

Focus on the Kingdom

Volume 6 No. 8

Anthony Buzzard, editor

May, 2004

To Tell The Truth, Some of Us Are Following Another Jesus

by Brian Wright

I was flipping through television channels one evening and came across an old program that I hadn't seen in years. I don't watch television game shows these days but this particular program fascinated me in my childhood. It was called "To Tell the Truth."

For those of you who are unfamiliar with the program, it was structured much like a detective story. The show begins with a brief introduction of an interesting, but not well-known, person. Then three guests are presented for questioning. Each guest claims to be the person described in the introduction. A panel of celebrities is allowed to briefly question the three guests. At the end of the time allowed for questioning, each panel member must cast his vote for the guest he believes is really the person described in the introduction.

Each guest who received a vote earned a monetary reward. Each guest did his best to convince the panel through his answers and demeanor that he was the real person. After the panel finished casting their votes and explaining why they voted for a particular guest, the game show host would announce with great anticipation, "Will the real [insert name] please stand up!" The fun for the program viewer was not only watching the drama unfold but also hazarding a guess of his own.

Tension mounted as first one guest and then another feigned rising and then returned to their seats. The real person finally stood alone to thunderous applause and squeals of delight (from those who had correctly identified the real person) and gasps of disappointment (from those who had been fooled by an imposter). Each of the "imposters" was then asked to state his real name, where he was from and what he really did for a living. The panel members who had voted for one of the imposters then explained why they had been fooled. The duped panel members graciously endured the good-natured teasing they received from those who were not deceived and vowed to do better next time.

It may sound like a simple task to pick out the "real" person but many times the "imposters" garnered more votes than the "real" person. How were

they able so often to fool the panel and viewing audience?

The "imposters" were confident with their answers, especially at the beginning. They had some knowledge of the "real" person's biography and the better imposters had done additional research into the "real" person's occupation. On the surface, they appeared to be the genuine article. It was only upon closer scrutiny that an astute questioner was (sometimes) able to entangle an imposter in the details and thereby expose him.

I wonder how the panel, and the viewing audience, would have fared if Jesus had been a guest on this program? Perhaps it would have gone something like this:

Announcer: "Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Our featured guest this evening is a miracle worker! He heals the sick, restores sight to the blind and proclaims good news. He was born under unusual circumstances in the Roman occupied city of Bethlehem nearly 2000 years ago. Honored guests, will you please tell us your name?"

Guest 1: "I am Jesus of Nazareth."

Guest 2: "I am Jesus of Nazareth."

Guest 3: "I am Jesus of Nazareth."

Panel question: "What does the term 'Messiah' mean?"

Guest 1: "It is the Hebrew form of my family name, Christ."

Guest 2: "It is the Hebrew title that identifies me as the second person in the Godhead."

Guest 3: "It is a Hebrew word which literally means 'anointed one' and indicates that I am an agent of God, a man appointed by Him to act on His behalf."

Question: "Which is the greatest commandment?"

Guest 1: "I gave ten commandments. They are equally important."

Guest 2: "I gave many commandments in addition to the ten. The most important is to love your neighbor."

In This Issue

Do Evangelicals Really Believe in the Second Coming? . 3
A Leading Scholar Defines "Son of God" Correctly 5
2004Theological Conference..... 7

Guest 3: “The LORD our God is one LORD.”

Question: “What is the gospel?”

Guest 1: “I died so that those who believe in me will never die but will live with me forever in heaven.”

Guest 2: “I am the second member of the triune God who lived as a man and died for the sins of those men I predestined to receive a reward in heaven.”

Guest 3: “The good news about the Kingdom of God and how it may be attained by those that believe the message.”

Question: “Did you really die on the cross?”

Guest 1: “No. I am God and cannot die.”

Guest 2: “Yes, but only the fully man part of me died.”

Guest 3: “Yes.”

Question: “By whose authority do you heal the sick and forgive men their sins?”

Guest 1: “By my authority as a member of the triune God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.”

Guest 2: “I need no one’s authority to perform these and other miracles.”

Guest 3: “By the authority granted to me by my Father, the only true God.”

Question: “What was your first miracle?”

Guest 1: “Creating the heavens and the earth from nothing.”

Guest 2: “Incarnating myself as a human being.”

Guest 3: “Turning water into wine at a wedding.”

Question: “What do the saints do in heaven?”

Guest 1: “They continually sing praises to me.”

Guest 2: “They intercede for sinful believers.”

Guest 3: “They are not in heaven. Those who have died are sleeping in their graves awaiting the resurrection. Those who are living are working to make more disciples.”

Question: “What finally happens to unrepentant sinners?”

Guest 1: “I have them consciously tortured in hell for eternity the instant they die.”

Guest 2: “I allow Satan and the demons to torment their souls forever in Hades.”

Guest 3: “I will one day judge them by their deeds and they shall die a second death in the lake of fire.”

Question: “When will you be coming back to the earth?”

Guest 1: “I’m not coming back.”

Guest 2: “I come back each time a believer dies.”

Guest 3: “I don’t know.”

Panel follow-up question for guest number 3: “Please clarify your last answer. I thought you knew everything?”

Guest 3: “I know...”

Announcer: “I’m sorry, guest number three. We are out of time for today. Panel, please cast your votes. Is the real Jesus guest number 1, guest number 2 or guest number 3? We’ll find out after we break for a message from our sponsor.”

Announcer: “Welcome back to ‘To Tell the Truth’! I hope you enjoyed the important commercial message brought to you by our sponsor. Remember folks, those in the know are rushing to buy Mr. Sparkle toothpaste/car polish. On the job or on the road, you’ll be sure to blind others with that Mr. Sparkle shine! And now for the moment you have all been anxiously awaiting. Will the real Jesus of Nazareth please stand up?”

We are almost out of time. How will we make this critical decision? All three guests look the part. Each one sounds religious and sincere. Their answers are similar but definitely not identical. Some responses were long; some were short. Maybe only the real Jesus could provide long, detailed answers. But maybe not!¹

Each guest responded to questions using technical terms and concepts we have heard before but since we aren’t trained ministers, may not fully understand. Some of the concepts expressed by guest number 3 sounded a little foreign. I noticed that the people sitting around me didn’t take him too seriously. Maybe that is enough to eliminate him from further consideration?

The man sitting to my left occasionally goes to church; surely he ought to at least have enough secondhand knowledge to know which guest is really Jesus. He’s not sure but he thinks that Jesus might be guest number 1. Maybe we should just go along with him?

But on the other hand, the lady sitting to my right attends church regularly and she goes on and on about how much she loves Jesus. She isn’t concerned about the responses that were given but she is certain that

¹ Colossians 2:4, 8

the real Jesus is guest number 2. She has been exuberantly singing and waving her hands in the air throughout the program. I'd like to engage her in further conversation but she has begun speaking in a language I don't understand and has suddenly fallen over backwards. She scares me a little but she is obviously a very spiritual person, convinced that she is following the real Jesus. Is it safe for us to rely on her judgment?

Fortunately we don't have to rely on those with secondhand knowledge or those who are "spiritual" and sincere. Maybe they have it right but there is a very real possibility that they are carelessly following a shrewd counterfeit Jesus without even realizing it. Jesus warned that there will come a day when he says to those who thought they were followers but were not, "I never knew you; depart from me, you who practice lawlessness."² How devastating will it be for those who hear Jesus speak these words to them when they are expecting to hear that they were good and faithful servants? Someday we are all going to be held accountable for what we believe. There is too much at stake to let others do our thinking for us.

Those who follow Jesus listen and respond to what he says. "My sheep hear my voice."³ But of course the imposter also beckons the sheep. The imposter will not plainly announce to the sheep that he is an imposter. Few would be deceived if he were this transparent. He will deceive the careless sheep, those not belonging to Jesus, by mixing truth with lies.

How then can we, the sheep, discern the voice of the real Jesus from that of a counterfeit Jesus? By paying close attention to the words that are being put into the mouth of "Jesus"⁴ and diligently comparing them with the Scriptures.⁵ A counterfeit Jesus will deceive the unsuspecting⁶ but will not be able to stand up under close scrutiny.⁷

In his second letter to the church at Corinth, Paul chided the congregation for accepting "another Jesus."⁸ Did you pick out the real Jesus in our example or, like some of the Corinthians in Paul's day, have you been misled into accepting an imposter? Maybe we should all take a second look at the guests' responses before being quick to answer.⁹ What do we

² Matthew 7:23

³ John 10:27

⁴ Luke 8:18

⁵ Acts 17:11

⁶ Romans 16:18b

⁷ II Peter 2:1, 3

⁸ II Corinthians 11:4

⁹ I Corinthians 10:12

have to lose by reexamining our faith? Those who accept "another Jesus" risk perishing by dying a second time.¹⁰ Those who accept the real Jesus will be rewarded at his return¹¹ with life in the kingdom of God.¹² It's worth taking a second look. ✧

Do Evangelicals Really Believe in the Second Coming?

There is nothing more fascinating and stimulating than a good, honest discussion on a Bible topic. Christians are those who meditate day and night (Ps. 1:2) and "delight in the word of God" (Ps. 119:77). If so, then that meditation in the heart is bound to be reflected in our words. Words, as Jesus observed, are the index of our hearts. The "heart" in the Bible is not the seat of the emotions as distinct from the intellect, but the center of our whole personality. "Heart" is very close to "mind" in the Bible and it is with the heart that we reason and think. Jesus spoke of "understanding with the heart" (Matt. 13:15).

So what is uppermost in your heart and in your mind? Is it the propagation of the precious words of Jesus? John warned us of the greatest of all theological disasters — a departure from the *words/teachings* of Jesus (II John 7-9). Read that verse several times and think about it deeply. John saw what was happening, later in the New Testament period. "Jesus" was being promoted divorced from his own teachings. The teachings of Jesus are what identify him as the true Jesus. A "Jesus" wrenched away from his teachings is not the Biblical Jesus at all. This is merely to say what Jesus said repeatedly, that only "those who hear his words and do them" are really believers on the way to salvation. "Whoever is ashamed of me and my words, of him the Son of Man will be deeply ashamed" when he comes in the glory of the Kingdom of God (see Mark 8:38).

Are you speaking the word(s) of Jesus at every opportunity? Just a brief statement or sentence can be enough to sow a seed, or raise a question. We know of two wonderful believers in our circle of friends who embarked on their quest for truth only because a challenging remark about the teaching of Jesus was made to them.

Try this on your friends: Ask if they believe in the Second Coming of Jesus. If they say they do, invite them gently to test whether they really do. The Bible

¹⁰ Revelation 20:15

¹¹ Revelation 22:12

¹² Revelation 20:6

says that Jesus is going to return to this planet and remain here on this planet. It does not say that Jesus is going to just visit the planet by swooping down as far as the sky and then disappear once more. Jesus is not going to come down to the sky and then make a “U-turn” and take off once again into space. That would not be a second *coming* at all. It would be a sort of “drive-by” situation.

You may find that your friends do not, despite what they say, actually believe in the second *coming* of Jesus at all. Acts 1:11 is entirely clear. Just as they saw him go off to heaven to be with the Father, so they will see him coming back to the earth. Acts 3:21 says that the Messiah is to be retained in heaven *until* it is time for him no longer to be retained there. At that point he will return to the earth. He will not be in heaven; he will be on earth. He will in fact come to his own land, as John 1:11 says he did earlier, but this time he is going to take charge of the affairs of the earth and of the nations. He is going to rule them with a rod of iron, at least initially until they submit to his gracious rule and Kingdom.

The Messiah has been promised the throne of David (Luke 1:32-35) and he has never yet occupied that throne. That means of course that he will do this in the future. One of the most damaging pieces of popular misinformation is the idea that the throne of David has been transferred off the earth and put in heaven. No one in the Bible ever imagined such a thing. It is no more reasonable than saying that the throne of England is located in China.

There are some six million Jehovah’s Witnesses in the world and they promote their teachings with zeal and persistence at private homes. They are determined that Jesus is not going to come back to the earth. Whose team are they really on? Are they representing the God of the Bible when in the name of religion they tell us that Jesus will not come back to the earth? They have mounted an amazing theory of their own invention and imposed it on the Bible. No one but a Jehovah’s Witness subscribes to this novel theory. The notion they present is that there are exactly 144,000 special Christians whose destiny is to reign in the heavens with Jesus in the future. And what if one is not one of those elite believers? They will simply be on the earth when the millennium arrives. It is not quite clear what those “other” “second-class” Christians will be doing, other than enjoying “Paradise earth.”

Let us say right away that the idea of the earth returning to a state of paradise, a restored Garden of Eden, is thoroughly biblical. Page after page of the

prophets speak of a world renewed and restored. Conditions on the earth will be delightful when mankind learns to live the way prescribed by God and the man Messiah, who is the one mediator between the One God, the Father and man (I Tim. 2:5). The Gospel itself is about the Kingdom and how one can prepare now to enter when it comes at Jesus’ return. Yes, his *return*. Jesus is going to come back to the earth and reside here, remain here to govern the nations. He will not be a King of the Kingdom *in absentia*. He will be here in person, and the world will be transformed under the marvelously beneficial effects of his empire and kingship. He will be the first successful world president, who will gently guide humanity into a sane way of life and will have the power to deal with the rebels. When that day comes, and under that regime, one murder a year in the world will be far too many. Human beings were not meant to kill each other. But thus far they always have, and indeed confessing Christians have constantly killed each other in time of war, thus denying the very sign by which Jesus said the true believers can be recognized — by the love they have one for another. Apparently churchgoers are oblivious to that important distinguishing mark of the true faith. They continue apparently to be quite untroubled by a “church” which allows its members to kill, in time of war, brothers and sisters who ostensibly also belong to the body of Christ. Thus the church has continued to practice “suicide,” the destruction of members of its own body. Until Christians take a stand against the use of lethal violence they will continue to kill both enemies and fellow believers in other lands.

Mennonites offered us an insightful piece of advice: “A modest proposal for peace: that Christians decide not to kill each other.” If you want war to stop, two, then four, then six and then eight human beings must pledge themselves never to kill another human being. Under the coming rule of Jesus this ideal will be achieved when the nations resolve to melt their weapons down and make farm implements.

But back to the Second Coming. Jehovah’s Witnesses have decided to keep Jesus off the earth. They claim that 144,000 will rule in the heavens with Jesus when the millennium begins. That teaching effectively denies the Messiah’s right to the earth over which God, his Father has appointed him King, the second Adam who will successfully rule for God and replace the first Adam, who failed to represent God on earth. Jehovah’s Witnesses then meddle with the Scriptures when they tell us that Revelation 5:10 should read: The lamb “has made them a Kingdom

and priests to God and they shall reign over the earth.” They apparently hope to escape a piece of information which would contradict their own unbiblical scheme which foresees no rule of Christ *on the earth*. The Greek phrase *epi tes gys* is found 19 times in Revelation and is translated correctly as “on the earth.” Even if the text were to say that the saints reign over the earth, no reader should imagine that the saints are suspended in the air! And to remove all doubt the camp of the saints, the Christians, is said to be on the “broad earth” in Revelation 20:9. The “saints” appear 13 times in the book of Revelation and without exception the reference is to Christian believers who suffer patiently and offer their prayers to God. The residence of those saints is clearly on the renewed planet — earth (Rev. 20:9).

Since the New Testament constantly promises the faithful saints that their reward is to be in the company of Jesus when he returns, and since the saints will be ruling on earth (Rev. 5:10), it follows that Jesus will be there on earth too. This is exactly what we would expect from the fact that he is destined to sit on his own throne of David. Indeed the Messiah is the “righteous Branch, and he will reign as king and deal wisely and will execute justice and righteousness in the land” (Jer. 23:5). On this basis, of course, the Messiah promises his followers that their inheritance will be the earth (Matt. 5:5). How utterly bizarre it would be if Jesus will not be there with them.

Any theology which denies that Jesus is going to return and reside on earth is false to the New Testament pattern. Churchgoers seem reluctant to give up the cherished notion that they will be “going to heaven.” If that were so, Jesus would have to be there in the future with them. But he expressly said he was coming back and that when he did, he would take them to be with him — in his company forever. The whole point of the Second Coming is that Jesus, having resided once on earth, is going to leave heaven and come back to the place in which he is destined to function as God’s ruler on earth. To speak of the Second Coming of Jesus and then to maintain that he never actually comes down to the earth is a self-contradiction. It is wrong to describe a descent of Jesus to the sky only, as a second coming. Without his permanent residence on the planet following his arrival, there is no Second Coming. The Parousia, which means the glorious arrival of Jesus on earth to take over the present evil nation-states and convert them into the Kingdom of God, is the goal of New Testament believers (Rev. 11:15-18). It is their hope, the hope which was conveyed to them in the Gospel

(Col. 1:5). That hope is presently stored up or reserved in heaven with God. It will be manifested and realized on earth when Jesus brings it to the earth from heaven.

That hope of inheriting the Kingdom of God on earth at the return of Jesus is a major factor in Christian belief, hope being a virtue next to love and faith. Paul can even say that faith and love spring from, are based on hope (Col. 1:4, 5). How important then for believers, if they desire to have faith and love, to have a clear idea of the Christian hope. This is to administer the world and rule with Christ on earth when he returns. This promise is for all believers without distinction provided they repent and “believe the Gospel of the Kingdom,” are baptized in obedience to Jesus and the Apostles’ command, and then persist in Christian obedience — the “obedience of faith” until the end. ✧

A Leading Scholar Defines “Son of God” Correctly

Imagine our delight at finding a refreshingly clear statement about the identity of Jesus in the theological journal, *Ex Auditu* (7, 1991). The author is Dr. Colin Brown, systematic theologian at a well-known seminary in California. Dr. Brown is rightly critical of the “social Trinity,” the notion that God is three distinct personalities. He traces this mistaken view of who God is to “a systematic misunderstanding of Son-of-God language in Scripture.” Here he puts his finger, surely, on the age-old conflict which has troubled the Church for nearly 2000 years. Dr. Brown says: **“Indeed one may ask whether the term ‘Son of God’ is in and of itself a divine title at all. Certainly there are many instances in biblical language where it is definitely not a designation of deity.”** He goes on to illustrate his point from the Bible. Then he says: **“In the light of these passages in their context, the title ‘Son of God’ is not in itself a designation of personal deity or an expression of metaphysical distinctions within the Godhead. Indeed to be ‘Son of God’ one has to be a being who is not God!** It is a designation for a creature indicating a special relationship with God. In particular, it denotes God’s representative, God’s vice-regent. It is a designation of kingship, identifying the king as God’s son.”

A marvelous statement! Should not this be made compulsory reading for every student in every land entering the halls of theological seminaries? Our joy of course was made even fuller when we read in the same article that it is a systematic mistake to read “I and the

Father are one” (John 10:30) and statements about the mutual indwelling of Jesus and the Father (John 10:38; 14:10, 11, 20; 17:21, 23) as statements about “inner relations of the ‘persons’ of the Trinity.” “The Fourth Gospel itself does not require such a reading. When read in context the statements are evidently statements about *Jesus’ relationship with the Father on earth.*”

Dr. Brown continues: “**It is a common but patent misreading of the opening of John’s Gospel to read it as if it said: ‘In the beginning was the Son and the Son was with God and the Son was God’ (John 1:1).** What has happened here is the substitution of the *Son* for *Word* (Greek *logos*), and thereby the *Son* is made a member of the Godhead which existed from the beginning. But if we follow carefully the thought of John’s prologue, it is the *Word* that preexisted eternally with God and is God.”

The Son of God of the Bible is certainly not an uncreated member of a Trinity. The Son of God is a creature, that is, a created being. Luke 1:35 provides the essential data, along with Matthew 1:18, 20, to inform us of the point of time at which the Son was begotten or created. It was in the womb of his mother Mary. Mary had no difficulty believing what the angel announced to her. “For this reason exactly (*dio kai*), the Son to be begotten will be called holy, the Son of God” (Luke 1:35). For what reason? The miracle which God performed in the creation of His beloved Son who is the second Adam. Just as God created the first Adam from the dust of the ground, so He later (not earlier!) created the second Adam by bringing him into existence within the human family, and precisely as the blood descendant, through Mary, of David, the king. The opening verse of the New Testament is sufficient to correct the age-old error that the Son was sent down literally from heaven and transformed himself into an embryo, while maintaining a full status as God, upholding, as a fetus, the whole universe! Matthew 1:1 informs us of the “generation of Jesus Christ.” Everyone should know that “generation” means the beginning, the *coming into existence* of a new person. That person could not “come into existence,” i.e., be generated, if he was already in existence. There was no actual unique Son of God until he was generated in Mary. Until then he was a promised Son, a Son whom God intended finally to create. He did this around 3 BC. The present age of the Son of God is thus some 2000 years, not infinity.

The later creeds forced on the Bible a new identity for the Savior. He was declared to be God Himself. Of

course this made God into *two* Persons, Father and Son, and thus ruined the first principle of sound theology that God is only One (Isa. 44:24; Deut. 6:4; John 17:3, etc.) and that He is alone as God, without rival or partner. The Son of God of the creeds originates outside the human biological chain and is thus by definition not really a human person at all. But Mary bore a human being. That is what mothers do. She did not bear a hybrid God/man nor an angel/man. (For more details request our book on the Trinity from 800-347-4261 and see the booklet at our site, “Who is Jesus?”). ✧

The Eternal Generation of the Son

The really vulnerable element in the doctrine of the preexisting Son is the concept that he was **eternally begotten**. It is doubtful if this expression contains any more meaning than hot ice cubes — as many have pointed out.

Nathaniel Emmons of Yale (1745-1850) declared that “‘eternal generation’ is eternal nonsense.” Emmons was a keen logician with a terse and lucid theological style.

In our time Donald MacLeod, *The Person of Christ* (Intervarsity Press, 1998), tackles the issue of the “eternal generation” of the Son: “The idea of eternal generation is an inevitable corollary of the **eternal Sonship** and figures prominently in the statements of the Nicene fathers and their successors. **But it is far from clear what content, if any, we can impart to the concept.** It is revealed, but it is revealed as mystery and the writings of the fathers abound in protestations of inevitable ignorance of the matter. Athanasius says of it:

‘Nor again is it right to seek how God begets [but Luke 1 and Matt. 1 do supply this information with complete clarity] and what is the manner of His begetting. For a man must be beside himself to venture on such points; since a thing ineffable [unspeakable] and proper to God’s nature and known to Him alone and the Son, this he demands to be explained in words. It is better in perplexity to be silent and believe than to disbelieve on account of perplexity.’”

Gregory of Nazianzen: “But the manner of the Son’s generation we will not admit that even angels can conceive, much less you [Gabriel announced it very clearly in Luke 1:32-35!]. Shall I tell you how it was? It was in a manner known to the Father who begat, and to the Son who was begotten. Anything more than this is hidden by a cloud and escapes your dim sight.”

MacLeod then comments: “The church insisted that divine generation cannot be understood in terms of human generation. Here again Athanasius set the tone for subsequent theology: ‘As then men create not as God creates, as their being is not such as God’s being, so man’s generation is in one way, and the Son is from the Father in another...Whereas in human generation a father always exists prior to a son, in divine generation this is not so.’ Athanasius writes, ‘Nor, as man from man has the Son been begotten, so as to be later than his Father’s existence, but is God’s offspring, and, as being proper Son of God, who is ever, he exists eternally. For whereas it is proper to men to beget in time, from the imperfection of their nature, God’s offspring is eternal, for His nature is ever perfect...‘God, Whose nature and existence are above time, may not engender in time’” (John of Damascus).

Thus God is forbidden by “church fathers” to act, in time, within His own creation!

MacLeod: “**To beget does not mean to originate.** In human generation, of course, it does, but in divine generation it does not...The Son was not unbegotten, but he was unoriginate. The Father was both unoriginate and unbegotten. This implies a clear distinction between being begotten and being originated.” Gregory of Nazianzen: “The Son was unoriginatedly begotten.”

But all this is simply to rewrite the laws of language and meaning and then claim that the Bible authorizes this massive departure from the historical and grammatical method. It was bound to lead to confusion and it has. The falsehood of the whole idea was spotted by Adam Clark, the famous Methodist expositor, and many others. Clark felt it necessary to say:

“The doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Christ is in my opinion antiscritptural and highly dangerous. I have not been able to find any express declaration of it in the Scriptures.”¹³

And yet without the “eternal generation” of the Son there is no doctrine of the Trinity.

J.O. Buswell, former Dean of the Graduate School, Covenant College, St. Louis, MO, examined the issue of the begetting of the Son in the Bible and concluded with these words. He wrote as a Trinitarian: “The notion that the Son was begotten by the Father in eternity past, not as an event, but as an inexplicable relationship, has been accepted and carried along in Christian theology since the fourth century...We have

examined all the instances in which ‘begotten’ or ‘born’ or related words are applied to Christ, and we can say with confidence that the *Bible has nothing whatsoever to say about ‘begetting’ as an eternal relationship between the Father and the Son.*”¹⁴ ✧

2004 Theological Conference

DVDs of the 2004 Theological Conference are available for \$10 each or \$65 for the entire set of 7 DVDs (plus postage for international orders). Please email Steve Taylor at staylor@abc-coggc.org or call 800-347-4261 to order. Sets of the papers from the conference are available for \$10, including postage. Email JillT@abc-coggc.org for papers.

DVD #1	“The Identity and Mission of the Servant in Isaiah” Alex Hall
	“The Struggle for the One God Against Binitarianism” F. Paul Haney
DVD #2	Faith Stories 1- Friday
	“Babylon in the Last Days” Greg Deuble
DVD #3	Faith Stories 2 - Friday
	“Scandalous Folly: The Cross or the Sword?” David Maas
DVD #4	“Colossians 1:15-20: Preexistence or Preeminence?” Bill Wachtel
	“The Shape of the Jesus Question” Colin Brown
DVD #5	“The Hermeneutic of the Apostolic Gospel” Robert Hach
	“The Gospels Revisited” Colin Brown
DVD #6	“The Abrahamic Faith: Taking Courage from the Words of Modern Scholars” Anthony Buzzard
	Faith Stories 3 - Sunday
DVD #7	“Truth in Short Supply” Kent Ross

Comment

“Once again I must thank you for your booklet *The Law, the Sabbath and New Testament Christianity*. I have marked it up, read it and reread it. Each time I seem to unearth gems and nuggets of truth, not for the first time necessarily, but bringing into clearer focus points already known.” — *California*

A One God Conference will be held at the Washington-Dulles Airport Holiday Inn in Sterling, VA from May 14-16, 2004. Contact Ken Westby at westby@godward.org for details.

¹³ *Commentary* on Luke 1:35.

¹⁴ *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*, Zondervan, 1962, p. 110.