into his slime pit, places all Biblical authority on compromised ground, completely dependent on finding or recreating, with the critical tools of the likes of Westcott and Hort!, the original autographs. If the Bible was delivered infallible, it was preserved infallible, we have God's Word on it.

13 Evens, William, “The Great Doctrines of the Bible”, © 1912, 39, 49, 74, Mood Press, Chicago pp 194,198

Q&A From Chapter 1 The Nature and Necessity of Theology

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 23-25 (r 1-6)

1. How has Christian Theology become larger than 'Theos-Logos', a discourse on God?

Ans. pg 24 (r 1) Christian Theology has taken a broader coverage than a discourse on God in that it is a discourse on Jehovah God's character and His relationship to everything in His universe.

2. Briefly differentiate between psychology and ethics.

Ans. pg 24 (r 2) Psychology deals with the how and why of behavior, ethics with the moral quality of conduct or motives to live up to a standard of conduct.

3. Religion is general is any adoration or service of a god or gods. What is it more specifically?

Ans. pg 25 (r 2) Religion specifically is a system of faith and worship where one is aware of the existence of a supreme being and living in light of the demands of that supreme being.

4. How are theology and Philosophy the same and how do they differ?

Ans. pg 26 (r 3) Theology and philosophy share the same objectives of seeking a comprehensive world and life view. Theology and philosophy differ in that theology begins with a premise of the existence of God and philosophy begins with a premise of some other 'existing thing'. Thus theology rests on a solid objective basis and philosophy rests on merely assumptions and speculations of the philosopher.

5. Recite the 5 reasons which necessitate theology.

Ans. pg 27 (r 4) 1) Organizing instinct of human intellect

- 2) The pervasive character of unbelief
- 3) The character of Scripture (Revelation of God)
- 4) The development of Intelligent Christian character
- 5) The conditions for effective Christian service.

6. An example of the full treatment of doctrine through the character of Scripture is the meaning Christs death presented in what 5 offerings of Lev 1-5?

Ans. pg 28 (r 5) Lev 1-5 1) He is our *burnt sacrifice* Lev 1:3

- 2) He is our *meal offering* Lev 2:1
- 3) He is our *peace offering* Lev 3:1
- 4) He is our *sin offering* Lev 4:3 and
- 5) He is our *trespass offering* Lev 5:6

7. In Acts 2:42 in what 4 things did the new converts continue in?

Ans. pg 28 (r 5) Acts 2:42 1) steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine, 2) the apostle's fellowship, 3) in breaking of bread, and 4) in prayers

8. Theology does not merely teach us what kind of life we should live but it also “ _____
_____.”

Ans. pg 29 (r 6) Theology does not merely teach us what kind of life we should live but it also
“**inspires us to live such a life.**”

Q&A From Chapter 2 The Possibility and Divisions of Theology

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 27-30 (r 7-22)

1. Theology has great possibilities because of two insights to God and two aspects of man; what are they?

Ans. pg 31 (r 7) God has given both a general and special revelation of himself to man who has a superb mental capability but also a spiritual aspect to his life, these four combine to make sound theology a tremendous possibility.

2. Name three areas with Bible reference where a general revelation of God is revealed.

Ans. pg 32 (r 7) In general a revelation of God is found in nature, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." (Ps 19:1), in history "For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another;" (Ps 75:6-7); and from conscious, wherein man has a sense of right wrong and also a sense of the supernatural being that he must one day be answer to, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them." (Rom 1:18-19)

3. What are some limitations to God's general revelations?

Ans. pg (r 8) A general revelation only gives a general awareness, providing a general manifestation of power, glory, divinity and goodness of God. Also the special revelation of God

has provided such a universal awareness of god through every society that knowledge of it has effect on general revelation and it is not to be isolated in any society.

4. Characterize four means of special revelation.

Ans. pg 35 (r 10) Special revelations are those acts whereby God makes himself know to mankind. This is done through 1) the miracles which he does, before men, 2) The prophecies he has made and fulfilled, most notably through 3) Sending his Christ to mankind and of course 4) the documentation he created and preserved in Holy Scripture.

5. In what three ways did Christ more fully reveal or manifest God?

Ans. pg 41 (r 15) Christ more fully revealed the existence of God, the nature of God, and the will of God.

6. Hebrews 1:1-2 expresses the greater revelation of Jesus Christ, what are the 7 listed qualities of his revelation?

Ans. pg 40 (r 14) Heb 1:1-2 1) God spoke to us by his Son, 2) He appointed him heir of all, 3) By him He made the worlds, 4) He was the brightness of His glory, 5) the express image of His person, 6) He is upholding all things by the word of His power, and 7) He purged our sins, ... by Himself.

7. The Scriptures is not regarded as a co-ordinate revelation of God, but as an _____ of all revelations.

Ans. P 41 (r 16) Embodiment

8. Name 4 ways that reason allows man to come in possession of the revelation of God.

Ans. pg 43 (r 17) 1) Reason is the capacity for knowing truth

- 2) Reason judges the credibility of a representation
- 3) Reason judges the evidence of a representation
- 4) Reason organizes the facts into a system of knowledge.

Q&A From Chapter 3 The Definition and Existence of God

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 51-63 (r 23-31)

1. A definition of deity that would completely view and properly grasp, to understand and wholly exhaust, ..."In this sense to define God would be to _____ Him.

Ans. pg 54 (r 23) 'CIRCUMSCRIBE'

2. A logical definition, with at least a proximate apprehension is to give the _____ and _____ of the subject.

Ans. pg 54 (r 23) GENUS and DIFFERENTIA

3. "Chas Hodge contends that the best definition ever penned by man is: "*The Westminster Shorter Catechism* says God is a _____, _____, _____ and _____ in his _____, _____, _____, holiness, _____, _____, and _____.

Ans. pg 54 (r 25) "*The Westminster Shorter Catechism* says God is a SPIRIT, INFINITE, ETERNAL, and UNCHANGEABLE, in his BEING, WISDOM, POWER, holiness, JUSTICE, GOODNESS, and TRUTH.

4. The three primary Hebrew names for God are: Hbrw _____ Engl _____, Hbrw _____ Engl _____, and Hbrw _____ Engl _____.

Ans. pg 52 Elohim - God, Jehovah – LORD, Adonai – Lord

5. Both Hodge and Strong put emphasis on the importance of Scripture and the names of God.

What does Thiessen say about the revelation of God in his names?

Ans. pg 52 “Strange to say we get little help from the basic names of God.”

6. What are Thiessen's three broad arguments for the belief in the existence of God?

Ans. pg 55-57 1) It is intuitive, 2) It is assumed by Scripture and 3) It is corroborated by arguments.

7. What are the 5 corroborating arguments for the belief in the existence of God?

Ans. pg 57 1) Cosmological, 2) Teleological, 3) Ontological, 4) Moral, 5) Congruity.

8. What is the best worded ontological argument?

Ans. pg 60-61 Umm... “Thought is the necessary *prius* of all that is – even of all possible and conceivable existence.” T.H. Green

Q&A From Chapter 4 The Non-Christian World Views

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 64-77 (r 32-42)

1. How are all non-Christian religions in a sense atheistic?

Ans. pg 64 “They do not recognize the only true God.”

2. Differentiate between 'Practical Atheism', 'Dogmatic Atheism' and 'Virtual Atheism'.

Ans. pg 65 Practical Atheism includes those who have rashly decided that all religion is a fake.

Dogmatic Atheism is the very small group who boldly flaunt their belief that there is no God, and

Virtual Atheism holds principles inconsistent with the belief in any common definition of God, such as naturalists, materialists, or positivism

3. The theological agnostic denies that three things are known or knowable: what are they?

Ans. pg 66 The agnostic contends that 1) The *existence of God* is unknown and unknowable,

2) The *nature of God* is unknown and unknowable and

3) The *ultimate nature of the universe* is unknown and unknowable.

4. Name and briefly explain the 5 leading types of the theory that “all material objects, and all particular minds, as necessarily derived from a single infinite substance” or *Pantheism*.

Ans. pg 67-69 1) Materialistic Pantheism – matter is the cause of life

2) Hylozoism – every particle of matter has physical properties, AND a principle of life.

- 3) Neutralism – (classical type of Pantheism) ultimate reality is neither mind or matter but neutral 'stuff', mind and matter are but appearances.
- 4) Idealism – ultimate reality and the world is the product of mind, individual or infinite.
- 5) Philosophical Mysticism – an Idealist who no longer distinguishes between the outside world and himself, wherein “the knower realizes that he is identical with the inner being of his subject.”

5. Differentiate between monism and monotheism.

Ans. pg 69-70 In monism the philosopher holds that the common originating cause is entirely within the world. In monotheism the common originating cause is outside of the world, as well as inside of it.

6. Pantheism, attractive to mans fallen nature, took mankind from monotheism to polytheistic views. What was the first departure from monotheism?

Ans. pg 72 Nature worship, where sun, moon and stars, fire, air, and water were first personified, then worshiped as personal beings.

7. Describe a Dualistic View, and the Christians departure from it.

Ans. pg 73 There are two dueling, irreducible substances or principles, such as 'idea and object', 'mind and matter', 'good and evil', or even 'God and Satan.' For a Christian God is eternal i.e. irreducible, while Satan is not co-eternal, but created.

8. Explain Thiessen's statement "As pantheism holds to the immanence of God to the exclusion of His transcendence, so deism holds to the transcendence to the exclusion of His immanence."

Ans. pg 74 Immanent is existing within or inherent, i.e. and inherent belief in God in human beings, while Transcendent is a preeminent supreme perception lying beyond the ordinary or inherent.

Thus deism denies special revelation, miracles, and providence, contending that God created the world spinning and lets things go without intervention.

Q&A From Chapter 5 The Scriptures: The Embodiment of a Divine Revelation

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 81-90 (r 43-49)

1. In the Bibliology introduction Thiessen defends his inclusion of this section in his systematic theology, What is his defense and the 'traditional view' that is under attack?

Ans. pg 79-80 Thiessen's defense for including some Bibliology in his systematic theology is that: "The present widespread opposition to the traditional view, held by the early Church which held the Bible as inerrant infallible and inspired as the final authority for all faith and practice"

Ans. pg 79-80 The traditional view of Bibliology that is under attack and prompted Thiessen's defense is "The present widespread opposition to the traditional view, held by the early Church" which held the Bible as inerrant, infallible and inspired and as the final authority for all faith and practice.

2) Chapter 5 of Thiessen lectures presents 7 'arguments' in support of what theses?

Ans. pg 81 The theses of Chapter 5 seem to be that God did reveal Himself in writing and the Holy Bible is the embodiment of that revelation.

3) Differentiate the 'A Priori' argument for the existence of a revelation from God from the 'Analogy' argument.

Ans. pg 81-82 The 'A Priori' argument for the existence of a revelation from God contends the "Man being what he is and God being what He is, we may possibly expect a revelation from God in a reliable and infallible source of truth." While the 'Analogy' argument strengthens that

argument with the analysis that intelligent beings communicate and reveal themselves to each other.

4) How does its indestructible nature lend credence that the Bible is God's revelation of himself to man?

Ans. pg 83-84 That such a book could survive intact through 4,000 years is marvelously amazing. That is be preserved intact and word perfect, while every heathen people and devilish influence (to include the Roman Church) has made every diligent attempt to hide and destroy it is downright supernatural.

5) What are the two aspects of the character of the Bible which strengthen the argument that it is the genuine revelation of God?

Ans. pg 85-86 The Bibles all encompassing contents and its miraculous unity being written “by some 40 authors over 1600 years” strengthens the argument that is it God's revelation of himself to mankind,

6) What 5 books does Thiessen mention as falling very short of the kind of influence which the Holy Bible has exerted on societies?

Ans. pg 86 The 5 books that Thiessen mentions as falling far short of any impact that the Bible has secured are: 1) The Koran, 2) Book of Mormon, 3) Science and Health, 4) Zend Avesta, and 5) Classics of Confucius.

7) Finish Thiessen's statement about Bible Prophecy." _____
_____ and we have many proofs in the Scripture that _____
_____.

Ans. pg 88 **Only God can reveal the future**, and we have many proofs in the Scripture that **He did reveal it to His servants.**

8) What 2 thing justify us in accepting the Scriptures testimony of its own behalf?

Ans. pg 89 The Scriptures have already proven themselves both 1) genuine and 2) truthful.

Q&A From Chapter 6 The Genuineness, Credibility, and Canonicity of the Books of the Bible

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 91-104 (r 50-61)

1. Differentiate between a book's genuineness and its credibility.

Ans. pg 96, 98 (r 50, 56) To be genuine a book must need to have been written by the one and/or in the time it is credited to; to be creditable it must be truthful in the matters which it treats. ex. The gospel of Thomas is not genuine, the Koran – wherein the sun extinguishes itself at night and reignites in the morning, loses credibility.

2. Conservative scholarship has always held that Moses wrote Genesis with access to what three sources?

Ans. pg 92 (r 51) Moses likely had access to 1) written records from Abraham and others, 2) to oral tradition from Israelites, and most assuredly to 3) the direct revelation from God Himself, in recording the record of Genesis.

3. Because the _____ was satisfied with the genuineness of the accepted Old Testament Scriptures, Christians are too.

Ans. pg 93 (r 51) Because the **Lord Jesus Christ** was satisfied with the genuineness of the accepted Old Testament Scriptures, Christians are too.

4. Name the 6 Hebrew former prophets and the Hebrew latter prophets.

Ans. pg 93 (r 51) The 6 Hebrew former prophets are: 1) Joshua, 2) Judges, 3,4) 1&2 Samuel, 5,6) 1&2 Kings. The Hebrew latter prophets are: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the 12 minor prophets.

5. The Hebrew *Kethubhim*, (or Writings) is divided into what 3 groups and containing what Bible books?

Ans. pg 94 (r 53) Poetic Books: Psalms, Proverbs, and Job; the *Meginoth*: Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther; and the Historical Books; Daniel, Ezra Nehemiah, 1&2 Chronicles.

6. Bible critics, as antagonists to Bible Authority and genuineness, call three Gospels '*synoptic*' and dispute the traditional genuineness of the four; How does Thiessen lend them credence?

Ans. pg 96-97 (r 54-55) Thiessen uses the source critics characterization of Matthew, Mark, and Luke as “synoptic” or general over viewing copies of each other, without reservation. He also presents, without countering, the arguments of two heretics, Origen and Clement of Alexandria, who attack the traditional ordering of the Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel according to Mark, and the Gospel According to Luke. In following the Bible critics outline of three Gospels being '*synoptical copies*' of each other which do not show Jesus' deity and one (John) being a rouge source which does , Thiessen lends them unrefuted and unmerrited credence.

7. What is the 1 common reason for a Christian's acceptance of both the genuineness and credibility of the Old Testament Scriptures?

Ans. pg 93, 98 (r 51, 56) Because the Lord Jesus Christ accepted them as genuine and credible, Christians accept the Old Testament Scriptures as both genuine and credible.

8. What are the 3 meaning of the word 'canon' and why is the 2nd held in contention by Bible believers?

Ans. pg 102, 104 (r 59, 60) Canon means measuring rod, rule or standard, but came to mean 'an authoritative decision of a Church Council', when it should only mean those books which have satisfactorily 'measured up' to being inspired of God. The 'Church Council' rendition of this meaning is tainted because "There have always been (and still are) ... men who have questioned the right of some books," and no man made council has come to any full agreement with God.

Q&A From Chapter 7 The Inspiration of the Scriptures

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 105-117 (r 62-74)

1. Thiessen quotes, and Doerksen removes Gausen's excellent 'best' definition of inspiration; What is it?

Ans. pg 107 (r 63x) Inspiration is “that inexplicable power which the divine Spirit put forth of old on the authors of Holy Scripture, in order to their guidance even in the employment of the words they used, and to preserve them alike from all error and from all omission.”

2. Gausen's book “Theopneustia” is a 365 exposition on Bible inspiration which never refers to an 'auto graph'; what is an autograph and how does Thiessen muck up Gausen's excellent work with its use?

Ans. pg 107 (r 63) Thiessen ends his definition of inspiration with this sentence... “And again, inspiration is affirmed only of the autographs of Scriptures, not of any of the versions, whether ancient or modern, nor any of the Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, nor of any critical texts known.” An autograph only comes from the pen held in the genuine authors hand. If this is true, not only is Gausen's work disemboweled, But Paul's pen was leading Timothy into error. Thiessen, and the Textual Critics, antagonist of inspiration, that he references are WRONG.

3. Thiessen chooses to prove the staunch and aged doctrine of verbal plenary inspiration with what two fundamental things?

Ans. pg 108 (r 64) Thiessen chooses to prove the staunch and aged doctrine of verbal plenary inspiration with 1) the character of God, and 2) the character and claims of the Scripture.

4. Thiessen quotes Shedd's exceptional paragraph explaining God's provision for man's 'higher' needs, now does Shedd's explanation effect a doctrine of preservation which neither Thiessen nor Doerksen dare mention?

Ans. pg 109 (r 67) Shedd's effectively contends "that a prophet or an apostle who has received directly from God a profound and mysterious truth inaccessible to human intellect, will not be left to his own unassisted powers in importing what he has received." Thiessen and Doerksen contend that it is inerrant, infallible, and verbally inspired only in the autograph, or the pen of the author, all subsequent copies are errant and fallible because God left all future generations "to his own unassisted powers in imparting what he has received."

5. Doerksen adds a definition of 'inerrancy' that is not once mentioned by Gausson, Hodge, Strong, Shedd or even Thiessen. Differentiate a dictionary definition of inerrancy from a dictionary definition of infallible and how does Doerksen's definition combine the two and make them include a manuscript's misspelled words or scribal errors?

Ans. pg 106 (r 63) Inerrancy is free from error or untruths; infallibility. Infallible is incapable of erring or incapable of failing. Conservative theologians Shedd, Hodge, Strong, used only 'infallible' to capture the Bible's inability to lead one into error and its inability to fail. Bible critics, infidels and antagonists of inspiration, force inerrancy to mean autographs without lettering error, grammar error, or wording error, and manuscripts without a copyist error in all subsequent copies. This outlandish twisting in definition is captured by Doerksen with no consideration for infallibility and the Bible critic's mislabeling of inerrancy, which can now only

apply to the 'original manuscripts'/ He thus labels the current Bible as riddled with error but the original as “inerrant in all that it affirms.” Doerksen makes the Bible critic ecstatic over all the muddied water.

6. How many men wrote the Bible over how many years of time, and how many times is an equivalent of “Thus saith the LORD” found in the Old Testament?

Ans. pg 109-110 (r 67-68) Forty men wrote the Bible over 1,600 years of time, and it contains over 38,000 equivalence of “Thus saith the LORD” found in the Old Testament.

7. What are the four explanations which generally account for the Bible seeming imperfections, errors, and contradictions accused by unbelievers, AND what is the fifth one added by Thiessen to appease Bible critics who suppose variations in spelling to be errors?

Ans. pg 112 (r69) “We may, however, say, (hedge, hedge, hedge) in general, that the seeming imperfections, errors, and contradictions (of the Holy Bible) usually disappear when we take into account 1) the non technical style of the writers, 2) the fragmentary character of many of the accounts, 3) the supplementary nature of the things that are recorded by the several authors, and 4) the historical situations that gave rise to a line of conduct. And Thiessen adds a fifth to appease the Bible critics who suppose even variations in spellings to be untenable errors; his addition is “the fallibility of the scribes. “

8. Thiessen includes Robinson's 1941 bold quote about no explicit contradictions ever being found, and Doerksen completely removes it. What is it and suppose why it is removed?

Ans. pg 112 (r 70) “No explicit contradictions of Scripture of any moment whatever has ever been found. More and more, scholars are coming to recognize the substantial verity of the Bible. And less and less do archaeologists endorse the evolutionary hypothesis of Higher Criticism to explain the growth of Law and religion in Israel.” “The Bearing of Archeology on the Old Testament” © 1941, pg 13. I suppose Doerksen disagreed with the first sentence, and found the great popularity gains of both Bible critics and evolutionists contrary to the rest.

9. The Hebrews quoting the Old Testament while writing the New Testament translated some portions to Greek. The Alexandrian produced Greek Old Testament called the Septuagint¹⁴, which was never accepted by the Hebrews is still claimed by Source Critics to be the primary source for these Hebrews. How does Thiessen lend them support to this hollow claim.

Ans. pg 113 (r 70) That the Apostles translation of the Hebrew into the Greek would sometimes align with the false Septuagint should be of no surprise or consequence, (The inept translation from Egypt was not all errant, just most errant.) But Thiessen and Doerksen say of the coincidence “Sometimes they quote an apparently false translation in the Septuagint on the ground that the mistranslation conveys at least one of the meanings contained in the Hebrew text.”

14 Septuagint (sometimes abbreviated LXX) is the name given to the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures. The Septuagint has its origin in Alexandria, Egypt and was translated between 300-200 BC. Widely used among Hellenistic Jews, this Greek translation was produced because many Jews spread throughout the empire were beginning to lose their Hebrew language. The process of translating the Hebrew to Greek also gave many non-Jews a glimpse into Judaism. According to an ancient document called the Letter of Aristeas, it is believed that 70 to 72 Jewish scholars were commissioned during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus to carry out the task of translation. The term “Septuagint” means seventy in Latin, and the text is so named to the credit of these 70 scholars. From <http://www.septuagint.net/> accessed 7/31/2010 NOTE FROM AUTHOR: The BC date of the Septuagint has little or no basis; it is not found in any use until the 2nd or 3rd century AD with NO EVIDENCE that Christ or his Apostles ever used it.

10 In sorting through the theories of inspiration Thiessen, and then Doerksen, lightly dismiss Gausson's excellent "Theopneustia" work, which rigidly defends a dictation theory. What are their shallow grounds for this dismissal?

Ans. pg 106 (r 65) They attribute that in the dictation theory expounded by the expert Gausson, "authors of Scripture were mere pens, amanuenses, not being whose individualities were preserved." Further they somewhere heard of "some even having argued that the grammar must be everywhere perfect", for a dictation to be true. In French, 100 years before Thiessen, Gausson¹⁵ counters well such trivialization.

15 Gausson, Louis a Swiss divine, was born in Geneva August 25, 1790, and in 1816 became pastor of Satigny, near Geneva. Here he came under the influence of pastor Cellier, who had retained his Christian fidelity and simple faith amid the general falling away of the Swiss clergy. The revival of religion in Switzerland about that time, due largely to the labors of the brothers Haldani (q.v.), was odious to the majority of the Geneva clergy, and the *Venerable Compagnie des Pasteurs* passed some ordinances infringing strongly upon Christian liberty. Gausson and Cellier protested against the proceeding by republishing the Helvetic Confession in French, with a preface advocating the need and utility of confessions of faith. Gausson continued to labor faithfully in Satigny for twelve years, and his name became known throughout Switzerland as an earnest upholder of evangelical Christianity. His aim was, not to divide the national Church, but to reinspire it with Christian life. His energy and orthodoxy were alike displeasing to the Rationalists, and he was involved in long disputes with the *Venerable Compagnie*. They ordered him to use the emasculated and Rationalistic Catechism which had been substituted in Geneva for Calvin's: he refused, and was censured (see *Letters du Pasteur Gausson la Venerable Compagnie*, etc., 1831; and, on the other side, *Expose des discussions entre la Compagnie etc. et M. Gausson*, 1831). He kept on his way, and, in union with Merle (d'Aubigne) and Galland, formed the "Evangelical Society" for the distribution of Bibles, tracts, etc. The Consistory at last suspended him, so low had orthodox Christianity sunk in Geneva, the home of Calvin. In 1834 he took the chair of theology in the newly-founded evangelical school of Geneva, where he taught a strictly orthodox doctrine, perhaps without sufficient knowledge of the condition of modern thought. In his *Theopneustie* (1840, translated in England and America) he maintained, in its strongest form, the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. In 1860 he published his *Canon des Ecritures Saintes* (translated, *Canon of Holy Scripture*, 1862), in which he vindicated his theory of inspiration against the attacks of Scherer and others. His *Lemons sur Daniel* contained the substance of his lectures and catechetical lessons on Daniel. He died June 18, 1863. We have translations of several of his writings besides those already named, viz. *Geneva and Jerusalem* (1844): — *Geneva and Rome*, a discourse (1844): — It is written, *Scripture proved to be from Col.* (1856): — *Lessons for the Young on the six Days of Creation* (1860). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:538. From <http://www.ageslibrary.com/authordb/G/gausson.html>

Q&A From Chapter 8 The Nature of God: Essence and Attributes

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 119-132 (r 75-88)

1. Name the four aspects of divine substance accredited to H.H. Smith by Thiessen (but not by Doerksen).

Ans. pg 119 (r 75) Four aspects of divine essence could be considered as) Spirituality, 2) Self-existence, 3) Immensity and 4) Eternity.

2. What four considerations are necessary in understanding that God is Spirit?

Ans. pg 120-121 (r 75-77) God as Spirit is 1) Immaterial and incorporeal (... or is not made up of matter), 2) is invisible ... therefore without image. 3) is alive ... called the living God ... implying feeling, power, activity and lastly, 4) He is a person.

3. Briefly define and differentiate the two aspects or substances of personality.

Ans. pg 121 (r 77) To be a person one must have a personality which though presently contained in our corporeality (matter/material) of body is indeed our spirit and in essence is self-conscious and has self determination. Self conscious or self awareness is the ability to think about what you are thinking about. Humans can do this, dogs cannot. Humans are persons animals are not. Self determination is likewise more than animal determination i.e. a squirrel shows great determination to get into your bird feeder, but self determination is the feelings of freedom which makes choices from within (self conscious) in view of (moral) motives and ends. These two entities make a living being a person.

4. What is Thomas Aquinas' (1225-1274 Italian Dominican Order of Catholic Church, father of Thomistia School of Philosophy and theology, the Roman Church's greatest philosopher and theologian) quote about God's self existence? What is God's greatest quote, and how does Doerksen's misquote of God (via his NASV) alter God's Word?

Ans. pg 122 (r 78) Thomas Aquinas the 13th century spokesman for Roman Catholicism, Philosophy and theology said "God is the first cause, Himself uncaused." God said "I am that I am" (Exod 3:14), unless you use an NASV or other modernist bible, like Doerksen the revisor of Thiessen, who things God said "I am WHO, I am, " which is like a line from Popeye the sailor man. "I yam what I yam."¹⁶

Substituting the singular pronoun 'who' where the plural pronoun 'that' should be used, changes the quote of God from one that addresses the essence of God, to one that addresses the personality of God. A subtle but gross error.

5. What are 4 various ways of classifying the attributes of God and what does Thiessen prefer?

Ans. pg 123 (r 79-80) Attributes of God may be classified in four ways for our examination" 1) *natural* attributes and *moral* attributes. 2) *immanent* attributes relating to Himself and *transitive* attributes relating to revelations towards His creation. 3) *Positive* attributes i.e. certain perfections and *negative* attributes i.e. certain limitations. And 4) *Man-like* characteristics of his essence, His intellect and His will. Of these four, Thiessen substitutes *non-moral* attributes for *natural* and uses the first characterization.

¹⁶ Popeye made his film debut in Popeye the Sailor, a 1933 Betty Boop cartoon (Betty only makes a brief appearance, repeating her hula dance from Betty Boop's Bamboo Isle). It was for this short that Sammy Lerner's "I'm Popeye the Sailor Man" song was written. I Yam What I Yam became the first entry in the regular Popeye the Sailor series. from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Popeye_the_sailor_man

6. What are the 4 'non-moral' attributes of God with brief definition.

Ans. pg 123-128 (r 80-81) *Omnipresence* is the infinite God not limited in the space continuum.

Omniscience is an infinite God not limited in knowledge.

Omnipotence is the infinite God not limited in power .

And *Immutability* is the infinite God that cannot change.

7. What are the four moral attributes of god?

Ans. pg 128-133 (r 81-88) The four moral attributes of God are 1) *Holiness*, 2) *Righteousness and Justice* , 3) *Goodness*, and 4) *Truth*.

8. The goodness of God is characterized in what four qualities?

Ans. pg 130-131 (r 86-87) The goodness of God includes: 1) the *love* of God, 2) the *benevolence* of God, 3) the *mercy* of God and 4) the *grace* of God.

9. In his closing paragraph how does Thiessen entertain and Doerksen expand the Roman Catholic hallmark of penance?

Ans. pg 133 (r 88) Thiessen contrasts repentance with disobedience and impenitence. On the part of man. The Latin Vulgate mistranslated 'repent' into 'do penance' to secure a salvation by works doctrine in catholicism. Doerksen then substitutes obedience and penitence (i.e. the Catholic doing penance) into the contrast of what man must do. The Latin Vulgate and Catholic error concerning repentance vs penance seeped into the modernist ecumenical bible versions.

Q&A From Chapter 9 The Nature of God: Unity and Trinity

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 134-146 (r 89-99)

1. Quote the first and classic text documenting God's plurality and His undivided indivisible unity.

Ans. pg 34 (r 37) Deut. 6:4 "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God *is* one LORD:" The ecumenical bible used by Thiessen, and the modernist ecumenical bible used by Doerksen departs from the 400 year old naming system and sporadically uses a supposed Hebrew transliteration of 'Jehovah' for 'LORD'

2. Thiessen includes and Doerksen removes Shedd's unit of God analogy; what did Shedd say?

Ans. pg 134 (r39) "A unit, like a stone or stick, is marked by mere singleness. It admits of no interior distinctions, and is incapable of that inherent trinality which is necessary to self knowledge and self consciousness." Op. Cit. I, 254f

3. Thiessen lists four sects who oppose the trinity but support the ecumenical modernist bible that Doerksen prefers; (NASV) Doerksen does not list them, who are they?

Ans. pg 134-135 (r 89x) Thiessen lists some sects who reject the doctrine of the trinity, but dared not be listed by Doerksen in his 1979 revision of Thiessen. These are the Ebionites, a Jewish sect which professes faith in Jesus Christ, and gained inclusion for the NASV bible, the Mohammedans, who threaten to send assassins to anyone who publishes contrary to their cause; the Scocinians, the 16th century Italian founders of unitarianism and the modern Unitarians who deny the divinity of Jesus and are instrumental in the American Bible Society, other Bible Societies and the translation of Doerksen's preferred NASV bible.

4. The mystery of the trinity is highlighted when Thiessen quotes Flint's 1899 clarification.

Doerksen removes the clarification in his revision. What is the quote?

Ans. pg 136 (r 90x) "But Flint well says, it is 'a mystery indeed, yet one which explains many other mysteries, and which sheds a marvelous light on God, on nature, and on man!' Thiessen's further clarification omitted by Doerksen states "One's view of this doctrine effects every other part of one's theological belief and practical religion. The doctrine is therefore, not a mere burden on our credulity, but a practical necessity to a true world and life view."

5. What is the practical definition of 'trinity' which Thiessen proposes is much older than Theophilus of Antioch, and Doerksen tenders as mere Christian concoction?

Ans. pg 135 (r 90) "By trinity we mean that there are three eternal distinctions in the one divine essence, known respectively as Father, Son and Holy Spirit."

6. Conservative theologians have always emphasized the plurality of Elohim and God's use of plural pronouns and verbs as a hallmark of the doctrine of the trinity: How does Doerksen trivialize and dismiss this hallmark?

Ans. pg 135 (r 90) Doerksen trivializes the hallmark by stating only "The name for God (Elohim) is plural and MAY IMPLY PLURALITY THOUGH THIS IS DUNIOUS" He dismisses the hallmark by stating "The plural form is PROBABLY FOR INTENSITY, RATHER THAN FOR EXPRESSING PLURALITY." Doerksen rehearses an aged Unitarian argument for rejecting the trinity in his modernized ecumenical revision of Systematic Theology.

7. As definite indication of God's plurality, what verses show Jehovah distinguished from Jehovah and how does Doerksen misquote from his own bible to muddy the distinction?

Ans. pg 136-137 (r 90-91) Genesis 19:24 states “Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven:” and Hosea 1:7 “But I (the LORD) will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the LORD their God, ...”

Thiessen quotes both of these verses from the 1901 ASV wherein they abandon the 400 year system of showing the name of Jehovah in all caps as in 'LORD' and show it as 'Jehovah.'

Doerksen, however, misquotes his preferred NASV, which went back to the old system and he shows the verses with non-caps as 'Lord.' Doerksen's preferred NASV is inconsistent in naming Jehovah, but his revision of Thiessen lends even further confusion to the conventional naming systems of Jehovah God.

8. List the eight qualities wherein the Son is recognized as God.

Ans. pg 138 -143 (r 92-96) Thiessen show eight qualities wherein the Son is recognized as God:

1) He has attributes of Deity, 2) He holds the office of Deity, 3) He has the prerogatives of Deity, 4) He was identified with the Old Testament Jehovah, 5) He has names that imply Deity, 6) Certain relationships prove His Deity, 7) He is rendered and accepts divine worship, and 8) His own consciousness and claims prove His Deity.

Q&A From Chapter 10 The Decrees of God:

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 147-160 (r 100-110)

1. Thiessen begins his doctrine of decrees acknowledging that “we come to the most mooted questions in theology,” define 'mooted' and why does he characterize this chapter so?

Ans. pg 147 (r 100x) Moot - “a hypothetical case argued by law students, an exercise ... to bring up as a subject of debate discussion or debate ... subject to debate; arguable.” Obviously Thiessen is acknowledging the extreme and long standing controversy around his doctrine that “God has decreed all that comes to pass”, because a plain reading of the Holy Bible indicates that God works in real time with man as a free agent and all things are indeed not decreed before the foundation of the world as is decrees in Augustinian and Reformed Theology.

2. Suppose why Doerksen, in his revision of Thiessen, completely eliminated any hint that there is an extreme and long standing controversy in the Doctrine of Decrees.

Ans. pg 147 (r 100) I suppose Doerksen is so very settled into a doctrine that “God has decreed all that comes to pass” that he refuses to acknowledge the existence of the opposition to such a view.

3. The problem with the doctrine of decrees wherein “God has decreed all that comes to pass” can be best emphasized with a dictionary definition of 'decree', state the definition.

Ans. American Heritage Dictionary :”Decree (noun) an authoritative order having the force of law.”

4. The proof text for the doctrine of decrees in Isaiah 14 is taken out of context, only partially quoted and then exhaustively applied to “all that comes to pass!” What is the context and the verse they omit?

Ans. pg 148 (r 101) The context of Isaiah 14 is God's purpose and plan for Babylon. At its writing both the Babylonian Captivity and the inhalation of Babylon lie hundreds of years away. Verse 22 says “For I will rise up against them, saith the LORD of hosts, and cut off from Babylon the name and remnant, and son and nephew, saith the LORD.” The verse they tactfully omit is verse 25 which reveals the context and states :That I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountains tread him under foot then shall his yoke depart from off them, and his burden depart from off their shoulders.”

5. Their 'proof of decrees' by taking Scripture out of context is practiced with Ephesians 1 where they quote only portions of verse 9 and 11 and add them to the partial quote of Isaiah 14. What is the full context of Eph 1:7-12?

Ans. pg 148 (r 101) The context of Ephesians 1 is the introduction wherein God the Fathers blessed us (vr 3-6) “to the praise of the glory” and God the Son redeemed us through his blood (vr 7-12) “to the praise of His glory” and God the Holy Spirit delivered the Word of Truth and sealed us (vr 13-14) “unto the praise of His glory.” In context verses 7-12 state “7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; 8 Wherein he hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; 9 Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself: 10 That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in

Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even* in him: 11 In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will: 12 That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ.”

6. A doctrine of decrees is developed by taking Romans 8:28 out of context and extending God's purposes to “one great all-inclusive purpose.” What is the actual context of Romans 8:28?

Ans. pg 148 (r 101) Romans 8:28 reads “And we know that all things worked together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose.” The context here is for believers being the called according to his purpose and certainly not that “God has decreed all that comes to pass” in one giant all inclusive plan.

7. To develop that their hypothesized 'all inclusive, one eternal, infinite plan and purpose of God' was formed “before the foundation of the world” they combine Eph 3:11, taken out of context, with 1Pet 1:20, Rev 13:8, Eph 1:4, 2Tim 1:9 and Titus 1:2. In context, in each of these verses, what was called out as present “before the foundation of the world”?

Ans. Holy Bible 1Pe 1:20 “Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,” = Christ was foreordained before the foundation of the world.

Re 13:8 “And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.” = him who was worshiped, the Lamb, was considered slain from the foundation of the world.

Eph 1:4 “According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:” = the corporate 'us' who get saved are chosen in him before the foundation of the world, ... no unsaved are included in the choosing.

2Ti 1:9 “Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,” = His own purpose that Christ Jesus would be given was before the world began.

Tit 1:2 “In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;” = God promised eternal life availability before the world began.

8. The extensive and verbose development of a hypothetical eternal infinite plan executed by God wherein “God has decreed all that comes to pass” must necessarily result in a distorted doctrine of “gracious election!” What is that as stated?

And pg 156 (r 106x) “By election we mean that sovereign act of God in grace, whereby from all eternity He chose in Christ Jesus fro Himself and for salvation, all those whom He foreknew would respond positively to prevenient grace.” The reformed definition of election that has never been readily accepted by Baptist, nor shall it herein be so accepted.

Q&A From Chapter 11 The Works of God: Creation

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 161-172 (r 111-118)

1. What are the two senses of 'create' and how does Hodge, quoted by Thiessen, differentiate them?

Ans. pg 161-162 (r 111) In the *immediate* sense of the word 'create' God, without the use of pre-existing materials brought into being, immediately and instantaneously the whole universe. In the *mediate* sense of the word, God did not originate things from nothing but shaped, adapted, combined, or transformed existing material. Hodge puts the distinction as “The one was instantaneous, the other gradual; the one precludes the idea of any preexisting substance, and of cooperation, the other admits and implies both.”

2. In considering the Mosaic account of creation Thiessen carefully tip-toes through a theological mine field. What are the three positions he is being so careful to appease?

Ans. pg 162 – 166 (r 112-117) Thiessen carefully tiptoes a path around the 'gaptists' who hold to the non literal and preposterous multi million year gap between gen 1:1 and Gen 1:2. He states whether due to deliberate incompleteness in the original act of creating or some catastrophe that befell the original creation, we find the earth in gen 1:2, “waste and void” and darkness was upon the face of the deep.” We shall not dogmatically decide between these two possibilities ...”

Thiessen also carefully tip toes a path around the 'theistic evolutionist.' They hold (held) the preposterous idea that 'science has established the theory of evolution of a solid basis, and that the Bible students and theologians had better adapt themselves to this position.” [such a position held by C.I. Scofield, and Augustus Strong, 2 of my heroes, originated when worldly 'scientists'

were come how thought to be 'stable in this their view;') Finally Thiessen tip toes a path around those who literally believe the Bible, and believe the Bible literally. He gives this group (us) the least amount of exposure and credibility, but he does state “But there are also a good many who hold that the six days are literal days.”

3. How does Doerksen's revision to the Mosaic account of creation lend more credence to a literal view than did Thiessen?

Ans. pg 162-166 (r112-117) Doerksen's 1979 revision of Thiessen's 1949 work, gives mention to the now old theories of 'gaptists' and 'theistic evolutionists' but clearly emphasizes the literal interpretation of the Bible. He states of the 'gaptist' “If, as had been suggested by many, Gen 1:2ff is a recreation ...” covering those theologians that previously bowed down to the worlds “Standard Geological Column” he states “If creation ... is recent, and a literal interpretation of Scripture favors this, the interpretation of long geological ages and the Standard Geological Column must be challenged.” Doerksen also included clarification about inexactness in the worldly scientists dating system and enforcement of “mature creationism.”

4. Why did Doerksen, editing in 1979, reduce Thiessen's whole 3 page section on Theories that are opposed to the doctrine of creation to only one short but blunt paragraph?

Ans. pg 167-169 (r 117) From 1949, when Thiessen taught, until 1979 when Doerksen revised him, the opposing theories, devised by Godless scientists, had dissolved or so fractured that they need very little consideration in theology.

5. Although differentiating an immediate and a mediate creation sense has lend itself to non literal theories of creation, is there a place for its consideration in a 'mature creationism' consideration?

Ans. pg 161-163 (r 111-112) Both immediate (from nothing) and mediate (from dirt) creation find their root in the Bible. In Gen 1:1 god created, fro nothing the time, space and matter continuums which make up the universe. The rest of the creation account seems to be mediate creation, wherein God formed the space and matter into all the various forms in the universe.

6. Did '*ex nihilo*' creation necessarily end at Genesis 1:1?

Ans. pg 163 (r112) God is never restricted in subsequent creations or miracles from using '*ex nihilo*' creation. Modernists seek a natural explanation of all miracles but god could have easily '*ex nihilo*' spoken flies, or manna or meat into existence from nothing.

7. Contrast Thiessen's handling the “geological formation s that exist” with Doerksen's handling of the same.

Ans. pg 169 (r 117) Thiessen tries to make “ample room in the genesis account of creation for all geological formations that exist,” while Doerksen contends that since Adam was created with age ... is it not also conceivable that the whole creation of God had the appearance of age.”

Thiessen would adapt the Bible account to accommodate the 'scientist' of his day; Doerksen, know how fickle and Godless the 'science' so called came to be would adapt the 'science' to fit the literal interpretation of the Bible... Bravo Doerksen.

8. What is Thiessen and Doerksen's assessment of Archbishop James Ussher and the young earth analysis?

Ans. pg 169 (r 118) Thiessen thought it necessary to clarify that Ussher's 4004 date of creation was not part of the inspired text, and concludes contrary to young earth enthusiasts that “the universe is much older than 6,000 years, - how much older perhaps no one can tell. Doerksen, however says “After careful analysis, Ussher (1581-1656) placed the date of creation at 4004 BC ... The recent creation theory of 10 to 20 thousand years seems more tenable and more in keeping with the grammatical – historical methods of interpretation than does the early dating of millions of years.”

Q&A From Chapter 12 The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule

Fill-In and Short Answer Test: Please put short answers in complete sentences. pg 173-188 (r 119- 129)

1. Give a dictionary definition of Sovereign.

Ans. American Heritage Dictionary Sovereign (noun) one that exercises supreme (ultimate, final) permanent authority, especially in a nation or other governmental unit.”

2. Differentiate between the doctrine of preservation and the doctrine of providence.

Ans. pg 174, 177 (r 120, 122) The doctrine of preservation hangs on the understanding that the universe and the matter that makes it is not self-existent or self-sustaining but by Him all things consist, to include the animate and inanimate creation. The doctrine of providence hangs on the understanding that God exhibits a “continuous activity whereby He makes all the events of the physical, mental, and moral phenomena work out His purposes.”

3. What two theories contend with a Biblical doctrine of preservation and what supports them?

Ans. pg 176 (r 121) The deistic theory is supported by the natural laws that seem to surround us in a universe which is perpetually winding down like a clock, however it proceeds to deny all supreme intervention in its preservation. The continuous creation theory contends that every moment in time is a new creation of the divine will and direct activity. It has no rationalistic basis but exists only to go to an opposite extreme of the theistic theory.

4. Give two verses which show God's providential sovereignty over animals.

Ans. pg 179 (r 123) Job 12:10 “In whose hand *is* the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind.” and Psalm 104: “27 These wait all upon thee; that thou mayest give *them* their meat in due season. 28 *That* thou givest them they gather: thou openest thine hand, they are filled with good. 29 Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled: thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust.”

5. Does Jeremiah 1:5 necessitate that God's providence in Jeremiah's birth applies to every individual ever born? Why or why not.

Ans. pg 180 (r 123) Obviously not. Jeremiah was to be used in God's specific dealings with his chosen nation Israel and in the fulfillment of specific prophecies he had already made. This is not thru for every individual born then and now.

6. Does 1Samuel 16:1 necessitate that God's providence is controlling every individual's birth and lot in life? Why or Why not.

Ans. pg 180 (r 123) Obviously not. David had a lot in life that directly involved the bringing of the Messiah into this world, and most of us are not that integral in such a comprehensive execution of His provision of redemption.

7. Typical to reformed theology, Thiessen does not directly address the real problem with his development of degrees and providence until his last two little paragraphs. What are these two major problems?

Ans. pg 187 (r 128-129) The reformed theologian puts great effort into developing an infinite all inclusive plan whereby God has Sovereign rule in everything (i.e. every breath of every human in every generation) with a complete disregard that God created man with his own sovereignty, his own 'free will' and his own ability to interact with his creator in deed and in prayer, in a way that his own path in life is impacted and changed from some infinite plan that God has laid out for hi. This 'free will' of man and the eternal interaction f our prayer life is completely obliterated by the Reformed Theologians extensive development of decrees which are eternal and infinite and God's providence which is predetermined and foreknown. In this regard Thiessen simply regurgitates some of the endless rhetoric of Hodge, Shedd, and other Presbyterians who annihilate free will and effectual prayer in their theology.

8. How does Thiessen dismiss his annihilation of mans free will and mans effectual prayer?

Ans. pg 187-188 (r 128-129) Thiessen calls his own development, that God is the sole Actor (eventually the soul Actor) in the universe, an extreme and then with audacity declares that he is not at the extreme. In side stepping the conflict of mans will he states “God always overrides what man does to His own ends ... on the basis of His foreknowledge He decides just what plan to put into operation or to permit to operate in order to carry out His Sovereign rule;” In the Bible God repeatedly waits on man's decision and actions and then acts on the basis of what man does or says. i.e. in 2 Kings 13 Joash's victorious conquests over Syria depended on the fervor he had in smiting arrows, not on any infinite plan of God . There is NONE of this real time intervention in Thiessen's development of decrees and providence. In side stepping conflict concerning man's effective prayer, Thiessen calls his own development an extreme position i.e.

that God “has already decreed just what He will do in every instance”, but then in his last sentence of the whole section he says (with NO substance) “Thus there is a perfect harmony between the fore knowledge, decrees, and providence of god.” This sentence is absolutely not true and not justified or defended anywhere in the body of Thiessen's work. When God heard Hezekiah's prayer He CHANGED His plan and Hezekiah's appointment with death. Thinking people are tired of the reformed theologians arguments that God for knew Hezekiah was going to pray and God foreknew he would change what He said and God foreknew He would send in Elisha twice with two “at odds” messages! Thiessen's whole development of decrees and providence follows verbatim his Presbyterian predecessors and the deep ugly ruts of Reformed Theology. It will take a real Baptist in some way to balance the Sovereignty of god in the universe and the sovereignty of man in his own right. Thiessen's development removes both mans free will and man's effectual prayer.

Detailed Chapter Outlines – TH501 Systematic Theology I

Chapter 1 The Nature and Necessity of Theology pg 23-30 (r 1-6)

Chapter 2 The Possibility and Divisions of Theology pg 31-50 (r 7-22)

Part I Theism

Chapter 3 The Definition and Existence of God pg 51-63 (r 23-31)

Chapter 4 The Non-Christian World Views pf 64-80 (r 32-42)

Part II Bibliology

Chapter 5 The Scriptures: The Embodiment of a Divine Revelation pg 81-90 (r 43-49)

Chapter 6 The Genuineness, Credibility and Canonicity of the Books of the Bible 91-104 (r 50-61)

Chapter 7 The Inspiration of the Scriptures pg 105-118 (r 62-74)

Part III Theology

Chapter 8 The Nature of God: Essence and Attributes pg 119-133 (r 75-88)

Chapter 9 The Nature of God: Unity and Trinity pg 134-146 (r 89-99)

Chapter 10 The Decrees of God: pg 147-160 (r 100-110)

Chapter 11 The Works of God: Creation pg 161-172 (r 111-119)

Chapter 12 The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule pg 173 -188 (r 119-129)

Outlines of Chapter 1 The Nature and Necessity of Theology

pg 23-30 (r 1-6)

I. Introductions

A. Theology

1. The queen of the sciences
2. The science of God
3. Liberals, not believing Scripture, hold that it is unsafe to formulate any fixed views about God as 'theological truths.'
4. Evangelical scholarship, believing Scripture, hold that there are things about God which are stable and fixed.

B. Systematic Theology

1. The crown of the queen
2. Systematizing of the findings of the science

I. The Nature of Theology ... Derived from the Greek *Theos* and *logos*, or 'God' and 'word, discourse, and doctrine.' Defined as the 'Doctrine of God' pg 1

A. Theology and Ethics

1. Psychology inquires of the HOW and WHY of behavior.
2. Philosophical Ethics inquires of the MORAL QUALITY of conduct,
 - a) Descriptive ethics examines conduct in light of some STANDARD of right and wrong.
 - b) Practical ethics stresses MOTIVES for seeking to live up to such standards; i.e. hedonism, utilitarianism, perfectionism, or in combination- humanism.

- c) These philosophical ethics are developed on PURELY NATURALISTIC basis, with no doctrine of sin, no saviour, redemption, regeneration and divine indwelling for attaining its goals.

3. Christian Ethics

- a) Includes DUTIES TOWARD GOD.
- b) MOTIVE is affection for God, and willing submission to God.
- c) Includes the doctrines of the trinity, creation, providence, the fall, the incarnation, redemption, and eschatology (doctrine of final things)
- d) It completely differs from philosophical ethics for these do not belong properly to ethics.

B. Theology and Religion

1. To be religious is to be aware, or conscious, of the existence of a supreme being and to live in light of the demands of that supreme being.
2. The 'Christian Religion' is restricted to biblical Christianity, the true religion which is set forth in the Holy Scriptures.
3. The relation between theology and religion is that of effects
 - a) in systematic thought the facts concerning God and his relation to the universe lead to THEOLOGY, i.e organized thoughts and understandings.
 - b) in the sphere of individual collective life, the facts concerning God lead to RELIGION i.e organized actions and attitudes.

C. Theology and Philosophy

1. Different approach and method of attaining a comprehensive world and life view:

- a) Theology: God exists, graciously reveals himself, and is the cause of all things, except sin.
 - (1) God graciously reveals himself
 - (2) Study of God's revelation develops a world and life view.
 - (3) Rests upon a solid objective basis
 - b) Philosophy: some other thing exists, (water, air or fire, OR mind or ideas, OR nature or personality or life) and 'it' is sufficient to explain the existence of all other things.
 - (1) Denies God, denies His revelation of himself
 - (2) From the 'thing' given and the supposed powers inherent in it, the philosopher develops his world and life view.
 - (3) Rests on assumptions and speculation.
2. Theologian benefits from philosophy
- a) It furnishes some support of the Christian position
 - b) On the basis of conscience argues for the existence of God, freedom, and immorality.
 - c) It reveals the inadequacy of reason to solve the basic questions of existence.
 - d) It's emptiness makes the theologian irresistibly driven to God and the revelation he has made of himself for a treatment of doctrines.
 - e) To know a mans philosophy is to get possession of the key to understanding him and also to deal with his soul.
 - f) It alone can never bring a person to Christ (1Cor 1:21, 2:6-8)

II. The Necessity of Theology pg 27 (r 4)

A. The Organizing Instinct of the Intellect

1. Not content with mere accumulation of facts
2. Seeks for a unification and systematization of its knowledge.
3. Strives for understanding of relations, to defragment knowledge.

B. The Pervasive Character of the Unbelief of This Age.

C. The Character of Scripture.

D. The Development of an Intelligent Christian Character.

1. Man has a direct link between his belief and his character, not a little connection.
(true belief must be differentiated from intellectual ascent.)
2. Theology enlivens and enriches the Spiritual life, not a deadening effect.
3. Theology is a guide to intelligent thinking,
 - a) indicating norms and conduct
 - b) furnishing motives to move us to these norms

E. the Conditions for Effective Christian Service

1. Christ and Apostles preached doctrine
2. Christians exhorted to preach doctrine
3. believers are to be thoroughly indoctrinated

Outlines of Chapter 2 The Possibility and Divisions of Theology

pg 31-50 (r 7-22)

I. The Possibility of Theology

A. A Revelation of God

1. The general revelation of God (pg 7)

a) nature reveals God

(1) Pantheists – Naturalists via nature reject a God

(2) Deists – via nature is all sufficient revelation of God – reject Scriptures

(3) Actually – via nature there is but a limited knowledge of God's existence

• Christ is the light that lights every man (John 1:9)

b) history reveals God

(1) Acts 17:26 And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell

on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before

appointed, and the bounds of their habitation; 27 That they should seek

the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not

far from every one of us:

(2) particularly history of Israel reveals God

(3) Christ is the light that lights every man (John 1:9)

c) conscious reveals God

(1) sense of right vs wrong reveals the existence of God

(2) sense reveals God's nature, that it is right

(3) Christ is the light that lights every man (John 1:9)

2. The special revelation of God (pg10)

a) God reveals himself in miracles.

(1) life did not exist from eternity... it must have been created, reality of miracle!

i. Naturalists reject miracles *a priori*

ii. Pantheists reject miracles *a priori*

iii. Deists reject miracles *a priori*

(2) miracles rest on testimony

(3) physical resurrection of Christ, the best-attested miracle

(4) miracles still do happen, God answers prayer, and does things that laws of nature cannot account for.

(5) ever present ever-recurring miracle of regeneration.

(6) Christ is the light that lights every man (John 1:9)

b) God reveals himself in prophecy.

(1) There is undisputed foretelling of events, Kings of Israel, Alexander the Great, Babylonian captivity, and fall, Cyrus named 150 years *a priori*, Josiah etc.

(2) Beyond human insight or prescience.

(3) Numerous prophecies of his coming son

(4) Christ is the light that lights every man (John 1:9)

c) God has revealed himself in his son, Jesus Christ

- (1) The general revelation did not lead Gentiles to clear apprehension of the existence of God, nor the nature of God, nor the will of God
- (2) The additional special revelation in miracle, prophecy, and theophany did not lead Israel to a true nature and will of God
- (3) Christ is the center of history and of revelation of God's threefold revelation
 - i. God's Existence
 - ii. God's Nature
 - iii. God's Will
 - iv. Christ is the light that lights every man (John 1:9)
- d) God has revealed himself in Scripture
 - (1) the clearest and only inerrant revelation
 - (2) the embodiment of all revelations of God
- e) God has revealed himself in personal experience
 - (1) men of all ages, OT & NT, have had direct fellowship with God
 - (2) this 'communion' with God has had a direct transforming power

B. The Endowments of Man

1. his mental endowments
 - a) Three types of rationalistic reason
 - (1) Atheistic Rationalism – Greek philosophers
 - (2) Pantheistic Rationalism – Stoics (the universe is the deity)
 - (3) Theistic Rationalism – English and German Deism 18th cent.

- b) The difference between knowing and understanding
 - (1) A plant grows, voluntary muscles move, Christ is God-man
 - (2) Apprehensive reason – how can these things be?
 - (3) Manifestly credible vs manifestly incredible i.e. Cow jumping over the moon
- c) Reason must examine the credentials
- d) Reason must organize the facts

2. his spiritual endowments

- a) mystic spiritism, extreme pantheistic world view, rigorous discipline/contemplation, although real, cannot reveal apart from repentance and faith in Jesus Christ
- b) extreme forms of Pietism, Quakerism and Quietism, 17th cent, stressing absolute union with God, a congeniality with God beyond Scripture, cannot reveal apart from repentance and faith in Jesus Christ.

II. The divisions of Theology

- A. Exegetical Theology
- B. Historical Theology
- C. Systematic Theology
- D. Practical Theology

Outlines of Chapter 3 The Definition and Existence of God

pg 51-63 (r 23-31)

Part I Theism

- I. Theism in four senses:
 - A. The belief in a supernatural power or powers
 - B. The belief in the existence of but one God
 1. whether personal or impersonal
 2. whether present active or unpresent inactive
 3. includes monotheism, pantheism, and deism, but not atheism, polytheism nor henotheism (belief in one god without denying the existence of others)
 - C. The belief in a personal God who is both transcendent and immanent and exists in only one person. This is the Jewish, Mohammedan, and Unitarian conception of God opposed to atheism polytheism, pantheism and deism.
 - D. The belief in one personal God, both immanent and transcendent, who exists in three personal distinctions, known respectively as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This is Christian Theism opposed to all other conceptions named.
 1. Trinitarian Monotheism, i.e. Vs unitarian monotheism
 2. The only true theistic view, all others have a false conception of the revealed God

Chapter 3 The Definition and Existence of God 23

- I. The Definition of God
 - A. The Erroneous Uses of the Term

1. Plato states “God is the eternal mind, the cause of good in nature.”
 2. Spinoza “The absolute, universal Substance, the real Cause of all and every existence”
 3. Fichte “God is the moral order of the universe, actually operative in life”
 4. Strauss identified God with “*Universum*”
 5. Matthew Arnold, identified God as “Stream of Tendency that Makes for Righteousness.”
 6. In more recent abuses Kirtly F. Mather, a geologist, “God is a spiritual power, immanent in the universe, who is involved in the hazard of his creation”
 7. So much for non Biblical conceptions of God.
- B. The Biblical Names for God
1. *El*, with derivations *Elim*, *Elohim*, *Eloah*, in Greek *theos*, Latin *Deus*, English *God*.
 - a) The Hebrew plural *Elohim* is used regularly with singular verbs and adjectives to denote its singular idea, but triune Godhead
 - b) The compound *El-Elyon* designates him as “the most high” Ps 78:35
 - c) The compound *El-Shaddai* as the “Almighty God” Gen 17:1
 2. *Yahweh*, Jehovah is the personal name *par excellence* of Israel's God.
 - a) Term is connected to the Hebrew verb “to be,” and means the “self existing one” or the “one who causes to be” Translated with upper case letters.
 - b) It is used in a number of significant combinations:
 - (1) Jehovah-Jireh, the LORD will provide Gen 22:14

- (2) Jehovah-Rapha, the LORD that heals Exod 15:26
- (3) Jehovah-Nissi, the LORD our banner Exod 17:15
- (4) Jehovah-Shalom, the LORD our peace Judg. 6:24
- (5) Jehovah-Raah, the LORD my Shepherd Ps 23:1
- (6) Jehovah-Tsidkenu, the LORD our righteousness Jer. 23:6
- (7) Jehovah-Shammah, the LORD is present Ezek 48:35

3. *Adonai*, my Lord, is a title that appears frequently in the prophets

a) expressing dependence and submission

(1) as a servant to his master

(2) as a wife to her husband

b) The title Lord of Hosts appears frequently in the prophetic and post-exilic literature Isa 1:9; 6:3 (probably hosts of heaven not hosts of armies)

4. In the NT *theos* takes the place of *El*, *Elohim*, and *Elyon*.

a) The name *Shaddai* is rendered *pantokrator*, the Almighty

b) The name *El-Shaddai* is rendered *theos pantokrator*, God almighty.

5. Sometimes the Lord is called “Alpha and Omega” Rev. 1:8,

a) “who is and who was and who is to come” Rev. 1:4

b) “the first and the last” Rev. 2:8

c) “the beginning and the end” Rev. 21:6

C. The Theological Formulation of the Definitions

1. a comprehensive definition with an exhaustive portrayal of an infinite God is impossible

2. God is a being and we can indicate ways in which he differs from other beings.

II. The Existence of God

A. The Belief in the Existence of God is Intuitive

1. Rom 1:19 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.
2. Rom 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:
3. Rom 1:32 Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.
4. Rom 2:15 Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)
5. The religious element of our nature is just as universal as the rational or social one.
6. Denial of his existence is necessarily forced and/or trained and it is temporary.

B. The Existence of God is Assumed by the Scriptures

1. The Bible regards all men as believing in the existence of God.
2. The existence of God is thus taken for granted
3. Writers wrote with certitude concerning the existence of God to readers who were likewise assured of his existence.

C. The Belief in the Existence of God is Corroborated by Arguments

1. Bear in mind that:

- a) there are not independent proofs of the existence of God, but rather corroborations and expositions of our innate conviction of his existence
- b) since God is a spirit, we must not insist on the same type of proof that we demand for the existence of material things
- c) evidence is cumulative, a single argument being inadequate, but a number of them together being sufficient to bind the conscience and compel belief.

2. The cosmological argument

- a) Everything begun must have an adequate cause.
- b) The universe was begun.
- c) Heb 3:4 For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God.
- d) In astronomy and geology the present order is not eternal.
- e) Limitation: if every existing thing has an adequate cause, this also applies to God.

3. The theological argument

- a) Order and useful arrangement in a system imply intelligence and purpose in the organizing cause.
- b) The universe is characterized by order and useful arrangement, therefore the universe has an intelligent and free cause.

- c) Psalm 8:3 When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; 4 What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?
 - d) Psalm 19:1 The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.
 - e) Psalm 94:9 He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? 10 He that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?
 - f) Acts 14:17 Nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.
 - g) Limitations: it proves that a great and intelligent architect fashioned the world, but it does not prove that he was God.
4. The ontological argument.
- a) In the very idea of God is the proof of his existence.
 - b) Hoeksema writes this argument “argues that we have an idea of God. This idea of God is infinitely greater than man himself. Hence it cannot have its origin in man. It can only have its origin in God Himself.”
 - c) Limitation: We cannot prove real existence from mere abstract thought.
5. The moral argument.

- a) Hoeksema writes “Every man has a sense of obligation, of what is right and wrong, together with an undeniable feeling of responsibility to do what is right and a sense of self-condemnation when he commits what is evil.”
 - b) We must conclude that since this moral law is not self-imposed and these fears of judgment are not self-executing, there is a holy will that imposes this law and a punitive power that will execute the threats of our moral nature.
 - c) Micah 6:8 He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the LORD require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?
 - d) Conscience recognizes the existence of the great law giver and the certainty of the punishment of all violations of his law.
6. The argument from congruity
- a) The postulate that best explains all the related facts is probably true.
 - b) The belief in the existence of God best explains the facts of our moral, mental, and religious nature, as well as the facts of the material universe; therefore God exists.
 - c) To believe in a personal, self-sufficient, and self-revealing God is in harmony with our moral and mental nature.

Outlines of Chapter 4 The Non-Christian World Views

pg 64 - 75 (r 32- 42)

I. The Atheistic view

A. Three distinct types:

1. Practical atheism – having decided that all religions are fake, they live as if there is no God. Not confirmed atheists, but merely indifferent to God
2. Dogmatic atheism – one who openly professes atheism and boldly flaunt their atheism without fear of the reproach. Recently revived.
3. Virtual atheism – holds principles that are inconsistent with belief in God or that define him in terms that do violence to the common usage of language.
 - a) Most naturalists are such
 - b) Those who define God as an active principle in nature, the social consciousness, the unknowable, or energy, belong here as well

B. The atheistic position is a very unsatisfactory, unstable, and arrogant one.

C. Both Scripture and history show that man necessarily and universally believes in the existence of God. Atheism is contrary to mans deepest convictions.

D. Limited knowledge can infer the existence of God, but exhaustive knowledge of all things, intelligences, and times is needed to state dogmatically that there is not god.

II. The Agnostic View

A. Neither the existence nor the nature of God, nor yet the ultimate nature of the universe, is known or knowable.

B. Positivism in science and pragmatism in philosophy and theology are the outstanding types of agnosticism.

1. Auguste Comte (1798-1859) founded 'positivism' wherein nothing is accepted as true beyond the details of observed facts, which was dealt its death blow with Einstein's theory of relativity.
2. Pragmatism in philosophy and theology, like positivism in science, rejects a special revelation and the competence of reason in the study of ultimate reality.

C. The agnostic view is highly unsatisfactory and unstable, and often displays a false humility, claiming to know so little.

III. The Pantheistic view ... “the theory which regards all finite things as merely aspects, modifications or parts of one eternal and self-existent being; which views all material objects, and all particular minds, as necessarily derived from a single infinite substance”

Robert Fline, *Anti-Theistic Theories*

A. The leading types of Pantheism

1. Materialistic Pantheism – matter is eternal and the cause of all life and mind via spontaneous generation of life.
2. Hylozoism and Panpsychism – every particle of matter has a principle of life, being not atoms, but 'monads' i.e. little souls, thus mind and matter are inseparable.
3. Neutralism- ultimate reality is neither mind nor matter but neutral stuff, mind and matter are but appearances

4. Idealism – ultimate reality is of the nature of the mind, and that the world is the product of both individual and infinite mind.
 5. Philosophical Mysticism – the most absolute type of monism distinguishing between the outside world and the great Self and all finite selves wherein the 'knower' realizes he is identical with the inner being of his subject. ...
Transcendentalists.
- B. The Refutation of the Pantheistic Theories ... The human mind is particularly fond of monistic world views, i.e. union of mind and matter.
1. They are Necessitarian
 - a) They affirm that all freedom of second cause is denied; everything exists and acts of necessity.
 - b) Against this we affirm that we do have a consciousness and are free agents and that we are accountable for our conduct.
 2. They destroy the Foundation of Morals
 - a) They affirm that error and sin are necessitated:
 - (1) Sin is not absolute nor deserving of condemnation
 - (2) There is no standard of right and wrong
 - (3) God himself must be sinful and thus cannot punish sin
 - b) They have even deified evil and worship the deities who represent evil the most
 3. They make all Rational Religion Impossible

- a) In stressing the unification of human and divine they destroy human individuality.
 - b) True religion is the worship and service offered by a human being to the divine being.
4. They deny Personal Immortality; if man is but part of the infinite, as a wave on the sea, his decease is his dissolve.
 5. They deify man by making him part of God – flattering man and encouraging human pride
 6. They cannot account for concrete reality. - the universe is running down, then it is not self sustaining, and if not self sustaining then it had a creation.

IV. The Polytheistic View

- A. Monotheism was the original religion of mankind, but nature worship lead to nature personification and to nature deification. i.e. Jupiter worshipers
- B. In India endless polytheism of the Hindus developed from pantheism where every remarkable thing came to be called an 'avatar' or incarnation of God, either Brahma, Vishnu, or Shiva.
- C. In Egypt Ra or Re, the sun-god was the chief deity, Osiris and Seth, lesser gods, the latter became Satan of later Egyptian mythology.
- D. The Greeks made an elaborate counsel of six gods and six goddesses, an elaborate pantheon of 12 members. Zeus, Athene, and Appolo formed a triad, Poseidon, apollo and ares another.

E. The Romans had Jupiter as the head of their pantheon, identical to the Greek Zeus, but considered the special protector of Rome. With Juno, his wife and Minerva, goddess of wisdom, a magnificent temple was consecrated on Capitoline Hill. Mars was the god of war, Jupiter, Juno and Minerva constituted a Roman triad of gods.

F. Somehow, still today polytheism has a strong affinity for fallen human nature.

V. The Dualistic View = two distinct and irreducible substances in existence

A. In epistemology – idea and object

B. In metaphysics – mind and matter

C. In ethics – good and evil

D. In religion – good (god) and evil (satan) (In Christianity, however, Satan is not co-eternal with God but a creature created by and subject to Him.)

VI. The Deistic View

A. God is present in creation only by His power, not in His very being and nature

B. God endowed creation with invariable laws over which He exercises a mere general oversight.

C. God imparted to His creatures certain properties, placed them under His invariable laws, and left them to work out their destiny by their own powers

D. Deism denies a special revelation, miracles, and providence.

E. Deism claims all truths about God are discoverable by reason, and that the Bible is merely a book on the principles of natural religion, ascertainable by the light of nature.

F. Some modern evolutionary theories are deistic in their explanation of the universe.

G. A deistic absentee God is not much better than no God at all.

Outlines of Chapter 5 The Scriptures: The Embodiment of a Divine Revelation

pg 81-90 (r 43-49)

Part II Bibliology

- I. The Bible is the best source, superior to reason, mystical insight, and the Church
- II. Roman Catholicism has long claimed to be a higher authority than the Bible, it is misled
- III. God is not present in any organization but in every believer, they are illuminated and can see truth in His Word.
- IV. Scripture is the supreme source of Christian Theology, the final authority.

Chapter 5 The Scriptures: The Embodiment of a Divine Revelation 43

- I. The *A Priori* Argument
 - A. God being what he is, and man being what he is, a revelation from God is to be expected and
 - B. Such an embodiment of the revelation would be reliable, infallible and the source of theological truth.
 - C. This argument does not take us beyond the point of possibility or probability.
- II. The Argument from Analogy
 - A. Intelligent beings reveal themselves to each other.
 - B. Living things damaged or broken display the creators 'repairative goodness'
 - C. Death displays mans damage and breaking, we quest for eternal life, , it is reasonable that there is a repair.
- III. The Argument from the Indestructibility of the Bible

- A. Few books survive ¼ century. The Bible has survived 50 centuries, Whole and complete it has survived 20.
- B. The Bible has been repeatedly 'annihilated' yet always is preserved 'annihilation'
- C. The most forbidden book in any society, yet ever present.

IV. The Argument from the Character of the Bible

- A. It is the embodiment of divine revelation
 - 1. Recognizing the personality, unity and trinity of God
 - 2. Accounting for a creativity of man, created in the image of the creator.
 - 3. It reveals His will for man, and His provision for his salvation.
- B. It displays unity throughout (40 authors over 1600 years)
- C. Pache' "Only the Lord, for whom time has no meaning, can take in with a glance the destiny of all the universe."

V. The Argument from the Influence of the Bible

- A. No other book, Koran, Book of Morman, Science & Health, the Zend Avesta, and the Classics of Confucius included, has this kind of life changing, family changing, nation changing, and world changing influence
- B. Born again regenerated influence is unprecedented.
 - 1. Robert E. Lee, the great southern general in the Civil War, said: "The Bible is a book in comparison with which all others, in my eyes, are of minor importance, and which in all my perplexities and distresses has never failed to give me light and strength."

2. Woodrow Wilson, the American president during World War I, said: “The opinion of the Bible breed in me, not only by the teaching of my home when I was a boy, but also by every turn and experience of my life and every step of study is that it is the one supreme source of revelation, the revelation of the meaning of life, the nature of God, and the spiritual nature and needs of men. It is the only guide of life which really leads the spirit in the way of peace and salvation.”

VI. The Argument from the Fulfilled Prophecy

- A. Only God can reveal the future.
- B. Prophecies of Israel's dispersion
- C. Prophecies of Gentile nations.
- D. Prophecies of 4 great world empires.
- E. Prophecies of the preservation and restoration of Israel.

VII. The Claims of the Scriptures Themselves

- A. Claims to be a revelation and an infallible one at that.
- B. Claims “Now the Lord spoke to saying over and over, i.e. Over 3800 times!
- C. New Testament writers claim to present the message of God from God.

Conclusion: The force of the evidence is cumulative , each argument adds modicum of conclusive truth, in result one is forced to the conclusion that the Bible is the embodiment of a divine revelation.

Outlines of Chapter 6 The Genuineness, Credibility, and Canonicity

pg 91-104 (r 50-61)

I. The Genuineness of the Books of the Bible i.e. Written in the time traditionally assigned to it, and/or by the author traditionally assigned to it. (Authentic means it relates facts as they really occurred.)

A. The Genuineness of the Books of the Old Testament

1. The genuineness of the books of the Law

a) Conservative Scholars confirm that Moses' authorship is:

(1) via his probable access to cuneiform tablets from Abraham and prior,

(2) via oral tradition passed down

(3) and via direct revelation from God

b) Modernist scholars vehemently deny the former and latter of these

(1) modernists acknowledge only a loose oral tradition enhanced as fable

(2) contend that there were many authors expecting that

i. Jehovistic authors wrote some, referring to Jehovah as God

ii. Elohist authors wrote some, referring to Elohim as God

iii. Deuteronomistic authors wrote some, repeating some laws

iv. and Priestly authors wrote some, referring to 'cultic' practices

c) The Pentateuch, however, is homogeneous throughout all 5 volumes, and on the modernists.

2. The genuineness of the books of the Prophets

a) Former Prophets

- (1) Joshua wrote Joshua, Samuel wrote Judges, 1&2 Samuel, Jeremiah compiled 1&2 Kings prior to the Babylonian Captivity
- (2) Authenticity of these has no sound naysayers
- b) Latter Prophets
 - (1) Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the 12 minor prophets
 - (2) All are homogeneous, authentic, genuine, with no sound naysayers
 - (3) (Daniel and Lamentations, that we normally categorize here are not)
3. The genuineness of the books of the Kethubhim (Hbrw כתב katab = writings, to grave, to write)
 - a) Poetry Books
 - (1) Psalms, 100 assigned to authors, 73 to David, 11 to sons of Korah, 12 to Asaph, 2 to Solomon, 1 to Ethan, 1 to Moses, ergo 50 unassigned to a specific Author
 - (2) Proverbs authored by Solomon
 - (3) Job authored, logically, by Job
 - b) Megilloth (Hbrw מגילת megilaw = roll, book, volume, writing)
 - (1) Song of Solomon by Solomon, Ruth unverifiable by Samuel who wrote Judges, Lamentations by Jeremiah, Ecclesiastes by Solomon, Esther likely by Mordecai
 - (2) All are authentic and genuine with no significant naysayers
 - c) Historical Books
 - (1) Daniel

- i. Daniel is clearly ascribed to Daniel, is written in the first person, in it Daniel was commanded to write, and it shows unity throughout.
- ii. Modernists, refusing to believe its predictive prophecy of kingdoms not yet in existence, must place it into the Maccabean period (166 BC) and assign it to a deceitful pseudo-author.

(2) Ezra by Ezra, Nehemiah by Nehemiah, both ascribed, authentic, genuine and homogeneous throughout

(3) Chronicles, dealing with the more priestly aspects than Kings' dealing with prophetic aspects, is traditionally assigned to Ezra

B. The genuineness of the books of the New Testament

1. Thiessen states "There is reason for believing the Synoptic Gospels were written in the order Matthew, Luke, Mark" (N2S And that the Bible's ordering of these books is wrong!?)

- a) Note To Self (N2S): 'Synoptic Gospel' as used by Thiessen here is the expression invented by liberal infidel scholars trying to promote their blasphemous 'Source Criticism' and contend that God is not the source of these writings, but 'Evangelical Synergism' is the source. A 'conservative' theologian should never use the term without clarifying that source.
- b) Note To Self: The same ill sources of the 'Synoptic Problem' is the driving force that would have us re-arrange the order of these gospels and Thiessen should not be lending them an ounce of credence without a pound of warning. Instead he gives full credence and no warning. Shame.

2. Tradition declares ... Matthew wrote Matthew
3. Also on the basis of the famous statement in Papias Matthew wrote Matthew
4. There is very general agreement that Mark wrote Mark
5. There is also very general agreement that Luke wrote Luke
6. The Gospel of John is rejected by some:
 - a) Because it emphasizes the Deity of Christ. (N2S Which the Gnostic producers of the Alexandrian Texts reject)
 - b) (N2S) 'Some' needs to be clarified to be those liberal source criticism skeptics who contend that John is not a real gospel because it is not 'synoptic' like Matt, Luke, Mark. Such is balderdash.
 - c) (N2S) This Ferdinand Christian Baur (1792-1860), called the brilliant Tubingen professor, by Thiessen? (more likely Doerksen) is barely exposed by Thiessen. Finally but not emphatically Thiessen mildly exposes 'the brilliant professor' Baur, the defender of dialectic gospel constructions (i.e. Dialectic = by arguing, vs Rhetoric = by preaching), and the founder of heretical, rationalistic, naturalistic New Testament 'higher criticism', i.e. Source Criticism, Redaction Criticism (i.e. Editors changing, revising, and rechanging the texts of the NT until they evolved to what we have today!), Form Criticism; and a proponent of 'lower criticism' i.e. Textual criticism wherein all priority is given to the Gnostic's Bible from Alexandria Egypt.
 - d) (N2S) These brazen attackers of the genuineness of the NT are not addressed in Thiessen's inadequate coverage here.

7. It is generally ascribed that Luke wrote Luke
8. Ten of the 'so called' Pauline Epistles are *today* for the most part attributed to Paul.
9. Doubt is cast on the Pastoral Epistles (1,2 Tim, Titus) on the basis of form... (N2S) Heretic Baur's¹⁷ form criticism¹⁸, that is. Thiessen leaves this doubt hanging from over these epistles. Shame on him.
10. Hebrews is unanimous
11. James & Jude undoubtedly by brothers of Jesus
12. 'Some' cast doubt on 2Peter because of style. (N2S) see N2S on ix above
13. The 3 epistles of John & Rev were written by the Apostle John

II. The Credibility of the Books of the Bible (Truthfulness)

A. The Credibility of the Books of the Old Testament

1. The proof from Christ's recognition of the Old Testament.
 - a) Christ received the OT as truthful and doctrinal. Matt 5:17f, Lu 24:27, 44f, John 10:34-36
 - b) Christ endorsed the direct creation of man. Matt 19:4
 - c) Christ endorsed the personality of Satan John 8:44

¹⁷ Ferdinand Christian Baur (June 21, 1792 – December 2, 1860) was a German theologian and leader of the Tübingen school of theology (named for University of Tübingen). Following Hegel's theory of dialectic, Baur argued that 2nd century Christianity represented the synthesis of two opposing theses: Jewish Christianity and Pauline Christianity. In the field of higher criticism, he proposed a late date for the pastoral epistles. From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ferdinand_Christian_Baur accessed 7/31/2010

¹⁸ Form criticism denies Biblical inspiration and operates on the premise that biblical text is derived from an oral tradition. It claims that the creative process has produced a number of layers, each with a particular meaning. ... "Form criticism is a method of biblical criticism that classifies units of scripture by literary pattern (such as parables or legends) and that attempts to trace each type to its period of oral transmission.[1] Form criticism seeks to determine a unit's original form and the historical context of the literary tradition.[2] Hermann Gunkel originally developed form criticism to analyze the Hebrew Bible. It has since been used to supplement the documentary hypothesis explaining the origin of the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Hebrew Bible) and to study the Christian New Testament." from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Form_criticism

- d) Christ endorsed World flood & Noah Luke 17:26
- e) Christ endorsed Destruction of Sodom & Gomorrah Luke 17:28-30
- f) Christ endorsed revelations of God to Moses Mark 12:26
- g) Christ endorsed the giving of Manna John 6:32
- h) Christ endorsed Moses' authorship of Pentateuch
- i) Christ endorsed the existence of the tabernacle Luke 6:3
- j) Christ endorsed Jonah in 'the big fish' Matt 12:39

(1) (N2S) Christ actually used whale not fish, modernist insert fish here to defend their change of Christ's word in the ASV, NASB, but the Greek 2785 κητος ketos = whale is in the Bible, not the Greek 3795 οψαριον opsarion = fish, while in the Hebrew of Jonah the Hebrew 01709 דג dag dawg = fish is used not the Hebrew 08577 תנין tanniyn = sea monster, dragon, serpent, whale, for obvious literal reasons, obvious unless you are a NASB translator who wants to correct the wording of the Christ!

- k) Christ endorsed the unity of Isaiah Matt 8:17, Luke 4:17
- l) Christ (who is the truth) knew the facts & was not erroneous

2. The proof derived from history and archeology.

- a) Correctness about Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Media Persia, + etc.
- b) We now have proof and know the Bible was correct about –

(1) Assyrian King Sargon II not being Shelmaneser IV as the world supposed.

(2) About Belshazzar of Dan 5 when the world thought him fiction.

(3) About Darius the Meade of Dan 5, who the world thought was fiction

- c) The Babylonian epic of creation is a polluted mirror of the Biblical account.
(N2S) (So to China, and Inuit accounts)
- d) The Babylonian epic of a world flood is a polluted mirror of the Biblical account. (N2S) (So to China, and Inuit accounts)
- e) Genesis 14s Battle of the Kings was thought to be fiction until the inscription in the valley of the Euphrater proved the Biblical record true.
- f) "evolution of writing" falsified by Egyptian findings
- g) The Hittites did not exist in worlds history, until man dug a little deeper.
- h) Tel-el-Amarna tables proved the book of Judges to be trustworthy
- i) (N2S) "Every time an archaeologist sinks his shovel into the ground the Bible is proven right and the skeptic wrong."

B. The Credibility of the Books of the New Testament

- 1. The writers of the New Testament were competent
 - a) They were qualified eye-witnesses (Mark interpretor for the eyewitness Peter)
(Luke the companion of Apostle Paul)
 - b) Paul called and Appointed by Christ as an Apostle
 - c) James and Jude were brothers of Christ and presented this background.
- 2. The writers of the New Testament were honest
 - a) set a moral tone
 - b) had regard for truth
 - c) were honest men not deliberate deceivers
 - d) their testimony endangered their lives, i.e not for worldly gain

3. Their writings harmonized with each other.
 - a) John agreed with "synoptic gospels" (N2S to use the heretic's phrase for Matt, Mark, and Luke ... in that order too)
 - b) Acts harmonizes with Paul's epistles
 - c) All fit the 1st cent. And harmonize with each other.
4. Their accounts agree with history and experience.
 - a) Cyrenius Governor of Syria, Luke 2:2 ... Sure Enough!
 - b) Herod the Great (Psychopath) Matt 2:16-18 ... Sure Enough!
 - c) Herod Agrippa I Acts 12:1, Sure Enough!
 - d) Gallio of Acts 18:12-17, ... Sure Enough!
 - e) Herod Agrippa II of Acts 25:13-26 ,... Sure Enough!
 - f) Harmony with History? ... Sure Enough!

III. The Canonicity of the Books of the Bible (Canon is measuring rod or standard OR a Counsel of Man Approval, OR Measured and Approved as inspired of God (by God without necessity of any counsel of man lending approval) ,... the latter please)

A. The Canonicity of the Books of the Old Testament

1. Book divisions, i.e. Law, Prophets, Kethubbim (Hbrw for writings) is completely independent of canonicity
2. Canonicity of Ecclesiastes was not settled until `Council of Jamnia in 90 AD
3. Discussions (dissension) continued for sometime, settled reasonably by 200 AD
4. How many radical dissents can hinder canonicity?
5. Jewish scholars contend canonization was settled by Ezra the Scribe.

6. Apocrypha (in Egyptian produced Greek Septuagint) was never in the Hebrew Cannon.
- B. The Canonicity of the Books of the New Testament
1. Shaped by the obviously genuine character of the books
 2. Apostolicity was of primary importance (N2S Makes Cannon 1st Cent.)
 3. "Suitability for public reading ",and "universality" (universal acceptance by Churches) were sometimes considered as a measure rod (canon)
 4. evidence of inspiration as a rule
 5. 7 books held hostage by rules Heb, 2,3 John, 2Peter, Jude, James, Revelation
 6. These 7 were recognized as apostolic
 7. the 27 book canon considered closed by the 4th cent.
 8. For the west, the Damasine Council of Rome in 382 AD and or the 3rd counsel of Carthage in 397 AD.
 9. There are ALWAYS naysayers.

Outlines of Chapter 7 The Inspiration of the Scriptures

pg 105-118 (r 62-74)

I. The Definition of Inspiration

A. Related Terms

1. Revelation- The communication of truth that cannot otherwise be discovered:
 - a) while *inspiration* has to do with the recording of the revealed will,
 - b) we can have revelation without inspiration. i.e. The thunderings tht John heard were not to be recorded.
 - c) We can have inspiration without revelation. i.e. Recorded eyewitness accounts of history are inspired.
2. Inspiration- The recording of truth involving the Spirit of God moving upon men to write, God breathed, et.all.
3. Authority- The divine Authority of God on the Bible making it binding upon man, creed and church.¹⁹
4. Inerrancy & Infallibility- It is without error [in the original manuscripts]²⁰ in all that it affirms whether historical, scientific, moral, or doctrinal matters.²¹
5. Illumination- since sin darkened man's understanding, Scripture must needs be illumined by God to be understood.

19 N2S a definition should generally not use the word it is defining

20 I have ordered an early 1949 version of Thiessen, expecting that these modernist inclusions were inserted by Vernon D. Doerksen in the 1979 revised edition when the polluted NASB was substituted for the pure Words of God as used by Thiessen. Doerksen and other modernists did not believe in inerrancy.

21 N2S Doerksen's addition of "in the original manuscript" implies that my copy likely has error in historical facts, error in scientific fact, error in moral fact and error in doctrinal matters. Those 4 words added to Thiessen's definition imply my copy may be fallible and that the copy that Paul commended to young Timothy might not have been inspired, because it was not the original, ... it was just a copy. These are very dangerous 4 words.

B. Inadequate Theories of Inspiration- PROBLEMS = Scripture contain some truth but not the truth.

1. Natural inspiration or the intuition theory = inspiration is merely a superior insight on the part of natural man.
 - a) Church hymns are then inspired as well?
 - b) PROBLEM = Confuses the spirits work of illumination with inspiration.
2. The dynamic or partial inspiration theory = God supplied the ability for trustworthy transmission of the truth.
 - a) infallible in regards to faith and practice
 - b) fallible in regards to history and science
 - c) PROBLEM = who can tell truth from error? Clergy? Catholic Priests?
3. The theory that the thoughts, not the words, are inspired = God suggested the thoughts but left it up to man to put revelation into words.
 - a) Scriptures DO indicate that the WORDS were inspired
 - b) All means All, and that's all all means.
 - c) PROBLEM = It is inconceivable to disassociate words from thoughts!
4. The theory that the Bible contains the Word of God = The Bible is a human book
 - a) i.e. THEY SAY Supernatural myth and miraculous tales are only to convey truth, never intended to be believed.
 - b) Interpreter must strip away myth and discover hidden truth.
 - c) PROBLEM = Bible may say one thing to one, another to another.
 - d) The cliché “That is just your interpretation” is born.

5. The dictation theory = The authors were mere pens not beings with individuality
 - a) The style and grammar is the Holy Spirits.
 - b) This ignores manifest differences in style.

C. The Biblical Doctrine of Inspiration

1. Defined: The Holy Spirit so guided and superintended the writers of the sacred text, making use of their own unique personalities, that they wrote all that he wanted them to write, without excess or error.
2. Inspiration is inexplicable (i.e. we do not know exactly how the power of the Holy Spirit operates in it.)
3. Inspiration in this sense is limited to the authors of Scripture.
4. Inspiration is essentially guidance, i.e. supervised the selection of material and the words to be employed.
5. The Holy Spirit preserved the authors from all error and from all omission.
6. Inspiration extends to the words,, thus is plenary verbal.
7. Inspiration is affirmed only for the autographs of Scripture, not any of the versions.²²
8. Inspiration is not affirmed of ANY Hebrew or Greek manuscripts in existence, NOR of any critical text known! (N2S: There you have it, in Thiessen's? own words, THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS INSPIRATION IN EXISTENCE TODAY, AND THEIR NEVER WAS!!!)

²² N2S In this subtle point Thiessen, (or more likely Doerksen) requires that no translation of the Scriptures is touched by inspiration, aligning his dominoes for a long distance fall from all aspects of inspiration.

9. No doctrine is effected b this situation. (N2S: How can Thiessen (likely Doerksen) completely remove from existence any inspired Bible anywhere in the world, from any time period ever, and say no doctrine is effected by this situation? How about the 3000 year old doctrine of inspiration of Scriptures? He sure is mucking up that doctrine with his unbelievable 'situation'!
10. Doerksen / Thiessen attempts to differentiate between inspiration and authority because the Bible accurately records the lies that Satan made with verbose argument (deemed by this student as trivially unnecessary considering his more preposterous elimination of inspiration.)

II. The Proofs of Inspiration

A. The Character of God: “It is improbable that God would reveal a fact or doctrine to the human mind, and do nothing towards securing an accurate (AND PRESERVED) statement of it.²³

B. The Character and Claims of the Bible

1. Character

a) The Bible is superiour to all other religious books in content.

- (1) highest ethical standards
- (2) enjoins the most absolute obedience
- (3) denounces every form of sin
- (4) informs the sinner of the cure

²³ N2S Equally improbable that he would let all inspired copy vanish with the original autograph! Don't you think.
... I mean Don't you THINK!

- b) The Bible displays a remarkable unity. (66 books by 40 authors over 1600 years but one book)
 - (1) one doctrinal viewpoint
 - (2) one moral standard
 - (3) one plan of salvation
 - (4) one program of ages
 - (5) one world view
 - c) Law and Grace are bound up with the dispensational purpose of God: - Jewish political and religious bound together temporarily ... not for present
 - d) No other sacred books display such organic unity as found in Scripture
2. It claims to be the Word of God
- a) Scripture speaking of itself as it were
 - (1) More than 3,800 times in OT “Thus saith the Lord”
 - (2) NT used phrases as “declaring unto you the whole purpose of God” ... “in words taught by the Spirit”
 - (3) Various writers claim absolute perfection and authority for the law and the testimony
 - (4) One book recognizes another's absolute finality.
 - (5) Peter puts the epistle of Paul on par with “the rest of Scripture.” (2Pet 3:15)
 - (6) Paul declares the whole OT to be inspired in 2Tim 3:16
 - (7) Peter declares it is not of private interpretation ²⁴

24 N2S Thiessen did not use the horrid inept translation of 2Pet 1:20 as given by Doerksen.

b) The Lords view on inspiration

- (1) Scripture cannot be broken
- (2) It all had teaching concerning himself
- (3) He came not to abolish, but fulfill
- (4) His do and title analogy is **at least** verbal plenary
- (5) Foretold the preservation and inspiration of himself and his mission i.e.
Holy Spirit will guide you into all truth.
- (6) The Apostles make claim to receiving this Spirit to guide them into all
truth

III. The Objections to this View of Inspiration

A. Quotations of Ignorance or Error – Paul “wist not, brethren, that he was high priest”
deals with an area of Paul's confessed ignorance with no bearing on inspiration

B. In Science and History

1. Not a science or history text book.
2. Uses the language of appearance , i.e. rising sun, not rotating earth, etc.
3. fragmentary character of some accounts is God's design not Scriptures ineptness
(N2S Doerksen does not believe this and adds to Thiessen, “the fallibility of the
scribed” as show of his criticism (higher and lower) and modernism.)
4. Accused disparages – Number fell in Num 25:9 plague vs NT account; level
place of Luke vs Matt 5's mountainside; (mountainsides do have level places) Old
Jericho and New Jericho separated cf Matt 20 Mark 10, Luke 8

- C. In Miracle and Prophecy “When the fact of God is accepted ... there can be no legitimate reason for denying His supernatural interventions where and when he wills.”
- D. In Quoting and Interpreting the Old Testament
1. Sometimes NT writers merely express OT ideas not verbatim quotes
 2. Sometimes they point out typical elements from atypical passages
 3. Sometimes they give credit to an earlier prophet when 'quoting' from later for of it (Matt 27:9, Zech 11:13)
 4. Sometimes they give statement that is close to and perceived by modernists as from the (unreliable) Greek Septuagint.²⁵
 5. Sometimes they combine two (or several) 'quotations' into one and assign the whole to the more prominent author.²⁶
 6. If NT authors were inspired they can change or 'misquote' anything they please and be right.
- E. In Morals and Religion
1. So called errors disappear when we consider
 - a) Sinful acts of man are recorded. i.e. Noah's drunkenness, Lot's incest, Jacob's lies, etc.

25 N2S I had to fix the horrid wording of this understanding from pg 71

26 N2S Thiessen's entanglement in the OT 'quotations' criticisms (if it is not Doerksen's) needs clarification that 1) 'quotations' were not perceived with such pristine exactness as expected today. 2) Modernists inflation of the age and importance of the Greek Septuagint is completely unwarranted, the all Hebrew authors of all 66 books read Hebrew fluently.

- b) Some evil acts appear sanctioned but it is the good intention or accompanying virtue sanctioned NOT the evil . i.e. Rahab's faith, Jael's patriotism, Samson's faith, etc
 - c) somethings are permitted as relative not absolute, i.e. divorce, retaliations.
 - d) Some prayers and divine command express the purposes of God who uses man to carry out his designs i.e. imprecatory Psalms, Assyrian Savagery, Canaanite inhalations.
2. Misapprehensions have charged that some books should not even be in the Bible, but perceiving the true design of these makes them each indispensable to the scheme of Bible doctrine.

Outlines of Chapter 8 The Nature of God: Essence and Attributes

pg 119-133 (r 75-88)

Part III Theology

I. The Essence of God = Substance

A. Spirituality i.e. not material substance John 4:24 God is Spirit, no Greek article 'a'

1. He is immaterial and incorporeal
 - a) does not have flesh
 - b) hand/eye/ear of God are anthropomorphic uses for expression and revelation
 - c) Man has finite spirit containable in finite body ... God not so much
2. He is invisible
 - a) Israelites did not see any form Deut 4:15-19
 - b) No man can see him and live
 - c) No man has seen God John 1:18
 - d) The invisible God Col 1:15 cf Rom 1:20
 - e) Redeemed will some day see him Ps 17:15
 - f) Men saw God saw the reflection of His Glory
 - g) Moses saw the 'back' of his glory
 - h) Theophanies = deity in visible form i.e. Jacob wrestled with God
3. He is alive
 - a) The living God
 - b) Feeling, power, activity
 - c) source of all life

4. He is a person i.e. has personality – self conscious – self determination
 - a) psychological characteristics of personality – intellect - sensibility – volition
 - b) qualities of relations – speaking – seeing – hearing – grieving – repenting – anger – jealousy - compassion

B. Self Existence

1. “I am THAT I am” says it all
2. “I am WHO I am” don't cut it thank you not Vernon D. Doerksen

C. Immensity = infinite in relation to space

D. Eternity = infinite in relation to time

1. Free from all succession of time
2. without beginning without end i.e. self existent
3. Abundantly taught in Scripture “The everlasting Father”
4. God alone possesses immortality 1Tim 6:16
5. Both time and space contain the finite, God is infinite
6. Both time and space will someday merge into eternity and heaven, but our finiteness will always be finite, thus space, real and time with succession?
7. N2S Christ resurrected body transcended space and matter, does it transcend time? Will we?

II. The Attributes of God (Possible Divisions = Natural/Moral, Immanent/Transitive, Positive/Negative, Soul/Intellect/Will, here Non-Moral/Moral)

A. The Non-Moral Attributes

1. Omnipresence = All present

- a) Not pantheism = a little bit present in everything
 - b) Infinite God transcends finite space
2. Omniscience = All knowing
- a) He knows himself perfectly
 - b) The Father, the Son, and the Spirit know each other perfectly
 - c) Knows inanimate creation perfectly
 - d) God knows all things possible.
 - e) God knows the future²⁷
3. Omnipotence = Almighty, All powerful
- a) comprehending that he cannot act contrary to his nature
 - b) having power does not demand that he use it
 - c) He has power to override mans free will
4. Immutability = unchangeable in essence
- a) Attributes consciousness and will
 - b) All change must be for the better or worse²⁸, God cannot go either way.
 - c) Would make him less wise, good, or holy ²⁹
 - d) God who cannot repent (Num 23:19) does repent because when his dealings with man changed, ... He did not?

B. The Moral Attributes

27 N2S At some point we have crossed over what God reveals about his knowledge and what we speculate he must know because he has infinite knowledge, i.e. All the verses used to support omniscients are in the present tense, not the future tense. Therein we boggel things up about foreknowledge.

28 N2S This makes good logic but is not necessarily true is it.

29 N2S Again, this is attractive logic but not necessarily true.

1. Holiness = Absolutely separate from and exalted above all his creatures, equally separate from all moral evil and sin.
 - a) This is not really an attribute that is coordinate with others, but coextensive of them all
 - (1) denotes perfection in all he is
 - (2) eternal conformity to his being and his will
 - (3) God's will is the expression of his nature ... which is Holy
 - (4) Holiness occupies the foremost rank among the attributes of God
 - i. God wanted it especially revealed in OT
 - ii. It is emphasized by the bounds set on Sinai when he came down upon it.
 - iii. In the divisions within the tabernacle then temple with a most holy place
 - iv. In the prescribing of offerings if an Israelite would approach God
 - v. the special priesthood to mediate
 - vi. the many laws about impurity (which seemingly extreme)
 - vii. the feasts of Israel
 - viii. the special position of Israel in 'Palestine'
 - (5) In the NY holiness is less frequently emphasized
 - i. Holiness as attribute still given greater emphasis than God's love, will, or power. For holiness is the regulatory principle of love, will, and power.

- b) There is a chasm between God and the sinner
 - Sinner is estranged from God, God is estranged from Sinner
 - (1) Before sin there was fellowship , after sin none
- c) Man must approach God through the merits of another
 - (1) Cannot acquire a sinlessness to approach God
 - (2) Only Christ has made such access possible
 - (3) Herein lies the reason and understanding of the atonement
- d) We should approach God 'with reverence and awe'
 - (1) a corrected view of his holiness gives a proper view of sin
 - (2) correct view brings humiliation, contrition, and confession

2. Righteousness and Justice

- a) Holiness as seen in treatment of His creatures
- b) Foundations of his throne Ps 89:14, 97:2
- c) Cause for a moral government
- d) Cause for bestowal of reward and punishment
 - (1) remunerative (reward) based on His love not strict merit
 - (2) Punitive based on divine wrath
 - i. punishment is not for rehabilitation but for maintenance of justice
 - ii. rehab and deterrence are just side effects
- e) Cause for vindicating his people from evildoers
- f) Encourages believers who are secured in Christ and assured their right will not go unnoticed.

3. Goodness = includes holiness, righteousness, and truth, but primarily (here) love, benevolence, mercy and grace.

a) The love of God

(1) perfect love = not mere emotional impulse, and not denial of feeling

(2) perfect love is grounded in truth, holiness and will

(3) causes grieving over sin of his people

(4) Exercised first in trinity

(5) Testified throughout Scripture

(6) Assured love is comfort to believers

b) Benevolence of God = his dealing bountifully, tenderly, and kindly with all his creatures.

(1) The Lord is good to all

(2) The eyes of all look to thee

(3) Thou dost open thy hand and satisfy the desire of every living thing

(4) concern for welfare of

(5) causes sun and rain .. on all

c) The mercy of God = His goodness towards those in misery or distress

(1) Compassion, pity and loving kindness are synonyms to mercy

(2) Eternal necessary quality in God

(3) It is FREE or not mercy

(4) God is rich in mercy

d) The grace of God = Goodness manifest toward ill deserving

- (1) Grace has respect to sinful man as guilty while mercy has respect for him as miserable and pity full
- (2) Scripture speaks of glory of, and riches of His grace, manifold grace and true grace.
- (3) exercise of Grace, like mercy is optional with God.

4. Truth = God is truth

- a) eternally conformed to reality
- b) genuine and truthfulness
- c) source of all truth
- d) He is ultimate truth when
 - (1) senses deceive
 - (2) consciousness is untrustworthy
 - (3) things are not what they appear
 - (4) existence seems only a dream
- e) Pilate to Jesus, "What is truth?"; Jesus to world "I am the truth."
- f) He is veracity and faithfulness
 - (1) veracity is his revelations are truth
 - (2) faithfulness is he will fulfill his promises

Romans 11:33,36 "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable *are* his judgments, and his ways past finding out! ... 36 For of him, and through him, and to him, *are* all things: to whom *be* glory for ever. Amen."

"In the presence of deity, the child of God falls down and worships. Omniscience is not ignorant; God knows. Love is not indifferent; he cares. Omnipotence is not powerless; he acts." Omnipresence is not absence, he is there.

Outlines of Chapter 9 The Nature of God: Unity and Trinity

pg 134-146 (r 89-99)

I. The Unity of God

A. There is but one God

B. Undivided and Indivisible

C. Important for understanding the Deity of Christ

II. The Trinity of God ...Thiessen ...“There are three eternal distinctions in the one divine essence, known respectively as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.. These three distinctions are three persons, and so we may speak of the tri-personality of God.” “Flint ... “A mystery indeed, yet one which explains many other mysteries, and which sheds a marvelous light on God, on nature, and on man.”

A. Intimations in the Old Testament

1. Pluralism of Elohim
2. Jehovah distinguished from Jehovah
3. Jehovah has a Son
4. The Spirit is distinguished from God
5. The Trisagias of Scripture seem to intimate a Trinity
6. The Aaronic benediction seems to intimate the same
7. Special attention to “The Angel of Jehovah”

B. The Teaching of the New Testament

1. General statement of allusions
2. The Father is recognized as God

3. The Son is recognized as God
 - a) the attributes of deity
 - (1) eternity
 - (2) the firstborn of every creature
 - (3) omnipresent and omniscient
 - (4) He is omnipotent
 - (5) He is immutable
 - b) The offices of deity
 - (1) He is the Creator
 - (2) He is the Upholder
 - c) The prerogatives of deity
 - (1) He forgives sin
 - (2) He raises the dead
 - (3) He will execute all judgment
 - d) His identification with Jehovah
 - (1) He was the creator
 - (2) Was seen by Isaiah
 - (3) Preceded by a forerunner
 - (4) to be among God's people
 - (5) to be sanctified
 - (6) Lead captivity captive
 - e) Names that imply deity

(1) Metaphors of Himself

- i. I am the bread which came down from heaven
- ii. I am the door
- iii. I am the way
- iv. I am the vine

(2) Isaiah fulfillment

- i. Born of a Virgin
- ii. Called Immanuel

(3) He was the WORD

- i. Emphasizes his Deity
- ii. From the personification of Wisdom
- iii. Personification of the Word

(4) Son of Man

- i. His humiliation
- ii. His veiling of divine nature
- iii. The authority on earth to forgive sins
- iv. Gives life, a ransom for many

(5) Lord

- i. Used of God the Father
- ii. a title of courtesy
- iii. as a name of a master or owner
- iv. as a title of address to the Christ

(6) Son of God

- i. applied to him by others
- ii. He accepts its application
- iii. Only begotten son, makes him the messiah
- iv. As the Son of God he:
 - executes all judgment
 - has life in himself and to quicken whom He will
 - he gives eternal life
 - is honored of the Father

(7) God, called so 7 times

- i. John 1:1 “The Word was God”
- ii. John 1:18 “the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father”
- iii. John 20:28 “My Lord and my God”
- iv. Titus 2:13 “God and Saviour Jesus Christ”
- v. Heb 1:8 “To the Son, he saith Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever”
- vi. 2Pet 1:1 “righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ”
- vii. 1Tim 3:16 “God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit”...

f) Certain relations proving his deity

- (1) Side by side in the Baptismal formula
- (2) Side by side in the Apostolic benedictions
- (3) He is the image of God
- (4) All the fullness of the Godhead dwells in Him bodily

- (5) He and the Father are one.
- (6) He and the Father act together
- (7) What the Father has is Christ's
- g) Divine ownership rendered to Him and accepted by Him
 - (1) God only was to be worshiped
 - (2) Men and angels refused the worship
 - (3) Jesus did not, he accepted worship
- h) Christ's own consciousness
 - (1) At 12 he recognized the peculiar claims of His Father, God
 - (2) At his baptism He was assured of his special Sonship
 - (3) in the Sermon on the Mount He sets Himself over the ancients
 - (4) He gave his disciples power to do miracles
 - (5) He asserted his pre-existence
 - (6) Prayer is to be offered in His name
 - (7) He and the Father were one
- 4. The Holy Spirit is recognized as God
 - a) He is a person
 - (1) Personal pronouns are used of Him
 - (2) neuter *pneuma* is referred to by the masculine pronoun
 - (3) He has three essential elements of personality
 - i. Intellect
 - ii. Sensibility

iii. Will

- (4) He acts as a person: He works, He searches, He speaks, He testifies, He teaches, He reproves, He glorifies Christ
- (5) He is susceptible of personal treatment

b) His is a divine Person

- (1) Attributes of deity are attributed to him, as eternity, as omniscience, as omnipresence.
- (2) Works of deity are attributed to him, such as creation, regeneration, inspiration, raising of the dead,
- (3) His association with the Father and the Son
- (4) His words are considered the word of God
- (5) He is expressly called Gods

C. Some Observations and Deductions bases on the Study of the Trinity

- 1. This doctrine is not in conflict with the unity of God
- 2. These distinctions are eternal
- 3. The three are equal
- 4. The doctrine has great practical value
 - a) Eternal love
 - b) Only God can reveal God
 - c) Only God can atone for sin.
 - d) It is hard to conceive of personality existing without society.

Outlines of Chapter 10 The Decrees of God

pg 147-160 (r 100-110)

I. The Definition of the Decrees

A. *Thiessen's inept assertion* “Decrees are not, as some erroneously suppose, inconsistent with free agency” !!!

1. Thiessen begins his doctrine of decrees acknowledging that “we come to the most mooted questions in theology,”
2. Moot - “a hypothetical case argued by law students, an exercise ... to bring up as a subject of debate discussion or debate ... subject to debate; arguable.”
3. Obviously Thiessen is acknowledging the extreme and long standing controversy around his doctrine that “God has decreed all that comes to pass”, because a plain reading of the Holy Bible indicates that God works in real time with man as a free agent and all things are indeed not decreed before the foundation of the world as is decrees in Augustinian and Reformed Theology.
4. “This (inept statement previous) will become evident in the course of the discussion of the present chapter” *It did NOT!*

B. The decrees of God are His eternal purpose, based on His most wise and holy counsel, whereby He freely and UNCHANGEABLY, for His own glory, ordained either efficaciously or permissively, all that comes to pass.

1. What did he say? “GOD UNCHANGEABLY ORDAINED ALL THAT COMES TO PASS.”

2. Thiessen hedges, he dodges, he apologizes, he pretends a distinction between efficacious and permissive, but in the end he holds to the age old erroneous definition that God decreed every word I type today.

II. The Proof of the Decrees

- A. Thiessen takes Isa 14:24, and 26 out of context and omits verse 25 as proof #1
- B. Eph 1:9, 11, cf 3:11 are listed as if they would support God's infinite, eternal decree of everything that comes to pass as proof #2. In context, THEY DO NOT
- C. Thiessen takes out of context Rom 8:28 and cross references it with Eph 1:11 taken out of context as proof #3
- D. Thiessen takes 1 Pet 1:20 out of context, and Rev 13:8 out of an ASV melded with Eph 1:4, 2Tim 1:9 and Tit 1:2 out of context, to support Presbyterian Shedd's statement that "The things decreed come to pass in time, and in successive series; but they constitute one great system which as one *whole* and a *unity* was comprehended in one eternal purpose of God."

III. The Bases of the Decrees

- A. Why did God decree or undertake anything *ad extra* at all? (Supposed question because they have supposed Calvinism accurate)
 1. Not in necessity
 2. No outside initiator
 3. Freely, voluntarily
- B. Why was He not content to confine His fellowship and activity to the Trinity? (Supposed problem question because they have supposed Calvinism accurate)

1. Not mere caprice or arbitrary will
2. His impulse not disclosed
3. God must have his reason ... “Thou shalt know hereafter” (John 13:7) is our only comfort (and that, too, is taken out of context)

C. We do not know but Deut 29:29 helps.

1. Decrees are a perplexing mystery (They are so perplexing because they have supposed Calvinism accurate)
2. Not just arbitrary will (They cannot be because they have supposed Calvinism accurate)
3. Decrees are based on His most wise and holy counsel (They must be, because they have supposed Calvinism accurate)

IV. The End (Doerksen=Purpose) of the Decrees ... What end did God have in view

A. Not primarily the happiness of the creature.

1. Paul at Lystra we enjoy plenty ... to be His witness
2. Ascetic principles of going without for holiness sake were wrong
3. So the purpose is not happiness of man

B. Not primarily the happiness nor the holiness of the creature.

1. He created man in holiness of truth and true righteousness BUT PLANNED HIS FALL
2. He admonishes man to be ye Holy as I am holy

C. The Glory of God

1. God cannot be selfish

2. God is worthy
- V. The Content and Order of the Decrees ... because “God has decreed all that comes to pass”
- A. In the material and physical realm
 1. To create the Universe and Man
 - a) To save some
 - b) To reprobate others
 - c) The length of human life Job 14:5 and the manner of our exit (actually not from the Bible at all but from Roman Popes)
 - d) All other events in the material and physical realm have likewise been decreed
 - B. In the moral and spiritual realm
 1. God determined to permit sin.
 2. God determined to overrule sin for the good.
 3. God determined to save from sin
 - a) Election is seen
 - (1) to save those whom he has foreknown would respond
 - (2) to give them life
 - (3) to place them in position as sons
 - (4) to conform them to the image of Christ
 - b) Election and foreknowledge are inseparable and essentially the same
 - (1) Election is unjust to the non-elect ... BUT there is no injustice in God so we must be wrong. OH PLEASE!

(2) God is Mercy and Grace NO God is just Grace and is to be praised for saving a few, rather than accused of condemning the masses because of Ps 44:3, Luke 4:25-27, 1Cor 4:7, OH PLEASE!

(3) God is arbitrary ... NO He simply permits the (unchosen) sinner to pursue his self-chosen rebellion via (Hos 4:17, Rom 9:22, 1Pet 2:8) OH PLEASE!

(4) God is without mercy and unfair!!! ... NO properly understood election drives the believer to admiration and reverence, humility and submission and worship. OH PLEASE!

4. God determined to reward his servants and to punish the disobedient

C. In the Social and Political Realm

1. The family and human government
2. The Call and mission of Israel
3. The founding and mission of the Church
4. The final triumph of God.

Outlines of Chapter 11 The Works of God: Creation

pg 161-172 (r 111-119)

I. The Definition of Creation

- A. In the *immediate* sense of the word 'create' God, without the use of pre-existing materials brought into being, immediately and instantaneously the whole universe.
- B. In the *mediate* sense of the word, God did not originate things from nothing but shaped, adapted, combined, or transformed existing material.
- C. Hodge puts the distinction as “The one was instantaneous, the other gradual; the one precludes the idea of any preexisting substance, and of cooperation, the other admits and implies both.”

II. The Proof of the Doctrine of Creation

A. The Mosaic Account of Creation

- 1. The immediate creation of the universe.
- 2. The mediate creation of the present universe.
 - a) Thiessen carefully tiptoes a path around the 'gaptists' who hold to the non literal and preposterous multi million year gap between gen 1:1 and Gen 1:2. He states whether due to deliberate incompleteness in the original act of creating or some catastrophe that befell the original creation, we find the earth in gen 1:2, “waste and void” and darkness was upon the face of the deep.” We shall not dogmatically decide between these two possibilities ...”
 - b) Thiessen also carefully tip toes a path around the 'theistic evolutionist.' They hold (held) the preposterous idea that 'science has established the theory of

evolution of a solid basis, and that the Bible students and theologians had better adapt themselves to this position.” [such a position held by C.I. Scofield, and Augustus Strong, 2 of my heroes, originated when worldly 'scientists' were come how thought to be 'stable in this their view;)]

- c) Finally Thiessen tip toes a path around those who literally believe the Bible, and believe the Bible literally. He gives this group (us) the least amount of exposure and credibility, but he does state “But there are also a good many who hold that the six days are literal days.”
- d) Was the creation immediate
- e) What was included in the immediate creation of God
- f) Does Gen 1:2 represent the original condition of the earth of a condition due to some great cataclysm?
 - (1) The Restoration Theory or Gap Theory
 - (2) The Gap as viewed in Gen 1:1
 - (3) Perhaps the most common (albeit wrong) view
- g) Are the six days of creation to be thought of as six revelatory days long.
 - (1) Moses received the revelation
 - (2) Or Days refer to long eras of time
 - (3) Or six days meant six literal days
- h) What is the age of the earth?
 - (1) Secular 'scientific' guess is very inexact, (and ever growing)
 - (2) Theistic Evolution

(3) Recent Creation

- i. (r112-117) Doerksen's 1979 revision of Thiessen's 1949 work, gives mention to the now old theories of 'gaptists' and 'theistic evolutionists' but clearly emphasizes the literal interpretation of the Bible.
- ii. He states of the 'gaptist' "If, as had been suggested by many, Gen 1:2ff is a recreation ..." covering those theologians that previously bowed down to the world's "Standard Geological Column" he states "If creation ... is recent, and a literal interpretation of Scripture favors this, the interpretation of long geological ages and the Standard Geological Column must be challenged."
- iii. Doerksen also included clarification about inexactness in the worldly scientists dating system and enforcement of "mature creationism."

B. Other Biblical Proofs of Creation

1. Thiessen tries to make "ample room in the genesis account of creation for all geological formations that exist," while Doerksen contends that since Adam was created with age ... is it not also conceivable that the whole creation of God had the appearance of age." Thiessen would adapt the Bible account to accommodate the 'scientist' of his day; Doerksen, know how fickle and Godless the 'science' so called came to be would adapt the 'science' to fit the literal interpretation of the Bible... Bravo Doerksen.
2. Doerksen lists several other Scriptures that corroborate the Genesis account without any gap in a 6 day creation of the universe ... Bravo Doerksen.

III. The End of God in Creation

- A. Another attempted defense of decrees
- B. What are the overall motives of God?
- C. He created with a plan ... only for His glory.
- D. Study of the universe displays His glory

Outlines of Chapter 12 The Works of God: His Sovereign Rule

pg 173 -188 (r 119-129)

I. The Doctrine of Preservation

A. A definition of Preservation

1. “God, by a continuous agency, maintains in existence all the things which He has made, together with all their properties and powers.
2. The first manifestation of God's sovereign rule American Heritage Dictionary
Sovereign (noun) one that exercises supreme (ultimate, final) permanent authority, especially in a nation or other governmental unit.”
3. Distinguished from creation, as creation is not self-existent nor self-sustaining

B. The Proof of the Doctrine of Preservation

1. He is upholding the universe
2. By him all things 'consist'
3. He preserves animate and inanimate creation Ps 104, , 36:6, 66:9, Job 7:20, Acts 17:28

C. The Method of Preservation

1. Not by The deistic theory, the world left like a wound up clock
2. Not by The continuous creation theory- makes God creator of sin
3. The theory of concurrence (Thiessen Concursus) “God concurs in all the operations, both of matter and of mind. Though God's will is not the only force in the universe, yet without His concurrence no force or person can continue to exist or to act.”

4. (Thiessen's problem with election and decrees makes even preservation hard to explain.)
- II. The Doctrine of Providence American Heritage Dictionary Sovereign (noun) one that exercises supreme (ultimate, final) permanent authority, especially in a nation or other governmental unit.”
- A. The Definition of Providence
1. “God has not merely created the universe, together withall its properties and powers, and that He is preserving all that He has created, but that as a holy, benevolent, wise, and omnipotent Being, He also exercises sovereign control over it.”
 2. (Thiessen's problem with election and decrees makes especially providence hard to explain.)
- B. The Proofs of the Doctrine
1. The nature of God and the universe
 - a) God is a personal being and creator and owner, expect him to govern
 - b) Expect God to act rationally
 - c) The universe everywhere exhibits evidence of intelligence and control
 2. The teaching of Scripture He is creator, He is in control
 - a) Over the physical universe
 - (1) His kingdom ruleth over all Ps 103:19
 - (2) He discomfited the Philistines 1Sam 7:10
 - (3) He shaketh the earth Job 9:5-7

(4) His breath gives ice Job 37:10

b) Over the plant and animal creation. Job 12:10, Ps 104:21,28, 29, 147:9

c) Over the nations of the earth Job 12:23, Ps 22:28, Ps 66:7, 75:6,7, Isa 10:5-7

d) Over all areas of each man's existence

(1) Does Jeremiah 1:5 necessitate that God's providence in Jeremiah's birth

applies to every individual ever born? Why or why not. Ans pg 180 (r

123) Obviously not. Jeremiah was to be used in God's specific dealings

with his chosen nation Israel and in the fulfillment of specific prophecies

he had already made. This is not thru for every individual born then and

now.

(2) Does 1Samuel 16:1 necessitate that God's providence is controlling every

individual's birth and lot in life? Why or Why not. Ans pg 180 (r 123)

Obviously not. David had a lot in life that directly involved the bringing

of the Messiah into this world, and most of us are not that integral in such

a comprehensive execution of His provision of redemption.

(3) Over the most trivial of circumstances- Thiessen's problem with election

and decrees makes his explanations of providence unresponsive.

(4) Through restrictive providence he prevents some sins , ... - Thiessen's

problem with election and decrees makes his explanations of providence

unresponsive.

(5) To the free acts of men - Thiessen's problem with election and decrees

makes his explanations of providence unresponsive.

C. The Ends Towards Which Providence is Directed

1. Thiessen's problem with election and decrees makes his explanations of providence unresponsive.
2. Here Thiessen gives a 'brief restatement and slight expansion of the thoughts that "God has decreed everything that comes to pass." etc etc etc

D. The Means Employed in the exercise of Divine Providence

1. The laws of nature
2. His holy Word
3. Persuasion
4. special agents
5. Thiessen's problem with election and decrees makes his explanations of providence methods unresponsive.

E. The Theories Opposed to the Doctrine of Providence

1. Naturalism
2. Fatalism
3. Pantheism

F. The Relation of Providence to Some Special Problems

1. The relation of providence to freedom.
2. The relation of providence to prayer.
3. Thiessen brazenly side steps his horrendous blunder in election, decrees and sovereignty with "Thus there is perfect harmony between the foreknowledge, decrees, and providence of God." NOT SO!

4. Doerksen, in his 1979 revision is inept at correcting such a horrendous blunder.

Bibliography

Evens, William, 1870-1950, "The Great Doctrines of the Bible", © 1912, 39, 49, 74, Mood Press, Chicago, Ebook <http://www.archive.org/details/thegreatdoctrine06038gut>

Hodge, Charles, "Systematic Theology: Volume I" © 1940, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Ebook <http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01hodg>

Miley, John, 1813-1895, Methodist, "Systematic Theology", Vol 1 & 2, Ebook <http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01mile>

Shedd, William G. T., Dogmatic Theology, © 1888, General Books, Ebook <http://www.archive.org/details/dogmatictheology01sheduoft>

Strong, Augustus H., "Systematic Theology: The Doctrine of God (Volume I)", © 1907, Philadelphia: The Judson Press

Thiessen, Henry Clarence, "Lectures in Systematic Theology – Revised by Vernon D. Doerksen", © 2006 William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company

Thiessen, Henry Clarence, "Lectures in Systematic Theology", © 1949 William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company