

5-1-1960

# A Biblical Study of the Lordship of Christ

Hal J. May

---

## Recommended Citation

May, Hal J., "A Biblical Study of the Lordship of Christ" (1960). *Western Evangelical Seminary Theses*. 366.  
[https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes\\_theses/366](https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/wes_theses/366)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Western Evangelical Seminary at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Western Evangelical Seminary Theses by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolf@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolf@georgefox.edu).

APPROVED BY

Major Professor: Nobel V. Sack

Co-operative Reader: J. H. H. H.

Professor of Thesis Form: Nobel V. Sack

A BIBLICAL STUDY OF THE LORDSHIP OF CHRIST

by

Hal J. May

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the

Western Evangelical Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Divinity

Portland 22, Oregon

May, 1960

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Problem . . . . .	2
Justification of the Problem . . . . .	2
Delineation . . . . .	3
Procedure . . . . .	3
II. THE CHRIST . . . . .	5
The Virgin Birth . . . . .	6
The God-Man . . . . .	15
Marks of the Human Nature . . . . .	16
The Divinity of the Incarnate Christ . . . . .	26
The Resurrection . . . . .	33
Summary . . . . .	43
Conclusion . . . . .	45
III. CHRIST AS LORD . . . . .	46
Usage of the Word Lord . . . . .	47
Use Outside the New Testament . . . . .	47
New Testament Usage . . . . .	52
Summary . . . . .	64
The New Testament Idea of Lord . . . . .	64
God as Lord . . . . .	65
Christ as Lord . . . . .	70
The Relationship of the Father and Son . . . . .	79



	iii
CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary . . . . .	86
Conclusion . . . . .	90
IV. THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S LORDSHIP . . . . .	91
The Kingdom . . . . .	92
The Limitation of the Kingdom . . . . .	92
The Centrality of the Kingdom . . . . .	94
The Nature of the Kingdom . . . . .	97
The Sphere of the Kingdom . . . . .	104
The Parables of the Kingdom . . . . .	113
The Kingdom in the Epistles . . . . .	118
Summary . . . . .	120
Conclusion . . . . .	123
V. CHRIST THE LORD AS SAVIOR . . . . .	125
The Presentation of Christ as Savior . . . . .	126
God as Savior . . . . .	134
Christ's Teaching Concerning His Saviorhood . . . . .	136
Summary . . . . .	141
Conclusion . . . . .	143
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	144
Summary . . . . .	145
Conclusions . . . . .	146
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	148
APPENDIXES . . . . .	151
APPENDIX A . . . . .	152
APPENDIX B . . . . .	153

## CHAPTER

## PAGE

APPENDIX C . . . . .	154
APPENDIX D . . . . .	156
APPENDIX E . . . . .	159
APPENDIX F . . . . .	160
APPENDIX G . . . . .	161
APPENDIX H . . . . .	162
APPENDIX I . . . . .	163
APPENDIX J . . . . .	163

**CHAPTER I**  
**INTRODUCTION**

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Problem

This is an inductive study of the scriptures in an attempt to understand the true nature of the Lordship of Christ. The Apostle Paul, the Historic Confessions of Faith, and the modern Protestant ecumenical movement have all held the phrase "Christ is Lord" as an essential element of the Christian Faith. Because there are many divergent opinions concerning its meaning and nature, it is essential that the scriptures be examined to ascertain the true concept of the Lordship of Christ, and how man is related to it.

#### Justification of the Problem

One does not have to read in a very wide theological circle today, before conflicting statements concerning the Lordship of Jesus Christ are observed. Some declare that he is not Lord, but only Savior, while others affirm that Christ is only Lord. Somewhere between these two opposite extremes there is a position which is in harmony with the scriptures, and this must be found. It is true that most groups calling themselves Christian will turn to the scriptures for the surety of their position, but it is also true that they cannot all be right. This thesis is not an attempt to prove anyone wrong or right, but to find what the scriptures teach through inductive study.

▲

### Delineation

This study is not an attempt to formulate a systematic doctrine of the Lordship. Nor, is it an attempt to examine the complete scope of the subject with all of the side facets, but rather an attempt to understand the meaning of Lord, the nature of his Lordship, and lastly, how Christ is Lord. Many phases of the picture will of necessity be set aside in an attempt to answer the main problem, but this is not to be construed as an attempt upon the part of the author to ignore them.

An example of this is the willful circumventing of the problem concerning the coming of the kingdom. Whether the kingdom came with Jesus, or whether it is yet to come, must be set aside for a study of the characteristics of the kingdom. Another example, is found in the examination of the Saviorhood of Christ. There is no attempt made to study the meaning of Christ's baptism, his transfiguration, or his death and resurrection, but these are set aside for the central study of the fact of Christ as Savior. If the study were ever broadened these things would require examination.

### Procedure

The study begins with an examination of the nature of Jesus Christ, for unless one has a true Christ, there is little point in dealing with his offices. His origin, humanity, divinity, and resurrection are all examined in the scriptures. In the next chapter, the etymological source of the word "Lord" is traced outside of the New Testament in Greek literature, and a thorough examination of all the uses of the word in the Greek New Testament. Out of this examination an analysis is made, and passages which throw light upon the usage are inductively studied. To find the nature of Lordship, in relation to

man a brief study is made of the characteristics of the kingdom, in an attempt to understand Lordship. Because Christ is also repeatedly called Savior, a brief study is also made of this office, that its relation to Lordship may be seen. Finally, in the summary and conclusion the facts that have come to light in the study are fitted into a composite picture of the Lordship of Christ.

## CHAPTER II

### THE CHRIST

## CHAPTER II

### THE CHRIST

This study must of necessity begin with a brief examination of the nature of Christ, for there can be no sound study of the offices of Christ until certain facts of his nature are examined. It is upon these basic facts that the Lordship of Christ rests, and therefore must here be presented. This is not an attempt to do what has already been done much more fully in most theology texts, but rather is an examination of certain facets which are pertinent to this study.

#### I. THE VIRGIN BIRTH

To begin with Christ, one must begin at the beginning, that is, as far as physical life is concerned, his birth. Not from the manger scene point of view, but rather the genetic aspect.

In the first chapter of Matthew's gospel, the author records a genealogy from Abraham to Christ, and declares that forty-two generations passed between Abraham and the birth of Christ. In verse 18 he begins a justification of this genealogy, not from the question of any of the other names upon the list, but justification for the placing of the name of Christ upon it. He begins with two facts. First that Mary was betrothed to Joseph. *ΜΥΗΣΤΕΥΘΕΙΣ* is a genitive singular feminine participle, first aorist passive meaning that she,



Mary was promised in marriage to Joseph.<sup>1</sup> The second fact is, that she was found pregnant while promised in marriage, but before they had come together. Matthew hastens to add, almost, it seems, in fear of what is running through the mind of the reader, that the child is of the Holy Spirit. The problem does not seem to be eased by the statement, for both ancients and moderns alike do not overlook the problem of conception that is involved. Chrystostom tried to explain it by declaring that Mary and Joseph actually lived together before marriage, which he declared to be a custom of the day, as a protection of the betrothal.<sup>2</sup> Nicoll, however declares that there is no historic ground for such a declaration.<sup>3</sup> Nels Ferre, on the other hand does not see that the question is any problem, for he can conceive of Jesus being the product of a Roman soldier, or of Joseph, without any harm to the incarnation.<sup>4</sup>

The Matthew passage, allows for no such interpretation, for it declares that she was pregnant before they came together, **συνελθεῖν**. The basic form is **συνέρχομαι** and simply means to assemble or come together as in Acts 6:1, I Corinthians 11:17, and many other places. **Συνελθεῖν** is a second aorist infinitive with no distinction of time. **Πρίν** is an adverb of time meaning before or sooner than. **ἥ** is an intensive either, or, when preceeded by **Πρίν**. The statement

---

<sup>1</sup>J. H. Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 416.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. Nicoll, ed., The Expositor's Greek Testament, p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>Nels F. S. Ferre, The Christian Understanding of God, p. 191.

is simply, *πρίν ἢ συνελθεῖν* "before either came together."

This would not allow for any living together, nor would it allow promiscuity before marriage for when man and woman come together in intercourse, they become one flesh, according to Genesis 2:24. The statement is that they had not come together as man and wife, thus the wording seems to rule out Joseph as the blood father of Jesus. Note also that Joseph obeyed the angel and took Mary to be his wife and knew her not. If he had been living with her one could not take her. "He knew her not" seems to indicate conclusively that the marriage was not complete until after the birth of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Add to this the statement of Luke 2:5 that Joseph took Mary "who was betrothed to him" to enroll for a tax. Luke is saying that Mary was a betrothed one and not his wife, indicating that marriage is a becoming one flesh and not a declaration or a living together under the same roof.

It seems impossible to rationally consider the possibility of Jesus being the result of a Roman soldier upon any debatable grounds, except to say that if this is so, God honored a woman who stooped to do that which he commanded in the Decalogue should not be done. Not only did he honor the woman, but he also used an act of disobedience to bring about the physical incarnation of the second person of the Trinity, which is rather impossible to accept.

Matthew simply states that the child was the conception of the Holy Spirit. Beyond this fact, it seems dangerous to tread. This

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 1:24-25. All scripture is from the American Standard Version.

fact was revealed to Joseph by an angel of the Lord, along with the name of the child, and his office, both of which will be dealt with later.

Luke's reporting of the annunciation is not the announcement of the angel to Joseph, but to Mary. In Luke 1:26 the angel Gabriel is sent to Mary, who is betrothed to Joseph, with the announcement that she is "favored of God". She is told "thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus."<sup>1</sup> There are several things to note in this declaration. First, that the announcement was prior to pregnancy, "Thou shalt conceive." Secondly, that Mary was chosen for the task of being the human conveyance of the incarnation because, first, she was highly favored, and secondly the Lord was with her. This does not seem to be a witness to one who is dealing in promiscuous living, rather the converse. If this is not true, then she is living out of harmony with the standards of the decalogue, let alone the standards of the one who is to be incarnate through her.

Along with this must be considered the answer to the announcement which Mary gave. "Mary said unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?" Brazen indeed would be the woman who could stand before the angel of the Lord and declare purity when she was not pure. A person may doubt the validity of the record, at the expense of the validity of the scripture, but he cannot deny that the record presents Jesus as being virgin born.

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 1:31.



One other thing needs attention in this annunciation, and that is the word **Παρθένος** translated in the ASV as virgin. The problem here is, does this mean a young woman, or a young woman who has not intercoursed with a man? It appears but a few times in the Greek Testament and in the ASV is always translated "virgin", however in I Corinthians 7:34, Paul makes a distinction between a virgin and an unmarried woman, saying that they are "careful for the things of the Lord." In II Corinthians 11:2, Paul again refers to a virgin. Here he uses the analogy of betrothal to Christ so that the Corinthians may be presented to Christ as pure virgins. He seems to give the sense of not having intercourse with the world as purity. In Revelation 14:4, in speaking of the one hundred and forty-four thousand he declares that "these are they that were not defiled with women; for they are virgins." Here the idea is clearly conveyed that virgin is one who has not had sexual intercourse.<sup>1</sup>

The point of this consideration is the same as the above consideration of Matthew, that is the establishment of the validity of the witness concerning Jesus. The scriptures present Jesus as not being the result of human procreation, but the conception of the Holy Spirit through the virgin Mary. Christ did not become incarnate by later coming into the life of the mature man Jesus, but rather he was incarnate by birth, making him inseparably connected to humanity by birth.

One final charge against the validity of the passage must be considered, and that is that it is the addition of a redactor at a

---

<sup>1</sup>W. R. Nicoll, The Expositor's Greek Testament, V, p. 436.

much later date. This charge is answered by Gresham Machen as being without sound basis, citing Harnack, Zimmerman and Gersdorf to agree with his conclusions.<sup>1</sup> He declares that the prologue is indeed a different style from the birth narrative, but uses the same language as the rest of the book, and some distinctive to Luke. He declares that it is evident that the birth narrative is original to the book.

There is however something far more basic to the acceptance of the Virgin Birth than an agreement with a fact. It has been presented above that the scriptures clearly teach that Jesus was not the result of natural human procreation, but was rather conceived by the Holy Spirit in the womb of a virgin, or one who had not known a man, thus making him related to God, by conception of the Holy Spirit, and the human race through Mary his mother. If this cannot be accepted as a validly reported fact by the two Gospel writers, then there seems little room to accept anything else that they have reported. If it is doubted, then we are saying that it is a fabrication, and if this is a fabrication, what is there to prevent the rest of what they say from being a fabrication? As the other two Gospel writers report many of the same facts, there is nothing to cause us to accept them as fact either, and thus the whole foundation of Christianity is in danger. If the Scriptures are not a reliable witness to Christianity, to what can we turn? If we cannot accept the virgin birth, there is no reason for considering anything else concerning Jesus Christ. We can and we must accept the Virgin Birth, and in it find the first

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Gresham Machen, The Virgin Birth of Christ, p. 47.

foundation stone for further consideration of the problem at hand.

Matthew and Luke are only reporters of a fact in this instance, and it remains the work of John and Paul to give us the meaning of the great mystery of the incarnation. John presents his concept of the incarnation in 1:1-18 of his Gospel. In his opening statement, he actually makes three statements which find their parallel farther on in his introduction. His first statement is, "In the beginning was the Word": the second, "And the Word was with God"; and the third, "And the Word was God". In verse fourteen there is a similar three fold declaration. First, "And the Word became flesh": secondly, "And tented among us and we beheld his glory, glory as the only begotten from the Father": and third, "Full of Grace and Truth". Note the conveyance of the meaning of the announcement of the incarnation, if the statements are read together. "In the beginning was the word . . . And the Word became flesh". "And the Word was with God . . . and tented among us, and we beheld his glory as the only begotten from the Father". "And the word became flesh . . . Full of Grace and Truth". In this John has presented the mystery of the annunciation of the incarnation which was given to Mary and Joseph.

"In the beginning was the Word" takes man face to face with the eternality of the Trinity. The author of Genesis takes man back to the beginning of this order, but John looks back to the unfathoming of the unfathomable, the dimension of the undimensionable, the infinity of infinity, and here John says was the "Word". This one who "WAS in the beginning," "became flesh." This "Word was with God", but came and "tented among us". He dwelt with God, but he came and lived on

our street, taking on humanity, so that we could behold "his glory as of the only begotten from the Father". He was with God, but he came so we could see him. But "the Word was God", "full of Grace and Truth". John is literally saying, God came into our midst as flesh and blood so that we could behold his Glory, Grace, and Truth.

Note John's last statement of this introduction in verse 18. He makes the definite statement "no man hath seen God at any time", which is the summation of verse one. The operation of God may be seen, but the operator always remains the unseen. John then says, "The only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Here he sums up verse fourteen, in that the one who "became flesh, and tented among us," so we could behold his Glory, was declaring to us the Father.

Now consider Paul's declaration of meaning of the annunciation given to Joseph and Mary. In his letter to the Philippian church he states,

Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.<sup>1</sup>

Disregarding the exhortation to Christians at the beginning, note what he says about Jesus Christ. First, he was in the form of God. Secondly, he left being on an equal status with God, and became as a servant in the likeness of man. It is not difficult to see the exact parallel which is here with that which John said. The birth of Jesus

---

<sup>1</sup>Philippians 2:5-7.

was the taking of the form of man by one who was in the form of God and was God, for he was equal with God, and thus we have the mystery of the incarnation.

This passage cannot be considered without a glance at the statement "emptied himself taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men." It is apparent that the key words are *ἐκένωσεν μορφῇ δούλου λαβών*, he emptied taking the form of a servant. In all of the other places where the word *κενώνω* appears in the ASV,<sup>1</sup> it is always translated "void", but here "emptied". If this is considered as meaning that he voided or emptied himself of his deity, then there would be little ground for saying he was the son of God. What must be kept in mind in this passage is, that the emptying is in connection with the "taking of the form of a servant". The word *μορφῇ* appears only one other place in the scriptures, that in Mark 16:12, in the Emmaus incident which is recounted more fully by Luke. Here Mark states that Jesus "was manifested in another form unto two of them". Note here that it was Jesus that was manifested, only the form was changed. It was still the same Jesus. Paul says he "emptied", "taking the form". John says "the word was with God" and "became flesh and tented among us". It was still the eternal son of God, the second person of the Trinity, but not in the form with God, for he emptied himself of that form to take the form of a servant, or to become flesh, yet remaining the eternal Son. He did not

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 4:14, I Corinthians 1:17, I Corinthians 9:15, II Corinthians 9:3.



empty himself of this nature, but only the form. This is the heart of the mystery of the incarnation. How this took place is a matter of speculation for the scriptures say no more than what has been examined concerning this point.

One other thing must be observed, that is, in all of these passages that have been considered thus far, there is an underlying tone conveying that it is the choice of God that the incarnation take place. It is the angel Gabriel who announces to a virgin what is to take place. It is the "angel of the Lord" who announces to a disturbed man that his suspicions are groundless, and that which is conceived is a result of the operation of the Holy Spirit. John says that "the word became flesh". Paul says "but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant". The virgin birth seems important in the light of this, for, the virgin birth would be the operation of God alone. If Joseph or a Roman soldier were involved, it would be the choice of man, and the operation of man. Even more preposterous is the concept that God would operate through sin to show his glory. He is true God-man and must remain so to be in harmony with what the scriptures teach, as has been briefly shown.

## II. THE GOD-MAN

In any consideration of Christ in this vein, there is a temptation to either dwell upon the divine nature of Christ, and disregard the human nature, or vice versa. To have a true incarnation, it must go farther than the virgin birth concept as considered above, but must remain an incarnation in the life, and it is to this point that this section is directed. First the marks of the

human nature will be considered, followed, by a consideration of the marks of the divine nature.

#### Marks of the Human Nature

Luke tells us in 2:21 that Jesus was circumcised when he was eight days old, which at first glance seems rather mundane, but one must consider the meaning of circumcision to understand the full import.

In Genesis 17 there is a narrative recorded, telling of the covenant between God and Abraham, which covenant was sealed with the mark of circumcision. This mark was not only to be borne by Abraham, but by all the generations that were to follow him, being administered to all males when eight days old. Each one who received the mark of the covenant came under provisions of the covenant.

Luke is again alone to record another incident that portrays the humanity of Jesus, found in 2:41-52. In this section there are actually three instances, yet they are a part of the same narrative. Here it is recorded that Jesus was taken up to Jerusalem to the feast of the Passover, and though not stated specifically, it is implied that he is taken up to Jerusalem for the first time. This was more than a trip to a feast for a twelve year old boy, but he had come to his Barmitzvah.<sup>1</sup> He became a son of the law, receiving the responsibilities of a man. The phylacteries were placed on him as a reminder of his obligation to keep the law.<sup>2</sup> This gave him the

---

<sup>1</sup>G. C. Morgan, The Gospel According to Luke, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. Nicoll, ed., The Expositor's Greek Testament, I, p. 478.

privilege to enter the Temple, where his parents later found him. Too much is often made of this journey, from the standpoint of his asking questions, and the teachers being astonished at his answers. It says that he asked questions and gave astonishing answers, but it does not say more. The importance of this passage lies in the fact that at the age of twelve Jesus became a son of the Law. The incarnate Son of God is pictured entering more fully into the stream of humanity, yet he knew from whence he was, for he desired to "be in my Father's house",<sup>1</sup> but he remained in the stream of humanity, returning to Nazareth to be "subject unto them", his parental home.<sup>2</sup>

Eighteen years elapse until we see Jesus again. One can only speculate as to what took place during these years, but it is not important for us to know or it seems that there would have been something recorded by the meticulous historian Luke. The very absence of anything except the incident of his becoming a son of the Law, indicates a reliability of this fact.<sup>3</sup> Matthew and Mark, however, give us a little hint as to what went on, though it perhaps was not their intention. Matthew records, upon the ministry of Jesus to his home town, that they said, "Is not this the carpenter's son?"<sup>4</sup> It appears that here he is known in connection with the carpenter's trade, and appears to indicate that he was connected with Joseph's carpenter business, probably he himself plying the trade with Joseph, he as the apprentice. A second indication is recorded in Luke, which states, "And he entered, as his custom was, into the synagogue on the Sabbath,"<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 2:49.      <sup>2</sup>Luke 2:51.      <sup>3</sup>Nicoll, op. cit., p. 478.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 13:55.

<sup>5</sup>Luke 4:16.

where he heard the Law and the Prophets read and interpreted, thus he lived as a strict Jew. Now we see him at age thirty,<sup>1</sup> emerging from the obscurity of Nazareth. Why age thirty? Why not twenty or twenty-five?

It appears that thirty was the age when a man was considered to have reached the age of maturity.<sup>2</sup> Joseph began his great work before Pharoah at thirty.<sup>3</sup> The Levites, though they entered their priestly courses at twenty, it was not until thirty that they took up the full work of a priest.<sup>4</sup> David was thirty when he took the throne of Saul, and the scribes did not begin their work until they were thirty, and according to Luke, Jesus began his ministry at thirty.<sup>5</sup> This is a historical fact, it is true, but it says something more to us. If Jesus is the Son of God, as the annunciation of the angel indicates, one possibility seems feasible, that is, he could have begun his ministry earlier, for he certainly could have exercised the capacity of his divinity, but the fact is that he did not. Rather he chose to remain silent, as far as we know, for thirty years, and then when one is considered mature, he departed from home, and began his vocation. He entered once again, fully into the stream of humanity by submission to the custom of that day.

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 3:23.

<sup>2</sup>Morgan, op. cit., p. 51; A. Clarke, Clarke's Commentary, Vol. V, 382; J. P. Lange, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, "Luke", p. 62.

<sup>3</sup>Genesis 41:46.

<sup>4</sup>Numbers 4:3.

<sup>5</sup>Morgan, Clarke, and Lange, op. cit., pp. 51, 382, 62.

The baptism of Jesus by John in Jordon must be examined under the heading of his humanity, though it will also be discussed under his Divinity later. The human side of this incident must not be lost in the great annunciation of God at the time. John at thirty, for he was only six months older than Christ,<sup>1</sup> came out of obscurity and in the less populated areas,<sup>2</sup> not to minister in the capital city of Jerusalem on the porches of the temple, but rather to begin his ministry in the wilderness region around Jordon.<sup>3</sup> He did not minister only to the poor and backward people of the country, but he caught the attention of the educated and religionists, for the Pharisees and Saducees came also.<sup>4</sup> John did not preach an antidote, story message, but his message was as piercing as a white hot rapier, for he cried, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."<sup>5</sup> They gathered from all quarters, and in no few numbers, for Matthew says, "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordon". Unless his language is completely misunderstood, there must have been thousands who heard him preach at one time. Some even would estimate as high as twenty thousand.<sup>6</sup> The number of conversions must have been just as outstanding, for Matthew does not change his form, but says, "And they were baptized of him in Jordon, confessing their sins."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 1:26.

<sup>2</sup>Luke 1:80.

<sup>3</sup>Luke 3:2-3.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 3:7.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew 3:2.

<sup>6</sup>David Smith, The Days of His Flesh, p. 28.

<sup>7</sup>Matthew 3:6.

It seems rather hard to conceive of John, baptizing like one would dip cattle, when he was so sharp with the Pharisees and Saducees, calling them "the offspring of vipers". Would one be hard on one group, while taking no mind who he baptized with water? It seems rather logical to conceive of John interrogating each candidate as to the sincerity of his confession. Picture then the long line of candidates waiting their turn to stand before the prophet to be baptized, and into this line entered Jesus, placing himself with sinners. Jesus comes to John, who is ready to begin his interrogation once again, but he recognizes the Messiah. John protests, that "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?"<sup>1</sup> Jesus' only reply is, "Suffer it now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Jesus did not place himself with the Pharisees and Saducees as an observer, but in the place of the sinner coming to God in repentance. He did not separate himself from the main stream of humanity, no not even in the matter of sin. Paul so ably sums this up when he says, "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him." Though he knew no sin, he became sin, or he numbered himself with the transgressors. He is not the "wholly other", but he "became flesh" in every sense of the word, and "tented among us."

Immediately upon his baptism, he was found in the wilderness, obviously alone and without food, where he remained forty days, "being tempted of the devil" and he was hungry.<sup>2</sup> It may be a small item,

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 3:15.

<sup>2</sup>Luke 4:2.

but not to one who himself is starving, but he was hungry. One who could feed five thousand with five little loaves and two fishlets,<sup>1</sup> and again four thousand with seven loaves,<sup>2</sup> is hungry. Even the devil recognized that he had the power to make bread of stones.<sup>3</sup> He perhaps could have, but the fact is that he did not and he was hungry, as any human would be. He entered into life's problems to the fullest.

It has been noted that he was tempted, but it is not the concern of this study to debate the peccability or impeccability of Jesus, but rather to note that he was tempted. One cannot feel the pangs of thirst unless he has the capacity of thirst. One cannot feel pain unless he has the bodily organism which can feel pain, and by the same token of logic, one cannot be tempted unless he has the capacity to be tempted. Only a man who can see, squints at the light. Only a man who resists temptation feels the agony of soul when he is tempted. If he immediately yields he feels no temptation, nor does the one who has no capacity of being tempted feel any temptation, for it is impossible. God cannot be tempted with evil.<sup>4</sup> Yet Jesus was tempted. Whether he was morally capable of yielding to temptation is a matter for another debate, but the fact is that the scriptures plainly teach that he was tempted. The writer of the Hebrews concurs in this concept when he says, "He himself hath suffered being tempted . . .",<sup>5</sup> and again, "One that hath been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin."<sup>6</sup> If God cannot be tempted of evil,

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark 6.    <sup>2</sup>Mark 8.    <sup>3</sup>Luke 4:3.    <sup>4</sup>James 1:13.

<sup>5</sup>Hebrews 2:18.    <sup>6</sup>Hebrews 4:15.



and Jesus, being God, according to John,<sup>1</sup> was tempted, there is only one conclusion that can be reached, that is, that he entered into the stream of humanity not only to the point of being numbered with the transgressors, but was tempted also, as all men are.

Matthew records an incident, only a few days from the close of his life, that clearly shows his humanity along religious lines, from a different angle than the baptism or temptation have done. In Matthew 26:36-44 there is recorded the scene in the Garden of Gethsemane where Jesus prayed for himself. Jesus prayed many times,<sup>2</sup> but in only two places are the prayers recorded. John 17 is Jesus' high priestly prayer, and in Matthew 26:39 we have at least a part of a prayer of Jesus, but this prayer differs greatly from John 17, for here Jesus prays for himself. He may have done so many times but no other such prayers are recorded. Here his concern is that the cup which is before him might not be his, yet he is not asking for his will but the will of his Father in Heaven. Does God pray to God? Not as God he would not, but this is not God with God as the second person of the Trinity, but here it is God become flesh, and to the extent that he cries out in the agony of his soul for the cup to pass if it be possible, but not to the setting aside of the will of the Father. He became flesh to the extent that during the hour of his greatest trial, he cried out to God for the strength he needed to face what was ahead. He knows our infirmities because he lived them.

---

<sup>1</sup>John 1:1.

<sup>2</sup>Mark 1:35, 6:46; Luke 3:21, 6:12, 9:28; John 17; Matthew 26:36-44.



Lastly, but far from the least is the fact that Jesus died. His death is treated almost always from the position of his Divinity, which will be done later, but the fact that he died as a human is tremendously important.

Jesus received the sentence of death by crucifixion from Pilate after a trial which is one of the greatest abortions of justice in all history, and was immediately led out for the execution of the sentence. John declares that, "He went out bearing his cross for himself."<sup>1</sup> Matthew, Mark and Luke say that Simon of Cyrene was compelled to carry his cross.<sup>2</sup> The fact is, there is no contradiction here when all of the facts are examined. Rome had a grim custom which dictated that the one condemned to death had to carry his own gibbet to the place of execution,<sup>3</sup> and thus the cross was laid upon his shoulders, and the grim procession, consisting of Jesus and two other criminals who were waiting execution at the time, proceeded toward the place of execution called Golgotha, the place of the skull.<sup>4</sup> Now let us note that three of the Gospels say Simon of Cyreen carried his cross. Look at the facts. It appears evident that Jesus had no rest for about thirty hours, for John declares that it was about the sixth hour, which according to our reckoning was about twelve noon.<sup>5</sup> During this time we know for certain that he kept the passover with his Disciples:<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>John 19:17.      <sup>2</sup>Matthew 27:32, Mark 15:21, Luke 23:26.

<sup>3</sup>David Smith, The Days of His Flesh, p. 491.      <sup>4</sup>Matthew 26:33.

<sup>5</sup>Daniel Rops, Jesus and His Times, p. 531.      <sup>6</sup>Luke 22:14-38.

he had walked to Gethsemane and prayed in great agony of soul:<sup>1</sup> he was betrayed by Judas and taken to the house of Annas where he received a brutal buffeting:<sup>2</sup> he had stood trial before the council of the Jews:<sup>3</sup> and he was now led to Pilate<sup>4</sup> who after examining him, sent him to Herod.<sup>5</sup> Herod abused him and mocked him, sending him back to Pilate:<sup>6</sup> Pilate subjected him to further examination and finally ordered him scourged and crucified.<sup>7</sup> Jesus probably received the limit of the Roman law, forty stripes save one, like the Apostle Paul did five times.<sup>8</sup> There are numerous instances in history where thirty-nine stripes have killed men, so brutal is the force of such a lashing. The soldiers, before leading him away, platted a crown of thorns and placed it upon his head, placing a reed in his hand and a scarlet robe upon his body. They insulted him, and took the reed and smote him on the head, evidently to drive the thorns into his skull.<sup>9</sup> After all of this they led him out to crucify him, and they had to compel someone else to carry his cross. He was physically not able, for he had been taxed to the limit of human endurance. One cannot look on all of this and not say in the strictest sense of the word, he was fully human, for he reacted as a human, and physical strength failed.

The last scene finds him being crucified at the hands of the Romans. He is not left to die in peace, for the mockers and ranters

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 22:39-46.

<sup>2</sup>Luke 22:63-65.

<sup>3</sup>Luke 22:66-71.

<sup>4</sup>Luke 23:1.

<sup>5</sup>Luke 23:7.

<sup>6</sup>Luke 23:8-11.

<sup>7</sup>Matthew 27:25.

<sup>8</sup>II Corinthians 11:24.

<sup>9</sup>Matthew 27:39-45.

are here to throw their jibes and insults at a dying man, and this went on for three agonizing hours.<sup>1</sup> He felt forsaken,<sup>2</sup> and then he cried with a loud voice and died. There was little question as to whether he was dead. Rome witnessed to his death, for the soldiers broke the legs of the other two men who were crucified to hasten death, but in the case of Jesus they saw no need, for he was dead already. Only as a double check is a spear thrust into his side by one of the soldiers, allowing blood and water to flow out.<sup>3</sup> Rome was satisfied that he was dead. The Jews were satisfied that he was dead, for they had made the request that the legs be broken so they would not hang on the cross over the sabbath day,<sup>4</sup> but they made no protest when the legs of Jesus were not broken. Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus were convinced that he was dead, for they buried the body.<sup>5</sup> The followers of Jesus were convinced that he was dead, according to the record of all that took place on the resurrection morning.

All of this is presented to see the humanity of Jesus. If the incarnate Son of God did not enter fully into the stream of humanity, he could not have died, but he died as a man, for he was a man. The incarnation was not a phantom appearance, or an on again off again incarnation, but he "became flesh and tented among us". He was man to the very depths of his being, and any Christology which fails to recognize his full humanity is not Biblical, for it seems apparent

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 27:39-45.

<sup>2</sup>Matthew 27:46.

<sup>3</sup>John 19:32-34.

<sup>4</sup>John 19:31.

<sup>5</sup>John 19:38-42.

that the scriptures present him as a man. But, he was more than a man, which is the subject that must be explored next.

### The Divinity of the Incarnate Christ

We have previously attempted to establish the humanity of Jesus from the standpoint of his Divinity, that is, assuming that he was Divine we examined the scriptures in regard to his humanity. It is now our task to assume his humanity and examine the scriptures in regard to his Divinity.

The virgin birth has already been examined at length, but there are several facts that must be examined in the record of the annunciation of the angel in regard to his Divinity. In Matthew's account of the annunciation of the angel to Joseph the statement is made, "And she shall bring forth a son: and thou shall call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins."<sup>1</sup> The importance of this statement does not lie in the name for Ἰησοῦς, Jesus, is the Greek equivalent of יְהוֹשֻׁעַ the Hebrew for Joshua, and the name Joshua was a common name for the Jews to name their children, meaning savior or deliverer. It is plain to see that not much stir would be created in the mind of Joseph or the people of Nazareth over the name Jesus, but what the angel added is the point to notice. The angel said, "for it is he that shall save his people from their sins." It is true that he was to be called savior, but he was not only to be called savior, he was to be the savior who

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 1:21.

would deliver this people from their sins. Others were called Joshua in remembrance of the national hero who led Israel in the captivity of the land, and the settlement of Israel as a nation with a country. He finished the deliverance from Egypt. Now Jesus was to be the true Joshua that was prophesied in the Old Testament as the one to come and be a deliverer from sin. This was the significant announcement to Joseph, and what set this Joshua apart from all the other little Joshuas of the day. He was the divine savior sent from God.

One must also note Matthew's comment on the annunciation, for he quotes Isaiah 7:14, "and they shall call his name Immanuel," which he says is interpreted, "God with us." Matthew immediately connects Jesus with the promised Messiah of the Old Testament, thus he is to fulfill the hopes of the past, "God with us." This is the one that the nation of Israel has been looking for through the centuries. Matthew also by this states that this Jesus is the son of God for he is "God with us" and thus Divine.

In the annunciation to Mary the name is once again given, but more is added, and in another vein.

He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.<sup>1</sup>

This statement is actually in three parts. The first deals with his being "the Son of the Most High"; the second with the throne of David;

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 1:32-33.

and the third, with the eternality of his kingdom.

Let us examine the first statement. "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High." The greatness referred to is certainly not an earthly greatness, for though he did have a following, it is evident that the masses did not deem him great. Rather his greatness is an inherent greatness, that is connected with the rest of the statement, "and shall be called the Son of the Most High." His greatness is in the fact that he was the Son of God. The angel did not say that he was to be called the son of Joseph and Mary, but the "Son of the Most High", and thus it appears that he is connected directly to God and thus Divine.

The next statement concerning the throne of David will not be examined fully now, but in a later section, though a few things must be observed. David's throne did not exist at this time on earth, for the Jews were under Roman rule. Pilate was the procurator over Judea, and Herod was king of Galilee. God promised David, "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever."<sup>1</sup> If this is taken in the physical sense the promise was never kept, and if the declaration of the angel to Mary is taken in a physical sense, it was never kept, but if in the spiritual sense, both promises were kept, and it is only in this sense that it can be considered an eternal kingdom, which establishes the premise of the last statement. David's throne can only exist in an eternal sense in one who is eternal. David's throne was established eternally, and it was given to Jesus who was the "Son of the

---

<sup>1</sup>III Samuel 7:13.

Most High", and thus it seems that this is a clear declaration of the divinity of Jesus.

The next instance to be examined is found in the narrative of his becoming a son of the Law, where he answers the worried query of his mother, "How is it that ye sought me? Know ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"<sup>1</sup> Strange indeed when a child of twelve seeks the company of the doctors of the Law, but stranger still is his answer regarding his "Father's house". Mary had said, "Thy father and I sought thee",<sup>2</sup> but Jesus answered, "this is my Father's house". Here there is a strange conflict between the human and the divine. Mary represents a father's house, while the Temple represents The Father's house. A lad of twelve, the incarnate Son of God, "God with us", is torn between being twelve and getting to the mission he came to accomplish. Joseph's house was the roof that sheltered him, while the Temple was the earthly house of his real Father, and his heart was there, yet he went back to Nazareth and was subject to them, for the time had not yet come.

One of the strongest witnesses to the Divinity of Jesus is found in the baptism narratives, which are recorded in all of the Gospels, though John's record is from a different point of view, yet essentially the same thing is recorded. In all of the Gospels the Spirit in the form of a dove comes down from heaven and abides upon him.<sup>3</sup> Of far more importance is the record of a voice witnessing

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 2:49.      <sup>2</sup>Luke 2:48.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 3:16, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:22, John 1:32-34.

from heaven, "Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased."<sup>1</sup> Allowing for slight variations in wording, all of the records are essentially the same, though John does not record a voice at all. John however gives John the Baptist's witness concerning this baptism, and he declares that he has seen the Spirit descend upon Jesus, and "have born witness that this is the Son of God."<sup>2</sup> Also upon seeing Jesus he declared, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!"<sup>3</sup> And again he declared to two disciples, upon seeing Jesus, "Behold the Lamb of God".<sup>4</sup>

Let us now analyze the situation. All of the witnesses apparently have John the Baptist as their common source of information, at least the ultimate source from which all information was handed down. According to the order presented by all of the Evangelists, none of the disciples had yet been called, nor had the ministry of Jesus begun. It must be noted that Matthew, Mark and Luke do not present their material as John's opinion, but rather the facts as they happened, while John presents John the Baptist's opinion and does not try to relate the facts at all. The first three Evangelists only declare that Jesus was baptized of John in Jordon, that the Spirit descended in the form of a dove, and that a voice from Heaven said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."<sup>5</sup> John would not necessarily be biased in his relation of the facts as they happened, but the Baptist's interpretation of the facts is the Baptist's opinion

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 3:17, Mark 1:11, Luke 3:32.      <sup>2</sup>John 1:34.

<sup>3</sup>John 1:29.      <sup>4</sup>John 1:36.      <sup>5</sup>Matthew 3:17.



and must not be confused with the facts of the baptism. John said that his ministry was that of water baptism,<sup>1</sup> but that the one upon whom he saw the Spirit descending was to baptize men with the Holy Spirit.<sup>2</sup> This is what John said the one sending him had related to him, but John the Evangelist does not record that John the Baptist saw the Spirit descending upon Jesus. This we must assume from what John at two other times says about Jesus, as recorded in John 1:29 and 1:36. John only writes that the Baptist saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God. Also we may assume that this is Jesus who John declares is the Son of God, by what John the Evangelist says in the preface to his Gospel. John says,

John bear witness of him, and cryeth saying, This was he of whom I said, He that cometh after me became before me: for he was before me. For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.<sup>3</sup>

John is presenting the fact that Jesus is the Christ, and it is doubtful whether he would record the sayings of a man who held contrary opinions to what he was presenting. It seems evident that the baptism narrative declares two things. First, that Heaven witnesses that Jesus was the Divine Son of God, and secondly, that John the Baptist witnesses that Jesus was the Son of God.

The transfiguration is another instance where there is witness from a heavenly source to Jesus being divine. The point of the consideration is not how he was transfigured, but rather the witness that came from heaven. Matthew records it as, "This is my beloved

---

<sup>1</sup>John 1:33.    <sup>2</sup>John 1:33.    <sup>3</sup>John 1:15 & 17.

Son, in whom I am well pleased; Hear ye him."<sup>1</sup> Mark records it as, "This is my beloved Son: Hear ye him."<sup>2</sup> Luke declares it to be, "This is my Son, my chosen: Hear ye him."<sup>3</sup> Allowing for slight differences, these statements are basically the same, so no comment need be made upon their differences. What must be observed is that this statement was not made for the benefit of Jesus, but rather for the three disciples who were on the mountain with him, Peter, John, and James.<sup>4</sup> It evidently was to confirm the Deity in the minds of the disciples, and because of his Deity he was to be heard.

One cannot pass by the miracles in any discussion of the Divinity of Jesus, though a full examination of all the miracles is not needful at this time for the purpose that is at hand. Because of this, one miracle is selected as a representative miracle, this is the feeding of the five thousand.<sup>5</sup> This is selected because first, it is recorded in all of the Gospels; secondly, because all twelve disciples were present.<sup>6</sup> It was witnessed by five hundred people, and they seemed convinced of the miracle for they desired

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 17:5.    <sup>2</sup>Mark 9:7.    <sup>3</sup>Luke 9:35.    <sup>4</sup>Luke 9:28.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew 14:15-21, Mark 6:35-44, Luke 9:12-17, John 6:5-14.

<sup>6</sup>Luke records that the twelve came to him saying that the people should be sent away to get food. The twelve here could be a non-numerical twelve, indicating the group of the disciples, as when they were gathered in an upper room after the resurrection and Thomas is referred to by John as "one of the twelve". John 20:24. Judas was already dead, but the twelve refers to the disciples in distinction to others who were followers and rightly called disciples, but this does not seem to be the use here. The fact that they took up twelve baskets full is an indication that in all probability they were all there.

to make him king.<sup>1</sup>

The resources were indeed limited that day for five loaves and two fishlets were far below the estimate of two hundred denarii worth of bread needed, yet Jesus took them and fed the multitude of at least five thousand, and had food left over, which is an indication that they were satisfied. How he did this is not a concern here, but the fact that five thousand people were hungry, and that they were satisfied with five loaves and two fishlets is really the heart of the miracle. There has never been such a miracle performed in all of recorded history. If this miracle appeared alone it would not lead us to the conviction that Jesus is the Son of God, but coupled with all of the other witnesses herein examined, it adds evidence to the contention that Jesus is the Son of God, as Nicodemus said, "No one can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him."<sup>2</sup>

### III. THE RESURRECTION

In the section on the humanity of Jesus we examined the fact that Jesus died on a Roman gibbet, but more needs to be said than just that he died, for because he died the hopes of his followers were dashed to the ground and trampled under the feet of the Jews. These disciples had staked three years upon the fact that Jesus was the Messiah, the King of the Jews, and now he was dead, and along with him all their dreams. The Jews in cooperation with the Romans had in a clean sweep destroyed all of the talk of Jesus being the

---

<sup>1</sup>John 6:15.

<sup>2</sup>John 3:2.

Messiah with an upright piece of wood with a cross-bar at the top. There was only one possibility that their hopes could be restored, and that would be through the resurrection of the body of Jesus.

A resurrection is indeed a strange possibility, for the millions of graveyards over the world bare mute witness to the fact that resurrection of the dead is not a common occurrence. Humanity in general discounts the possibility of resurrection of the body for no one has ever seen it take place as far as secular historical records are concerned, yet the scripture plainly declares the resurrection of Jesus, being recorded in all four gospels.<sup>1</sup>

There are three possibilities to be considered in relation to this resurrection. First, that it was the perpetration of an absolute fraud which the disciples concocted to deceive the world as to the divinity of one called Jesus. The second possibility is that the whole thing was a figment of the imagination which arose out of the deep anguish and sorrow corporately shared by the disciples over the loss of their leader. Plainly they were suffering from hallucinations brought about by absolute despondency. The third possibility is that the whole story is true, and that Jesus actually did rise the third day from the grave.

One may philosophize upon the possibilities of these three alternatives, but a critical examination of the facts should give a reasonable answer, for it seems that upon this fact alone, the whole of Christianity will rise or fall.

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 28, Mark 16, Luke 24, John 20.

Joseph of Armathaea, a rich man, and evidently a member of the Sanhedrian,<sup>1</sup> along with Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews,<sup>2</sup> buried the body in haste before sundown. This ushered in the day of preparation before the sabbath day, which was the great feast day called Passover. The Jews feared that the body might be spirited away from the tomb, and that the story be told that he arose from the dead, so they went to Pilate with the request "that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day."<sup>3</sup> Pilate's reply was, "Ye have a guard: go, make it as sure as ye can."<sup>4</sup> Whether this guard was a watch of Roman soldiers or the Temple guard is not certain, but in all probability it was the former for the guards seemed to be in some jeopardy with Pilate when the body was missing.<sup>5</sup> They stationed the guard and affixed some type of seal upon the stone that was rolled in front of the entrance to the sepulchre in order that no one could steal the body.

It must be noted that the Jews need not have placed their guard nor affixed the seal as far as the followers of Jesus were concerned, as indicated by their actions. Joseph and Nicodemus entertained no thoughts of a return or even a pilferage of the body for they wound the body in a linen burying cloth and placed about one hundred pounds of spices with the body in the wrapping.<sup>6</sup> This is certainly not the action of persons who expect a return or removal of the body. The women who had followed Jesus from Galilee watched this burial operation, and noting where the body was laid, went home

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 23:51.    <sup>2</sup>John 3:1.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 27:64.    <sup>4</sup>Matthew 27:65.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew 28:14.    <sup>6</sup>John 19:40.

to prepare more spices and ointments to add to the one hundred pounds already used.<sup>1</sup> This certainly is not the action of those who are anticipating any removal or resurrection. Peter and supposedly John were not anticipating anything, for they were told that the body was not in the tomb, and they ran to see.<sup>2</sup> If they were putting on a show for someone to see, they picked the wrong time of day, for it was very near daybreak, and there is no record that anyone saw them. It was curiosity that prompted their action, for the scriptures seem to convey that they were completely surprised.

How Jesus arose is a mystery, for nothing is said in the scriptures, only how it affected other people, and in this we find the strongest indication that Jesus arose from the grave. If minute details had been given, it would savor of a hoax, but the very lack of details is an indication that there were none, for no one was there. The stone's removal was evidently witnessed by the guards,<sup>3</sup> and they are very probably the source of Matthew's information,<sup>4</sup> but even they do not have detail of the resurrection.

It is well to make special note of the chief priests reaction to the news of the guards, for in it they do not deny their story. The council is assembled and with the solution that money be paid to the guards to say that "His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept." For such an incriminating story as this, they promised to persuade Pilate of their innocence, thus relieving them

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 23:55-56.    <sup>2</sup>John 20:2.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 28:2-4.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 28:11.

from the danger of being punished for sleeping on watch.<sup>1</sup> One may doubt the bribe of the council and accept the story of the guards as true, but facts seem to point to the contrary. First, what soldier would sleep on watch, when his life was at stake for doing so.<sup>2</sup> Secondly, if they did sleep, could the stone be removed with such silence that sleeping guards, in close proximity to the tomb, be not awakened? Both of these arguments make the story told by the guards extremely doubtful. All that the High Priests had to do was to produce a body to stop the resurrection story, but this they did not do. The best answer that the Jews had was the perpetration of a lie by bribery.

Peter and John, upon visiting the tomb, saw something in the tomb that caused them to believe that the story of Mary, that the body had been removed, was not true, and that he had risen from the dead. Note the record,

Simon Peter therefore also cometh, following him, and entered into the tomb; and he beholdeth the linen clothes lying, and the napkin, that was upon his head not lying with the linen clothes, but rolled up in a place by itself. Then entered the other disciple also, who came first to the tomb, and he saw and believed.<sup>3</sup>

What did they see that convinced them that Jesus had risen? They saw grave clothes, but what was there about the grave clothes that indicated that Jesus had risen and not that the body had been merely removed?

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 28:14.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. Nicoll, ed., The Expositor's Greek Testament, I, p. 338.

<sup>3</sup>John 20:6-8.



John declares that Jesus was buried after the custom of Jewish burial, but the question is, how do the Jews bury? They took linen and bound or wound the body, limb by limb, and in the folds of the bandages they placed the spices of embalming. Finally the head was wrapped in a napkin, which was not a part of the bandages which bound the body.<sup>1</sup> The raising of Lazarus throws light upon this also, for when he was called forth by Jesus he came forth bound in the grave clothes, and the napkin about his face, but the clothes did not hinder him from walking.<sup>2</sup>

If Peter and John had entered into the tomb to see grave clothes strewn about the floor in a disheveled mess, there would be little to convince them of the validity of the resurrection, but evidently what they saw was the collapsed grave clothes, lying there in the form of a man where the body had laid. The napkin was not in a pile of grave clothes, but separate, where the head had once laid, now only a napkin was rolled up. This appears to be what they saw, for it is recorded that they were convinced.

Up to this point evidence of a non-personal nature has been examined, but there is evidence that is far more certain than this, and that is the personal appearances of Jesus. Though there are problems with the appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene it is none the less a fact that Mark and John both declare that Jesus appeared unto her.<sup>3</sup> Matthew records that Jesus appeared to both Mary Magdalene

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 618.

<sup>2</sup>John 11:44.

<sup>3</sup>Mark 16:9, John 20:15-17.



and "the other Mary" as they fled the tomb with the resurrection news. Jesus met them in the way and they "took hold of his feet and worshiped him."<sup>1</sup> At this meeting Jesus declares his intention to meet the disciples in Galilee<sup>2</sup> as the angel had announced.<sup>3</sup> There is nothing more known of this meeting except that it took place and that Jesus gave his charge to the disciples, but details are lacking.<sup>4</sup>

Jesus appeared to the two who were walking on the road to Emmaus. He talked to them and expounded the meaning of all that had taken place, and finally revealed himself to them.<sup>5</sup> They were elated at the appearance and hastened back to the disciples in Jerusalem to bear the news, only to find that the disciples had news also, for, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon",<sup>6</sup> which to them seemed to clinch the evidence and the rumors that had been floating about all of that day. This indeed was strong evidence to them, but not as strong as they were about to behold, for, "As they spake these things, he himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, "Peace be unto you."<sup>7</sup> John, in relating the same instance declares that they had shut the doors in fear of the Jews, but that Jesus appeared in the midst of them.<sup>8</sup> Luke dispels the concept of a hallucination for he records that Jesus showed his wounds and told them to feel him that he was flesh and bones and he declares that he ate.<sup>9</sup> In all probability Mark's record of Jesus' appearance to the

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 28:1-9.      <sup>2</sup>Matthew 28:10.      <sup>3</sup>Matthew 28:7.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 28:16-20.    <sup>5</sup>Luke 24:13-21.      <sup>6</sup>Luke 24:34.

<sup>7</sup>Luke 24:36.      <sup>8</sup>John 20:19.      <sup>9</sup>Luke 24:39-43.

disciples while they were eating is this same instance recorded by Luke and John.<sup>1</sup> John declares that Jesus made a second appearance, eight days later, under much the same circumstances as before, though this time it seems to be for the benefit of Thomas who was not present at the first group appearance. John then records that Jesus appeared to Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, James and John, upon the post resurrection fishing trip.<sup>2</sup> Jesus appeared upon the shore calling to the disciples,<sup>3</sup> which appearance John declares is the third appearance to the disciples, evidently meaning as a corporate body.<sup>4</sup> The last appearance is recorded by Luke and in the book of Acts, and is commonly called the ascension.<sup>5</sup>

Is the resurrection, fact or fiction? In the light of the evidence, is it feasible to declare that it is a hoax? There seems little reason to accept this story as a hoax, for it was far too vast. It is true that the number of people who saw the resurrected Lord were perhaps few, and that is the way to keep it, if one wishes to perpetrate such a fraud, but there is still other evidence to examine. There was a man named Saul, who determined to stamp out this hoax that had arisen in Judaism.<sup>6</sup> On his way to carry out his plot of destruction he became convinced of the validity of Christianity and became one of its arch propagators.<sup>7</sup> Evidently what convinced him was the appearance of Jesus,<sup>8</sup> though some may doubt that

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark 11:14.    <sup>2</sup>John 21:2.    <sup>3</sup>John 21:4-5.    <sup>4</sup>John 21:14.

<sup>5</sup>Luke 24:50-51, Acts 1:9.    <sup>6</sup>Acts 8:1-3, 9:1-2.

<sup>7</sup>Acts 9:3-19.    <sup>8</sup>Acts 9:5.

he actually saw Jesus, Paul's own words seem to indicate that he did for he said, "and last of all, as a child untimely born, he appeared to me also."<sup>1</sup> Note also that he did not stop at declaring that he saw Jesus, but went so far as to say that five hundred saw him at one time.<sup>2</sup> Again note that he affirmed most of them to be alive at the time of the writing, allowing that anyone interested could do a little checking of the story. Certainly one who is propagating a hoax does not invite such investigation.

One other fact must be observed in this examination, and that is the reaction of the disciples after the resurrection. How did they act under the pressure of hostility? The cowering group of disciples who would not go into the trial of Jesus, and hid behind closed doors for fear of the Jews, stood in open boldness on the day of Pentecost and declared the resurrection. They were thrown into prison for preaching the resurrection and were strictly charged to stop preaching in the name of Jesus but they continued with renewed zeal.<sup>3</sup>

At another time they were cast into prison, only to be released by the miraculous power of God, to return to the Temple where they were arrested, to begin preaching again. They were arrested a second time and brought to trial before the Sanhedrian, who was minded to kill them, had it not been for the intervention of one named Gamaliel. After beating the disciples and charging them to

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 15:8.    <sup>2</sup>I Corinthians 15:6.    <sup>3</sup>Acts 3 and 4.

stop preaching in the name of Jesus, they released them. This did not deter them, but only caused them to rejoice that they were counted worthy to suffer for the sake of Christ, and to preach with renewed vigor.<sup>1</sup> Stephen was stoned to death when he would not recant his position.<sup>2</sup>

Add to all of this the witness of the Apostle Paul and the case becomes stronger. The perpetrator of a hoax would hardly be willing to suffer many imprisonments, and lashings above measure, for five times he has been lashed with forty stripes save one, and three times he has been beaten with rods, and stoned once. Three times he suffered shipwreck, and once he was in the water a day and a night before rescue. Add to this the general hazards of travel in that day along with starvation and the cold, and you have not a picture of a man who is striving to dupe others, but on the contrary, one who is thoroughly convinced with the validity of his mission.

The resurrection is not fantastic from the standpoint of modern medicine, for the shooting of adrenalin in the heart, and the massage of the heart has become a common practice in modern medicine.<sup>3</sup> Even the passing through locked doors is no longer fantastic in a modern scientific world which resolves all matter into a form of energy.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 5.      <sup>2</sup>Acts 6.

<sup>3</sup>Martin C. Sampson, M.D., "When the Curtains of Death Parted," The Reader's Digest, LXXIV (May, 1959), p. 48.

<sup>4</sup>Eric Frost, This Jesus, p. 96.

It must be concluded that the early church was convinced that Jesus Christ did rise from the dead, and that it was their responsibility to tell the world of it. Hoaxes do not demand the loyalty that the early church gave to Jesus Christ, nor do hallucinations attain the vast proportion that this one would have had to, to be shared by five hundred people, nor do hoaxes or hallucinations turn an arch enemy into a zealous supporter. This resurrection was taken by all as the ultimate in evidence to support the divinity of Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

#### IV. SUMMARY

In this chapter the scriptures have been examined concerning the virgin birth of Jesus, the marks of his humanity, the marks of his Divinity, and his resurrection. As has been seen, the scriptures clearly declare that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary, and do not allow room for one to declare that he was the product of natural human procreation of any man, but rather the Son of God by the Holy Spirit. It was also seen from the writings of John and Paul, that this one who came to earth was the incarnate son of God.

The fact that Jesus was Divine was then taken as a basic assumption, and the scriptures were examined for the marks of the humanity of Jesus. It was seen that Jesus became a child of the covenant at eight days, and at twelve years he became a child of the Law. At the age of thirty years he entered upon his vocation, as was the custom of the Jews, and at his baptism by John in Jordon, Jesus identified himself with sinners. In his temptation by Satan

in the wilderness he became hungry and was tempted as a human being, while in his life he prayed, and in the Garden of Gethsemane he prayed for himself, but the greatest mark of his humanity was the fact that he died. From all of this it is concluded that Jesus entered fully into the stream of humanity as a man. He was a man for he bore all the marks of true humanity.

In the light of the scriptural record concerning his humanity, the scriptures were examined in reference to his Divinity, with the question as to whether he really was divine. It was noted that at the annunciation of the birth of Jesus the angel declared that he was to "save his people from their sins" and that he was to receive the throne of David, and reign eternally over the house of Jacob, none of which would be possible if he were not divine. Jesus at the age of twelve, made the distinction between his Father's house and Joseph's house, even though Mary called Joseph his father. At the baptism of Jesus a voice from heaven said, "This is my beloved Son," and at the Transfiguration a similar occurrence took place. Though many miracles were indeed performed, the feeding of the five thousand was taken as a representative miracle to depict the power of Jesus beyond the explainable, and was used as a support to the other declarations of his divinity. The resurrection was lastly seen to be as an undoubtable fact from the records that have come to us in the scriptures, and that there is little doubt that the Disciples and the Apostle Paul held it to be an absolute fact, holding it to be the supreme evidence of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

## V. CONCLUSION

From this study it is concluded that Jesus Christ is both human and divine. He was "God with us," or the incarnate Son of God, according to the scriptures. He was, before coming to earth, with God, and "Was God". This is not a modality of God for the distinction is made between the Father and the Son, therefore one cannot deny that the scriptures present Jesus Christ as God-man.

CHAPTER III  
CHRIST AS LORD



## CHAPTER III

### CHRIST AS LORD

Thus far in this study it has been observed that according to the scriptures, Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, fully human and fully Divine, making him God-man, or "God with us." Having thus far seen the nature of Christ, it remains to examine his office of Lord, which will be done in this chapter, not from the philosophical point of view, but rather from the semantic and scriptural standpoint.

#### I. USAGE OF THE WORD LORD

Words are windows through which we look at ideas. We may use them profusely yet seldom fully comprehend their full import, while sometimes we use them with a completely different meaning than that which is generally conceived. It is for this reason that the little window must be washed thoroughly in order that we might see as clearly as possible the complex idea which is so easily conveyed by the simple little thing called a word.

In the Greek New Testament there are two words that can be translated "Lord", and often are, except they have a different shade of meaning. They are *κύριος* and *δεσπότης*.

#### Use Outside the New Testament

The word *κύριος* is used as an adjective in Greek literature

to denote one who has great power and strength,<sup>1</sup> but this might or power is not a physical might. It is rather a subtle influence exercised over subjects by leaders, not brutally nor externally, but rather unintelligibly on the part of the subject over whom it is exercised. It also has the force of the legal power of the state.<sup>2</sup>

**Κύριος** used as a noun, in Greek literature, has the force of one who is lord of a house and family. The family in speaking to him or of him, used the title of **Κύριος** to denote his being the head of the family.<sup>3</sup> The noun first appeared in the fourth century B.C. with two meanings. First, lord of slaves, and lord of subjected peoples. He is one who had a purpose for holding the title, because he was a spokesman in a legal sense for the ones over whom he was lord.<sup>4</sup> In many instances in Greek literature **Κύριος** and **δεσπότης** are used to denote the one who owns slaves, but a distinction remains between the two words. **Κύριος** retains a feeling of kindness and gentleness, while **δεσπότης** has the connotation of hardness,<sup>5</sup> and thus slaveholders preferred to be called **Κύριος** because of its milder connotation.<sup>6</sup> It was not until the Hellenistic period that **Κύριος** was applied to the Greek gods for it did not have the connotation of absolute ownership which **δεσπότης** carried.<sup>7</sup> The earliest application of **Κύριος** to God is found in the LXX, which seems to be a use

---

<sup>1</sup>G. Kittel, Bible Key Words, p. 1.      <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>3</sup>C. R. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup>Kittel, op. cit., p. 5.      <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 8.      <sup>6</sup>Trench, op. cit., p. 96.

<sup>7</sup>Kittel, op. cit., p. 11.

contrary to the popular connotation of that time.<sup>1</sup>

Before the first century B.C., *Kýrios* was used to denote power, but in the first century B.C. *Kýrios* is applied to Isis in Egypt. In about 64-50 B.C. the king of Egypt is called lord, while about this time Augustus is called both *Θεός καί Kýrios*. Herod as well as Agrippa I and II were all called *Kýrios*.<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to note that it almost always appears with one of the substantives, *Θεός*, *Βασιλεύς* and *στρατηγός*, without the intervention of a *καί*.<sup>3</sup>

When it was applied to the gods it did not distinguish between greater or lesser gods, nor ones that were to be especially worshiped, but rather denoted the personal relationship of the addressee to the god as in a prayer or expression of thanks.<sup>4</sup> The role of the slave to his master was one of subjection, but the role of the master was that of protection, and so the relation of the god to the one who subjected himself.<sup>5</sup>

From the time of Trajan, the emperors of Rome allowed themselves to be called *Kýrios*, but this did not mean that the emperor was god, though it does not rule out the possibility,<sup>6</sup> for a predicate to Augustus reads,

As Zeus ruled over all, so is Augustus *Παντομέδων* [lord of the sea<sup>7</sup>] and *Ἀπείρων* [boundless, endless<sup>8</sup>] *κρατέων*; [strong, mighty, powerful, master of, surpass or to be superior<sup>9</sup>]

<sup>1</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 12.      <sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 18.      <sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 23.      <sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 26.      <sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>7</sup>H. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Col. 3, p. 1223.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, Col. 1, p. 166.      <sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, Col. 1, p. 496.

and as Helios shines over all parts of the earth, so is Augustus.<sup>1</sup>

Add to this the evidence that the Christian martyrs later did not refuse the authority of Rome, but the religious claims of the state and the emperor as their overlord.<sup>2</sup>

In the LXX κύριος is used to translate יהוה which is a periphrasis for the divine name Yahweh,<sup>3</sup> and יהוה or יהוה, but it is difficult to establish a definite meaning for Yahweh.<sup>4</sup> The use is however not confined to God, but is a respectful term of address, and is used to denote ownership. Yahweh is a few times addressed as δεσποτης but this is only in the vocative case.<sup>5</sup> It is in the guiding of Yahweh that he is seen as Lord, which is a total covering of the whole life as the Torah would suggest.<sup>6</sup> "Thou shalt have no other gods before me"<sup>7</sup> etc. For submission to God, man was to receive unconditional guidance, which would make his life balanced, and give it significance and purpose, but this was not to be an ethereal idea, but was to manifest itself in proper actions with his fellow man. Man was to be absolutely obedient to God with no reservations.

By the time of Jesus the Jews refused to pronounce Yahweh, and from general speech יהוה had almost disappeared though it was still used occasionally in reference to the king and high priest.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kittel, op. cit., p. 31.    <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 34.    <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 36.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 58.    <sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 36.    <sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 75.

<sup>7</sup>Exodus 20:3.    <sup>8</sup>Kittel, op. cit., p. 88.

Lord was used by the Rabbis in reference to a master of a slave, property owner, lord of a soul, that is of the passions. It was used with a personal pronoun in address from inferiors to superiors and equals, and also used to correspond to the  $\text{לַיהוָה}$  of the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> In late Judaism, God is conceived of as being Lord and leader of the universe and history, and also the Lord and Judge of the individual.<sup>2</sup> The reason for his being Lord was because he was creator of all, and thus by right of creation he is Lord. This gave God an ethical responsibility for its course of history.<sup>3</sup>

$\Delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  is a man who is the owner of slaves. The emphasis is upon the absolute ownership and complete submission. It carries the force of unrestricted authority and domain, and little consideration for the person of the slave. It is the derivation of the English word despot, despotic and despotism.<sup>4</sup> In some early papyri it was used to denote the slave of a writer.<sup>5</sup> When one addresses another as  $\delta\epsilon\sigma\pi\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  it is an act of complete subjection, and was considered so complete that it was only used in classical Greek to refer to their gods as seen in the writings of Euripides. At that time the Greeks had not yet become slavish.<sup>6</sup> The Greeks refused to regard their gods as lords and themselves slaves, for their gods did not have the power of creation. They were only basic forms of reality, of which they too were a part.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 88-89.    <sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 90.    <sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>4</sup>C. R. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, p. 96.

<sup>5</sup>J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, p. 143.

<sup>6</sup>Trench, op. cit., p. 96.

<sup>7</sup>G. Kittel, op. cit., p. 13.

### New Testament Usage

As has been seen in the usage outside of the New Testament, the word *Kúpios* is not bound to a stable meaning reducible to a simple definition, but rather the context often supplies the varied definition. The New Testament affords much the same picture.

The word *Kúpios* appears in the Greek New Testament seven hundred eighty-one times,<sup>1</sup> representing about six different categories in which the word can be classed,<sup>2</sup> each of which will be examined.

The first category,<sup>3</sup> which corresponds to the common usage of the day, is that of another person being addressed as lord, cognant with the English "sir", as in Matthew 13:27, where Jesus says, in relating a parable, "And the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir (*Kúpios*), didst thou not sow good seed in thy field? whence then hath it tares?" In John 12:21 certain Greeks came to the Galilean Philip and said, "Sir (*Kúpios*), we would see Jesus." *Kúpios* is also used to address a ruler, as when the high priests went to Pilate and asked for a guard for the tomb of Jesus he said "Sir (*Kúpios*), we remember that that deceiver said . . .". It is also ascribed to the head of a house by Jesus in a parable of two sons in Matthew 21:30, and they addressed their father as *Kupios*.

---

<sup>1</sup>This count is based upon W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden's Concordance to the Greek New Testament, in comparison with D. Eberhard and D. Erwin Nestle's Greek New Testament.

<sup>2</sup>Author's own analysis based upon the listings of W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden's Concordance to the Greek New Testament.

<sup>3</sup>For full listing consult Appendix A.

Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians writes, "their are gods many, and lords many; yet to us there is one God . . . and one Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>1</sup> Here he reveals two things that are important. First that the title was recognized by a scriptural writer as being ascribed to other gods or other humans who profess lordship, though it is not perfectly clear which he has in mind; possibly both. Secondly, he is evidently using the title, *Κύριος*, in a far wider sense than the formal address significance. This will be considered later.

A second category<sup>2</sup> is the use of *Κύριος* to denote a master or owner, as the following examples will illustrate. In the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants which is recorded in Matthew 25:14-30, *Κύριος* is used repeatedly to designate the owner of the servants (*δούλους*). It is well to note also the concept here conveyed of the absoluteness of the lordship for he commanded that the unprofitable servant be cast out into outer darkness, thus he had the power to dispose. Another good example is recorded in Acts 16:16 and 19. Paul and Silas were accosted many days, by a maid who was devil possessed, as they were on their way to a place of prayer. The owners of this maid who did soothsaying are called *Κύριος*. Paul, in his letter to the Ephesian church exhorts, "Servants (*δούλοι*), be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters (*Κυρίους*)."<sup>3</sup> Again he declares, "And ye masters (*Κυρίους*) do the same thing unto them and forebear threatening:"<sup>4</sup> It is interesting

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 8:5-6.    <sup>2</sup>For a full listing consult Appendix B.

<sup>3</sup>Ephesians 6:5.    <sup>4</sup>Ephesians 6:9.

to note that just preceding the first quotation he uses *Κυρίου* to designate Christ, and in the same verse as the latter quotation he declares that both the servant and the master have a master (*Κύριος*) in heaven. A similar usage appears in his letter to the Colossian church.<sup>1</sup>

The third category of usage is where *Κύριος* is used to designate God apart from the second person of the Trinity.<sup>2</sup> In this category there are two separate groups, the first of which uses *Κύριος* alone without *Θεός*. In Matthew 5:33-34, Jesus quotes from the Old Testament, saying,

Ye have heard that it was said of them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord (*Κύριω*) thine oaths: but I say unto you, swear not at all; neither by heaven for it is the throne of God;

Note here that Jesus places himself in distinction to the Lord, for Moses went before the heads of the tribes of Israel to declare the command of Jehovah saying, "When a man voweth a vow unto Jehovah, or sweareth an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word."<sup>3</sup> It appears from this that the Lord has reference to God. Another clear instance appears in Matthew 11:25, where Jesus prays, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord (*Κυρίε*) of heaven and earth". Here God definitely designated as Lord of all in distinction of Christ. Perhaps the clearest separation between God and Christ is the application of *Κύριος* in Luke 2:22-29, where Mary and Joseph go to

---

<sup>1</sup>Colossians 4:1.

<sup>2</sup>For a complete listing consult Appendix C.

<sup>3</sup>Numbers 30:2.



Jerusalem, "to present him to the Lord (*Κυρίω*)". The word is used several times again in the passage. If Jesus was the Christ Incarnate, and the appellation *Κύριος* is applied to Christ, Mary and Joseph would be presenting Christ to Christ, which is the height of absurdity. The only conclusion is that here *Κύριος* is applied to God the Father. Again in Luke 5:17 a similar distinction is made when Luke declares that "the power of the Lord was with him to heal." It would be absurd again to say that Christ came upon himself, but rather the Father was with him. This is in line with the concept of John 14:10 where Jesus declares,

Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?  
The words that I say unto you I speak not of myself: but the  
Father abiding in me doeth his works.

Though it is a quotation from the Old Testament,<sup>1</sup> the word *Κύριος* is used to designate God in Hebrews 7:21. "But he with an oath by him that saith of him, The Lord (*Κύριος*) sware and will not repent himself, thou art a priest forever." The writer goes on to declare that Jesus is the eternal priest, but he would not be a priest except by the oath of the Father.

The second division of this category needs only one example to illustrate its use, for the word *Κύριος* always appears with *Θεός*. In most instances, it is found in quotations from the Old Testament, though not always, as in the Revelation of John. Jesus said in Matthew 22:37, quoting Deuteronomy 6:5, "Thou shalt love the Lord (*Κύριον*) thy God (*Θεόν*) with all thy heart, and with all thy soul,

---

<sup>1</sup>Psalms 110:4.

and with all thy mind." Here is plainly a translation of the Hebrew Jehovah ( יהוה or יהוה ) and not יהוה or יהוה .

The fourth category is by far the largest, for here *kúrios* is ascribed to Jesus, but within this general category there are several sub-divisions. These are actually each separate divisions in their own right, but for the sake of the outline they will be classed under one general head.

First, there are the many instances where the title *kúrios* is affixed to Jesus without the use of his name or further title.<sup>1</sup> A good example is where the sisters Mary and Martha send word to Jesus saying, "Lord, (*kúrios*) behold, he whom thou lovest is sick."<sup>2</sup> Again it is used when Jesus appeared to the fishing disciples and asked them if they had any fish. Jesus told them to cast the net upon the other side, and after doing so and catching many fish, Peter recognized Jesus and said, "It is the Lord (*kúrios*)."<sup>3</sup> The writer of the Book of the Acts uses it to designate Jesus in reference to his disciples when he declares, "But Saul yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord (*kúrios*) . . ."<sup>4</sup> Also in the letter to the Philippian Church, Paul declares, "But I trust in the Lord (*kúrios*) that I myself also shall come shortly."<sup>5</sup> None of these uses seem to be addressed to Jesus with the intent of sir, for all have the deeper meaning of Lord which will be examined later. There are, however, uses which seem to have the import of sir.<sup>6</sup> An

---

<sup>1</sup>For a full listing consult Appendix D. <sup>2</sup>John 11:3.

<sup>3</sup>John 21:7. <sup>4</sup>Acts 9:1. <sup>5</sup>Philippians 2:24. <sup>6</sup>See Appendix D\*.

example of this is when the centurion came to Jesus for aid in behalf of his servant who had the palsy. He addressed him as *Kúptos*, evidently not meaning Lord, but sir.<sup>1</sup> Also the woman who met Jesus at the well of Sychar certainly did not have anything in mind but "sir" when she addressed Jesus as *Kúptos*, for she did not know who he was, except that he was a Jew.<sup>2</sup> There seems no reason to translate the title affixed to Jesus by the blind man, who was healed by Jesus in the ninth chapter of John, as Lord. The man addressed him as *Kúptos* and then asked who the Son of God was so that he could believe on him.<sup>3</sup> In verse thirty-eight it is possible that he did call him Lord, in the true sense, but that is purely a matter of conjecture.

The next division is the use of *Kúptos* affixed to the name Jesus Christ.<sup>4</sup> It is interesting to note that no instances of this usage are found in the Gospels, and from Acts forward it appears only a few times. The first instance is found in Acts, where Peter gives his defense for going to the Gentile Cornelius with the Gospel. Peter argues, "If then God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God?"<sup>5</sup> Another example is found in Paul's greeting at the beginning of his letter to the Romans, where he says, "Grace to you, and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>6</sup> This same phrase appears in the greeting of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians,

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 8:6 and 8.    <sup>2</sup>John 4:11, 15, 19.    <sup>3</sup>John 9:36.

<sup>4</sup>For full listing see Appendix E.    <sup>5</sup>Acts 11:17.    <sup>6</sup>Romans 1:7.

his first and second letter to the Thessalonians, and Philemon. James also uses it in his introductory greeting. Other instances need not be cited here.

Another instance of usage is the application of *Kύριος* to "Jesus" or "Our Lord Jesus".<sup>1</sup> This is used in the Gospels, in two places only. Mark in the last of his Gospel says, "So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken to them was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God."<sup>2</sup> Because such a phrase is not used by Mark previously, and the fact that he sat down at the right hand of God, it is possible that this is a later addition to the writing, but this is not certain. Luke uses the phrase in his description of the Resurrection, where the women of Galilee came to the tomb and "found not the body of the Lord Jesus."<sup>3</sup> The writer of the Acts also uses it many times, as well as most of the rest of the New Testament writers.

The next category is one that is almost exclusively the usage of Paul, for it is found but few times in any writings other than his. It is the word *Kύριος* applied to Jesus in the phrases, "Jesus Christ our Lord", "Our Lord Jesus Christ", and "Christ Jesus our Lord". Outside of the writings of Paul, James uses it only once, Peter six times, and Jude only four times.<sup>4</sup> For example, Paul says in his letter to the Romans, "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>5</sup> He writes to Timothy, "Grace,

---

<sup>1</sup>For a full listing see Appendix F.    <sup>2</sup>Mark 16:19.    <sup>3</sup>Luke 24:3.

<sup>4</sup>For a full listing see Appendix G.    <sup>5</sup>Romans 5:1.

mercy, peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord."<sup>1</sup> In Paul's letter to the Corinthians he tells them, "God is faithful, through whom ye were called into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."<sup>2</sup>

Paul has a usage that is all his own, for it appears in no other writing except Paul's and there only twice. In Romans 16:18 he says, "For they that are such, serve not our Lord Christ,". This appears again in Colossians 3:24, where he writes, "Knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance: ye serve the Lord Christ."

The next division is the use of *Kύριος* in reference to Jesus to denote ownership and lordship.<sup>3</sup> The difference between this category and the others, lies in the fact that there is here little question as to whether it means more than a title of respect as is possible in many of the other references. Here the designation of *Kύριος* has the connotation of being master, ruler, owner, disposer, and possessor. The first three Gospels all declare the "Son of man" to be the "lord ( *Kύριος* ) of the sabbath."<sup>4</sup> Paul in his letter to the Philippians declares:

Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>I Timothy 1:2.    <sup>2</sup>I Corinthians 1:9.

<sup>3</sup>For a full listing see Appendix H.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 12:8, Mark 2:28, Luke 6:5.    <sup>5</sup>Philippians 2:9-11.

Again, Paul, in his first letter to Timothy wrote:

I charge thee in the sight of God, who giveth life to all things, and of Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession; that thou keep the commandment, without spot, without reproach, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in its own times he shall show who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and the Lord of lords.<sup>1</sup>

Peter in his first epistle admonished: "But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord."<sup>2</sup>

Not only is the word *κύριος* applied to Jesus by others, but he also applied it to himself in a few places in the Gospels. The first instance appears in Matthew where Jesus says,

Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works?<sup>3</sup>

Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record the instance where Jesus told the disciples to go to a certain place and they would find an ass and a colt. If they were questioned about taking the colt, he told them to say, "The Lord hath need of them."<sup>4</sup> Jesus also, in telling of the second coming said, "Watch therefore: for ye know not what day your Lord cometh."<sup>5</sup> In the same setting of the second coming he later declared that the righteous would say to him, "Lord, when saw we thee hungry and fed thee?"<sup>6</sup> Nearly the same statement is repeated in Matthew.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>I Timothy 6:13-15.    <sup>2</sup>I Peter 3:15.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 7:21-22.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 21:3, Mark 11:3, Luke 19:31.    <sup>5</sup>Matthew 24:42.

<sup>6</sup>Matthew 25:37.    <sup>7</sup>Matthew 25:44.

At another time Jesus interrogated the Scribes as to why they said that Christ was the son of David. To support his argument he quoted Psalms 110:1: "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet."<sup>1</sup> Then he raises the question: "David himself calleth him Lord; whence is he his son?"<sup>2</sup> Peter in Caesarea Philippi declared that Jesus was the Christ, to which Jesus replied that this was a revelation of "My Father which is in heaven."<sup>3</sup> It is obvious that Jesus owned the affirmation that he was the Christ. If he then was the Christ, he also owned to being Lord of David, as is recorded in the above quotation.

According to Luke, Jesus said, "And why call ye me Lord and do not the things which I say?"<sup>4</sup> This statement in connection with that which John records is a direct claim to Lordship. "Ye call me, Teacher, and, Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Teacher, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet."<sup>5</sup> There is no question here of his claim to Lordship.

Two other instances must be affixed to this category, though they are not without their problems. In the record of Jesus' temptation in the wilderness at the hands of Satan in reply to his suggestions and offers, Jesus answers, "Thou shalt not make trial of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 22:44, Mark 12:36, Luke 20:42.    <sup>2</sup>Mark 12:36, Luke 20:44.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 16:13-20.    <sup>4</sup>Luke 6:46.    <sup>5</sup>John 13:13-14.

Lord thy God."<sup>1</sup> And again he said, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God."<sup>2</sup>

There are two remaining categories which are of no significance for they are of uncertain application. One is the word *κύριος* used alone, and in the understanding of the author, they probably apply to Christ, but it is rather uncertain.<sup>3</sup> The other is *κύριος* used in such a way and context, that the author is not able to ascertain whether it is applied to Christ or God the Father.<sup>4</sup>

There is one more word that must be examined according to use, and that is *δεσπότης*. It appears but few times in the scriptures, but as has already been seen, it has a close derivation with the word *κύριος*. When Jesus is presented at the Temple in Jerusalem as a babe, there was a devout man of Jerusalem who was looking for the coming of Christ. Simeon, upon coming into the temple at that time was directed to him. He took the babe into his arms, and uttered this prayer: "Now lettest thy servant depart, Lord . . ."<sup>5</sup> The word he used was not *κύριος* but *δεσπότης*. God is again addressed in prayer, in this manner, when the disciples gathered after Peter and John were threatened not to preach in the name of Jesus any longer. "O Lord (*δέσποτα*) thou that didst make the heaven and the earth, and the sea, and all that in them is:"<sup>6</sup> In his book of the Revelation, he records another similar prayer, "O Master (*δεσπότης*),

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 4:7, Luke 4:12.      <sup>2</sup>Matthew 4:10, Luke 4:8.

<sup>3</sup>For a listing, see Appendix I.      <sup>4</sup>For a listing, see Appendix J.

<sup>5</sup>Luke 2:29.      <sup>6</sup>Acts 4:24.



the holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell in the earth?"<sup>1</sup> In these instances it is applied to God when the one praying is acknowledging God's absolute sovereignty over them to do as he will with them.

The word is used in a different way with reference to Deity by Paul in his letter to Timothy, where he says, "If a man therefore purge himself from those, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, meet for the master's (δεσπότης) use, prepared unto every good work."<sup>2</sup> Peter has a similar use when he says,

But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers, who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master (δεσπότην) that brought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction.<sup>3</sup>

Also in the little book of Jude it says:

For there are certain men crept in privily, even they who were of old written of beforehand unto this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master (δεσπότην) and Lord (Κύριον) Jesus Christ.<sup>4</sup>

Note that δεσπότης and Κύριος are here used together, the only place where this occurs in the New Testament, obviously for emphasis.

The last two uses of δεσπότης are found in the writing of Paul and Peter, both of whom applied the term to God, but in these instances they apply them to slave owners. "Let as many as are servants under the yoke count their own masters (δεσπότας) worthy of all honor, that the name of God and the doctrine be not blasphemed."<sup>5</sup> Again, "Servants be in subjection to your masters (δεσπότας) with

---

<sup>1</sup> Revelation 6:10.    <sup>2</sup> II Timothy 2:21.    <sup>3</sup> II Peter 2:1.

<sup>4</sup> Jude 4.    <sup>5</sup> I Timothy 6:1.

all fear."

### Summary

It has been the attempt of this section to present a survey of the usage of the words *Κύριος* and *Δεσπότης* both in Greek literature, the LXX, and the Greek New Testament. It has been seen that the word *Κύριος* has no one single definition, but one must read the context in order to ascertain its meaning, though even this is at times rather difficult. *Κύριος* in Greek literature generally has a much milder meaning than *Δεσπότης* which is the derivation of the English "despot", but in the New Testament this does not seem to be the case, for it is used to address God as the one who has absolute power of disposition over the human, at the pleasure of his will. *Κύριος* has much the same meaning except it is used in more of an affectionate way.

## II. THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEA OF LORD

Thus far an attempt has been made to examine the usage of the word *Κύριος*, but the task at hand is to determine exactly what the writers had in mind when they called Jesus Christ Lord. To do this one must make a critical analysis of the context and teaching where the word is used from the context. Immediately upon examination, some of the above mentioned categories are ruled out as being irrelevant to the study. There is no need to consider the use of Lord when it is ascribed to another person,<sup>1</sup> nor when it has reference to

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix A.

the owner of slaves or property.<sup>1</sup> The only other two categories that need not be dealt with are the last two, as they are of uncertain ascription.

### God As Lord

In this section the passages ascribing Lordship to God will be examined, but the references are too numerous to deal with each one separately. There are, however, several that require special attention, as they bear important significance.<sup>2</sup> It is of no little importance that Jesus addressed the Father in prayer as Lord. "I thank thee O Father, Lord of heaven and earth."<sup>3</sup> There are several things to note about this address. First that Jesus is addressing God the Father, and that he addresses him as Lord in the sense of sovereign of the universe. Therefore it is of special importance to notice that Jesus recognized God as Lord in the sense of sovereign.

Paul in his sermon upon Mars Hill in Athens declared,

The God that made the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is he served by men's hands, as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;<sup>4</sup>

Here Paul conceived of God being Lord and creator of the universe, and thus its absolute sovereign. This he was saying to a people who called their gods, lords over little segments of the universe, such as the sea, the fire and love. Their gods were not gods of creation, but

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup>For a full listing of references see Appendix C.

<sup>3</sup>Luke 10:21, Matthew 11:25.      <sup>4</sup>Acts 17:24-25.

gods who were of the same reality of which they were apart. To these Paul presented the God who was Lord of all, because he was Lord when he created the universe.

Jesus, when asked what was the greatest commandment, replied, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."<sup>1</sup> Here Jesus ascribes Lordship to God, and that the demand of that Lordship is love to God with the whole being. In recording the same instance, Mark gives a little more of the full narrative when he quotes Jesus as saying also, "Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one . . ."<sup>2</sup> In this Jesus rules out the possibility of two Lords, but the Lord God is one. Thus there is commanded fidelity on the part of the worshippers to the one God.

In the annunciation of the angel to Mary, he declares that Jesus "shall be called great, and the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David:"<sup>3</sup> It is significant to note here that the Angel does not say that he shall be called Lord, but rather the "Son of the most High". The title of Lord is affixed to God, who will give the throne of David. God is the one who has the power of disposition of the throne and does the giving, for he is Lord.

Jesus in a debate with the Saducees over the resurrection, ascribed Lordship to God again when he said, "But that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the place concerning the bush, when

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 22:37, Mark 12:30, Luke 4:8, Luke 10:27.

<sup>2</sup>Mark 12:29.      <sup>3</sup>Luke 1:32.

he calleth the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."<sup>1</sup>

Peter, after preaching his sermon at Pentecost, received the response of "what shall we do",<sup>2</sup> to which Peter replied:

Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.<sup>3</sup>

He did not point to Jesus as being Lord, but to "The Lord Our God." Here there is a definite distinction made. They were to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, but the promise was to all whom the Lord drew unto him.

In the Revelation of John he records that God said: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, who is and who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."<sup>4</sup> Here the First and the Last, the Almighty God is ascribed as Lord. A similar ascription is found in the fourth chapter and the eighth verse. The twenty-four elders come before the throne and say, "Worthy art thou our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honor and the power: for thou didst create all things, and because of thy will they were, and were created."<sup>5</sup> Here John portrays God being Lord by right of creation, and the will to create, and thus absolute Lord of all that he created. In the eleventh chapter the twenty-four elders again address God as Lord,<sup>6</sup> which salutation is repeated in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 20:37.    <sup>2</sup>Acts 2:37.    <sup>3</sup>Acts 2:38-39.

<sup>4</sup>Revelation 1:8.    <sup>5</sup>Revelation 4:11.    <sup>6</sup>Revelation 11:17.

nineteenth chapters.<sup>1</sup>

In another place the "Lord God the Almighty" is set in distinction to the Lamb, which is understood to be Christ, and the both of them are the temple of the Holy City, the New Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup>

Paul writes to Timothy:

I charge thee in the sight of God, who giveth life to all things, and of Christ Jesus who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good confession; that thou keep the commandment, without spot, without reproach, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: which in its own times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power eternal.<sup>3</sup>

This appears to be a rather poor translation as the neuter is used instead of the masculine in verse 15, which according to the Greek form would better read, "who in his own seasons will show the only sovereign, the King of kings . . ." The problem lies in the one who is to do the showing and the one who is the Sovereign. Verse 16 seems to be the key to the passage, "who only hath immortality, dwelling in light unapproachable; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honor and power eternal." This appellation seems directed to God in the light of this statement, for men saw Christ when he was on earth, but God has not been seen by men. John bears this out: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the father, he hath declared him."<sup>4</sup> Newport J. D. White agrees with this interpretation as he says:

---

<sup>1</sup> Revelation 15:3, 16:7, 19:16.      <sup>2</sup> Revelation 21:22.

<sup>3</sup> I Timothy 6:13-16.      <sup>4</sup> John 1:18.

God the Father is the subject of this whole attribution; and it is the Catholic doctrine that he alone has endless existence as his essential property. God the Son and God the Holy Spirit are co-eternal with the Father; but their life is derived from and dependent on His. This is expressly declared by Christ himself, 'As the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son to have life in himself.' John 5:26.<sup>1</sup>

Phillips in his translation of the New Testament has caught the spirit of this also.

I charge you in the sight of God Who gives us life, and Jesus Christ who fearlessly witnessed to the truth before Pontius Pilate, to keep your commission clean and above reproach until the final coming of Christ. This will be in His own time, the Final Denouement of God, Who is the blessed Controller of all things, the King over all kings and the Master of all masters, the only source of immortality, the One who lives in unapproachable Light, the One Whom no mortal eye has ever seen or ever can see. To him be acknowledged all honor and power forever. I Timothy 6:13-16.<sup>2</sup>

What Paul is trying to convey is that the appearing of Jesus will be God's final act in his declaration that he is absolute Lord of the Universe.

From this study it is seen that God, and by this is understood the first person of the Trinity, is called Lord many times. The title of Lord is not just a respectful title, but rather has the meaning of being the sovereign of the universe by right of creation and supremacy. The usage is not centered in one book, nor is it centered in any one section of the New Testament. Such ascription runs completely through it, and thus it may be stated that the scriptures present God as Lord.

---

<sup>1</sup>W. R. Nicoll, The Expositor's Greek Testament, IV, p. 148.

<sup>2</sup>J. B. Phillips, Letters to Young Churches, p. 151.



### Christ As Lord

The previous study has revealed that God the Father is presented as Lord, but it is also evident that the scriptures present Christ as Lord. An examination of Christ as Lord is the intent of this section.

Jesus is repeatedly called "Lord" without any other name being affixed to him.<sup>1</sup> *κύριος* is however affixed numerous times to Jesus as "The Lord Jesus Christ",<sup>2</sup> "Lord Jesus", or "our Lord Jesus",<sup>3</sup> Jesus Christ our Lord, our Lord Jesus Christ, and Christ Jesus our Lord,<sup>4</sup> all of which could possibly be honorary titles, but in the places where he is declared to be Lord, as owner or ruler, there is little doubt as to the meaning. These passages must now be examined.

In Matthew, Mark and Luke, Jesus declares that, "The Son of man is lord of the sabbath."<sup>5</sup> The term "Son of man" is used many times in the gospels by Jesus, but a few instances show clearly that Jesus was using it as a name for himself as the Christ. At Caesarea Philippi, Jesus asked the disciples who people say the "Son of man is."<sup>6</sup> They gave some of the answers that they had heard, but Jesus asked them, "But who say ye that I am?"<sup>7</sup> Jesus used the term in reference to his betrayal,<sup>8</sup> in speaking of his crucifixion,<sup>9</sup> and concerning his

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix D.    <sup>2</sup>See Appendix E.    <sup>3</sup>See Appendix F.

<sup>4</sup>See Appendix G.    <sup>5</sup>Matthew 12:8, Mark 2:28, Luke 6:5.

<sup>6</sup>Matthew 16:13.    <sup>7</sup>Matthew 16:15.

<sup>8</sup>Matthew 26:24, Matthew 26:45, Mark 14:21, Mark 14:41.

<sup>9</sup>Matthew 26:2, Mark 8:31, Luke 9:22.



resurrection.<sup>1</sup> One of the most outstanding, giving us a positive identification of whom he meant when he used the term Son of man, if found in the betrayal scene, when after Judas kissed him, he asked, "betrayest thou the Son of Man with a kiss?"<sup>2</sup>

From this it is clear that when Jesus said that "the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath", he had reference to himself, and thus he was claiming Lordship over the sabbath for himself. This is of great significance, for the sabbath was instituted by God at the completion of his creation.<sup>3</sup> Keeping of the sabbath is enjoined in the decalogue as a binding observance which was not to be broken.<sup>4</sup> As this was an institution of God, the claim of Christ to being "Lord of the Sabbath" is of vast importance. Jesus is here claiming Lordship over what God has instituted, thus claiming an equality with God.

The title of Lord is ascribed to Jesus by the "angel of the Lord" at the tomb, for he declared, "Fear ye not; for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, even as he said. Come see the place where the Lord lay."<sup>6</sup> It is possible that this is the application of the writer, but there seems no reason to doubt that the angel did not ascribe the title of Lord, to Jesus. Also at the annunciation to the shepherds, the "angel of the Lord"<sup>7</sup> said that "there is born to you this day in the City of

---

<sup>1</sup>Mark 9:9.    <sup>2</sup>Luke 22:48.    <sup>3</sup>Genesis 2:2-3.

<sup>4</sup>Exodus 20:8-11.    <sup>5</sup>Matthew 28:2.    <sup>6</sup>Matthew 28:5 and 6.

<sup>7</sup>Luke 2:9.

David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord."<sup>1</sup> Thus angels of the Lord at both the birth and the resurrection ascribed the title of Lord (*Κύριος*) to Jesus, which seems obvious to this writer to mean true Lordship and not just an empty title. It seems illogical that God would ascribe a title to a man by angels when the title had to do with sovereignty of the universe, unless the title was valid.

Peter in his conversation with Cornelius, the Roman Centurion of the Italian band, realizing for the first time that Christ had come to all men, and not just the Jews declared that "the Word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching good tidings of peace by Jesus Christ, this one is Lord of all." (*οὗτος ἔστιν πάντων Κύριος*)<sup>2</sup> Peter now understands that Jesus Christ is not just Lord of the Jews, but that he is Lord of all men. Paul wrote to the Romans concerning this same matter saying:

For there is no distinction between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him: for, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.<sup>3</sup>

In these two passages Lordship is definitely connected to the concept of the universality of salvation, that is salvation being possible for all because he is Lord of all.

Paul gives a formula for this salvation, when, to the terror stricken jailer who cries out for the means of salvation Paul replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house."<sup>4</sup> The same thing seems to be delivered to the Romans in a

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 2:11.    <sup>2</sup>Acts 10:36.    <sup>3</sup>Romans 10:12.    <sup>4</sup>Acts 16:31.

much fuller form when he says:

The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is, the word of faith which we preach: because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved:<sup>1</sup>

It is apparent from these passages that Paul conceives of salvation being connected to the fact that Christ is Lord, and that no one can be saved until there is a personal acceptance of Christ's Lordship. This is the basic problem which is generally called the fall. Man, in the beginning was under the Lordship of the Godhead, but man rejected God as Lord of his life and thus lost fellowship. To restore fellowship man must make Christ Lord of all.

In Paul's first letter to the Corinthians he declares that "the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof."<sup>2</sup> This is an Old Testament passage he uses to admonish the Corinthians to flee idolatry, and more specifically what is to be their relationship to the idolatry in the city. He turns their attention to the communion of the blood of Christ, and the body of Christ, saying that to partake is to partake of that which has been offered upon the altar, and thus the one doing so becomes one with the sacrifice. To eat is to have communion with the altar. He then turns to the heathen sacrifices to note that though the idols are nothing, and that the offering has not really changed, the worshippers are actually sacrificing to demons, and it is not possible to have communion with demons and the Lord at the same time. The Lord here seems to mean Jesus Christ. The problem is

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 10:8-9.

<sup>2</sup>I Corinthians 10:26.

not so much what actually happens to the offering or that there is an actual fellowship with demons, but rather how do the heathen neighbors and friends look upon the sacrifices. Evidently the meat was sold, and possibly at a cheaper price. The problem was how the neighbors conceived of one who ate meat offered to idols, and they evidently considered consumption of it as fellowship with the altar. Paul tells them not to ask any question when they bought, but just to eat, unless they were told it was offered to idols. Then they were to abstain for the sake of their witness, but the earth was the Lord's and the fulness thereof. He seems here to indicate that Christ is Lord of all, even the meat offered to idols, so the only problem lies in the influence upon others that it might have.

Again Paul writes, in dealing with the spiritual gifts, of which the Corinthian church was so proud: "Wherefore I make known unto you, that no man speaking in the Spirit of God saith, Jesus is anathema; and no man can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> The Corinthian church was having trouble distinguishing between the true and the false in regards to spiritual gifts. They were being carried away with speaking in tongues, and other outward manifestations, which the heathen society, in which they lived, also manifested. They were having trouble discerning what was of the Lord and what was not. They were plagued with false teachers, who fashioned themselves as apostles of Christ.<sup>2</sup> To these Paul raises one test, whether they

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 12:3.    <sup>2</sup>II Corinthians 11:13.

declare Christ to be Lord, or call him accursed (*ἀνάθεμα*).<sup>1</sup> If a man says he is accursed, he is not speaking in the Holy Spirit. Neither can a man say he is Lord, that is, and it be so, except he be in the Holy Spirit. Thus until Christ is actually Lord through the reception of the Holy Spirit he is anathema, and has no part of that man. It is then clear that Paul is declaring that nothing less is accepted than the complete submission to the Lordship of Christ through the Holy Spirit.

In his second letter, Paul defends his own ministry to them, by this same standard when he says: "For we preached not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake."<sup>2</sup> Thus he was declaring that for him Christ was Lord.

To the Philippians Paul writes the real meaning of Lord in full explanation, and not by mere declaration that he is Lord.

Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in the fashion of a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things on the earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.<sup>3</sup>

Paul presents several things here that must be observed. First that Jesus Christ existed in the form of God before he came to the earth to take up the form of man. Secondly, to do this, he had to empty

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 12:3.

<sup>2</sup>II Corinthians 4:5.

<sup>3</sup>Philippians 2:5-11.

himself, not of his nature but of his form, that he might take the form of a servant. Thirdly, he further humbled himself to the death on the cross. Therefore, because of this God exalted him. The problem lies as to what caused his exaltation. Did God exalt him because he died on the cross alone, or did he exalt him because he first emptied himself and became a man and then humbled himself to the cross? Note well the steps which Paul presents. He was exalted, equal with God, then he emptied himself of this form, to the form of man. In the form of man he humbled himself to the death on the cross. It is from this that he is exalted, but Paul does not say that it is because of the cross that he is exalted. The cross is a step in the process, which goes from exaltation to humiliation, to exaltation, thus it seems to be a restoration to a form that he once enjoyed, but not to a nature, for this he never lost nor set aside. It is in this state of exaltation that every knee should bow to him and every tongue should confess him to be Jesus Christ the Lord. It then seems proper to analyze the name from this standpoint. Jesus was the earthly name that he carried, and Christ is the name of the mission which he fulfilled, but Lord is the position which he always held, for it is his eternal office.

Paul upholds the monistic idea of Lord to the Corinthians, who lived in a society of polytheism. There were many lords in the Greek mind, but he points them to one Lord and one God when he writes:

Concerning therefore the eating of things offered to idols, we know that no idol is anything in the world, and that there is no God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many, and lords many; yet to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we

unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him.<sup>1</sup>

Though Paul here is not giving, in so many words, a formula of salvation, it is none the less in harmony with the concept. There were many voices professing to be lord, not the least the Roman emperor. To the Philippian jailer, who in all probability was a Roman soldier, he held up Christ as Lord. To the Roman church, under the very shadow of the emperor, he held up Christ as Lord. To the Corinthian church, which was under the bondage of the emperor, as well as to all Greek gods and goddesses, he held up Christ as Lord. One God, and one Lord Jesus Christ.

Peter in his first letter admonishes: "But sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord."<sup>2</sup> He is dealing with the dangers involved in living a Christian life in a heathen world, and raises the question of who it is that can harm them if they do that which is right. He also realizes the real problem of suffering that Christians have to face, but his solution is to "Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord." The analysis here goes back to the Greek use of the word. The slave was to render absolute subjection in all things, but the master was to render protection, and thus the idea was carried to the gods, that the ones who subjected themselves to the gods enjoyed their protection.<sup>3</sup> Thus Peter here presents this concept, that one "Sanctifying Christ as Lord" also enjoyed his protection, and if one

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 8:4-6.      <sup>2</sup>I Peter 3:15.

<sup>3</sup>G. Kittel, Bible Key Words, II, 26.

suffered, it was only as he allowed, for he is "Lord". His plea is that they make Christ the absolute Lord, by the cleansing of the heart from anything contrary to his being "Lord".

John, in Revelation, uses the term "King of kings and Lord of lords",<sup>1</sup> in what seems to be an application to Jesus Christ. In verse seven the multitude cries that the "marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." In verse 9, John is told to write, "Blessed are they that are bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb." In verse 10, John is informed that the "Testimony of Jesus is the spirit of the prophecy." In verse 13, his name is given as "The Word of God", and finally on his garment is written the name, "King of kings and Lord of lords." This seems evidence enough to apply this to Jesus Christ for John the Baptist called Jesus the Lamb of God.<sup>2</sup> John the beloved ascribed to Jesus the term or Word,<sup>3</sup> while the one speaking to John in the Revelation applies the whole prophecy to Jesus.

Therefore from examination of the scriptures, it is apparent that Jesus Christ is held up as Lord, in the sense of owner, disposer and ruler, which seems to qualify all of the other places where the title alone is ascribed to Jesus Christ without any explanation. He is presented as sovereign over the universe with power of full disposition and will, but over man the call is always to make him Lord.

---

<sup>1</sup>Revelation 19:16.

<sup>2</sup>John 1:29.

<sup>3</sup>John 1:1.



### The Relationship of the Father and Son

According to the scriptures, it has been seen that Lordship is ascribed to God the Father as well as Jesus Christ the Son, thus, who then is Lord? The concept of two Lords just cannot be, for there cannot be two Lords and both be Lord of all.

Jesus recognized the impossibility of a dual Lordship when he declared: "No man can serve two masters (*Kυριοις*): for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other."<sup>1</sup> Man would be divided into a duality of loyalty, which would lead to an ultimate rejection of either God or Jesus Christ, as the Unitarians, and "Father only" group,<sup>2</sup> have done with Christ and the "Jesus only" groups have done with God the Father.<sup>3</sup>

In dealing with the charge of the Pharisees that he cast out demons by "Beelzebub, the prince of the demons,"<sup>4</sup> Jesus replied:

Every kingdom divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan casteth out Satan he is divided against himself; how then shall his kingdom stand?<sup>5</sup>

This is clearly a denunciation of a division theory, allowing that there be two Lords. Jesus further denies a division between himself and God the Father when he says: "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."<sup>6</sup> Not only

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 6:24.

<sup>2</sup>E. T. Clark, The Small Sects in America, p. 104-105.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.      <sup>4</sup>Matthew 12:24.      <sup>5</sup>Matthew 12:25-26.

<sup>6</sup>Matthew 12:28.

does Jesus deny a separation, but he declares that it is by the power of God that he acts. The problem then centers in the relationship of the Father to the Son and the Son to the Father.

The scriptures do not allow an interpretation that would place Jesus Christ in competition with God the Father and vice versa. There seems little problem to the writers of making any distinction between God and Jesus Christ as far as Lordship is concerned. A good example of this is found in Peter's Pentecost sermon. He declares in one place:

Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.<sup>1</sup>

From this statement he proceeds by saying: "For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him."<sup>2</sup> Note carefully that in one verse he declares Christ Jesus to be Lord, while in just three verses later he declares God to be Lord. But one must note further that Peter does not set Jesus Christ and God in competition, for he declares that it is God who hath made him Lord. It is the action of God that Christ is Lord, and thus it is God's will that he be Lord. Most all of the New Testament writers do the same thing as Peter has done above, and seem to see little problem of a duality of Lords.

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 2:36.

<sup>2</sup>Acts 2:39.

What then is the relationship that Jesus sustains to the Father? Jesus repeatedly called God his Heavenly Father,<sup>1</sup> and anyone can find such usages in a concordance, but Jesus also, in speaking to the disciples said your Father in Heaven. He also taught the disciples to pray, "Our Father who art in Heaven . . ."<sup>2</sup> The fact that he called him Father does not alleviate the problem, yet it must be recognized that the disciples did not enjoy the relationship that Jesus did to the Father.

In the preamble to John's Gospel he wrote:

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made through him; and without him was not anything made that was made.<sup>3</sup>

And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth.<sup>4</sup>

No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.<sup>5</sup>

In this passage there are several things that must be noticed, to clearly understand the Lordship of Christ. John declares that the Word was in the beginning, and thus it is entirely improper to think of Christ beginning at the Birth in Bethlehem as has been noted. He is the eternal Word which was in the beginning. John pushes back the curtain of time to reveal the timelessness of Christ. If one wants to think of the beginning of creation, Christ was still there, but John seems to push on beyond that, to point to the vast reaches

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 7:21, 10:32-33, John 5:17, etc.      <sup>2</sup>Matthew 6:9.

<sup>3</sup>John 1:1-3.      <sup>4</sup>John 1:14.      <sup>5</sup>John 1:18.

of eternity, which is impossible for a time-centered mind of man to fully comprehend. As far as the intellect of man will go into antiquity, there he will find the eternal Word, according to John's statement.

John however qualifies the statement of eternal existence, to conform to God, not allowing for the Word and God to have gotten together in the past, as the Greek gods were prone to do. The Word was not only with God, but was God. One could speculate a good deal upon the form of this union or oneness, but one can do little to improve upon the simple statement of John, "The word was with God and the word was God." What more can be said?

This union, according to John was not a silent partnership, where the Second Person of the God-head was inactive until it was time for him to become incarnate. He was an active agent in creation, and so much so that nothing was made without him. What he did is not important here, nor can it be known, for there is nothing to indicate the "how" of creation any place in scripture. The point is, that the Word was an active participant in creation, whatever that action might have been.

John does not leave the action of the Word at creation, but declares that this eternal Word, who was God, became flesh to "tent" (ἐσκήνωσεν) with us. He took upon himself the form of a man to dwell in our midst, that we might behold the glory of the Father. Note that he did not come to manifest his own glory, but that of the Father. The only way that he could do this was that he be one with the Father, and still not the Father; that he be God, yet not God the Father. In

him we saw grace and truth, for he was grace and truth as God, for he was God.

No man has seen God the Father, but they have seen God the Son, and in seeing the Son they saw the Father. Jesus himself taught this concept when Phillip asked to see the Father.<sup>1</sup> Phillip was not satisfied, but declared that he would be if only he could see the Father. To this Jesus replied:

Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me Phillip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, Show us the Father? Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? the words that I say unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works sake.<sup>2</sup>

Jesus here claims such close union with the Father that the Words he speaks are not his words, but those of his Father, the works also are those of his Father. Not only that, but the union is so close that to see Jesus Christ is to see the Father; yet he still makes the distinction between himself and the Father. This taxes the human mind beyond the limit of endurance, for it is beyond human comprehension to understand how two heavenly beings could be one and still be two, yet it is what is here taught.

There is one passage of scripture that was purposely not considered until this place; that is the temptation passage. In both the Matthew and Luke account, Jesus quotes Deuteronomy 6:16, "Thou shalt not make trial of the Lord thy God."<sup>3</sup> Again he quotes Deuteronomy 6:13, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt

---

<sup>1</sup>John 14.

<sup>2</sup>John 14:9-11.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 4:7, Luke 4:12.

thou worship."<sup>1</sup> These Jesus uses in his defense against the temptation of satan. Now it is evident that Jesus is claiming to be God or he could not use such expressions. One might declare that the devil was not to tempt his neighbor, but it would be no defense for him. Jesus was using this in his defense, and thus claiming to be God. The passage does not stand alone and must be qualified in the sense which John has done. Note also that Jesus did not only claim to be God before the devil, but he also claimed to be Lord God.

In recording the annunciation of the angel to Joseph, Matthew places an interpretation at the end of the passage, which conveys this same concept. He quotes the prophet Isaiah: "And they shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us."<sup>2</sup>

Paul is in harmony with this concept of Jesus being God, when he states:

Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men;<sup>3</sup>

If he was in the form of God he certainly was God, for only God could be in the form of God, yet he emptied himself. Emptied himself of what? If he emptied himself of his nature, then John could not say that the Word, which was God became flesh. If he was no longer God then he could not say, that to see him was to see the Father, as he told Phillip. If he emptied himself of his Divinity then he had no claim at all upon being one with the Father, but if on the other hand

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 4:10, Luke 4:8.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 1:23.    <sup>3</sup>Philippians 2:5-6.

he only emptied himself of his form of God, he would still be God except he would not exist as God in form, still he would be God by nature.

It is well to note also that Paul makes little distinction in his use of God and Jesus Christ. To the Ephesians he writes, "For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is also the head of the church, being himself the savior of the body."<sup>1</sup> To the Philippians he writes, "For our citizenship is in heaven; whence also we wait for a savior, the Lord Jesus Christ:"<sup>2</sup> But in his first letter to Timothy he begins, "Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our savior."<sup>3</sup> In contrast to this, he writes in his second letter to Timothy, " . . . hath been manifested by the appearing of our savior Jesus Christ."<sup>4</sup>

In Titus the contrasts are not so far removed, for he declares, "Grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Savior",<sup>5</sup> but in the preceeding verse he says that he was "instructed according to the commandment of God our Savior."<sup>6</sup> In the second chapter he calls Jesus Christ God, when he says,

For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world; looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the Great God and our savior Jesus Christ.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ephesians 5:23.    <sup>2</sup>Philippians 3:20.

<sup>3</sup>I Timothy 1:1. Similar application appears in I Timothy 2:3, 4:10.

<sup>4</sup>II Timothy 1:10.    <sup>5</sup>Titus 1:4.    <sup>6</sup>Titus 1:3.    <sup>7</sup>Titus 2:11-13.

This seems a clear situation of Paul calling Jesus Christ God, for the author knows of no prophecy of the appearing of God the Father. Also in the third chapter he calls God the savior,<sup>1</sup> while just two verses later he applies saviorhood to Jesus Christ.<sup>2</sup> Rather than look on these as contradictions, it seems more logical to infer that Paul did not make much of a separation between God and Jesus Christ. One can conclude only one thing, that he was God, God the Son.

Peter also holds a similar position when in his second letter he begins, "Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us in the righteousness of our God and Savior Jesus Christ."<sup>3</sup> The American Standard Version places an article before savior, but it is italicized and does not appear in the Greek New Testament. In the King James Version the possessive pronoun ἡμῶν is placed after the conjunction, making it read, "God our savior Jesus Christ," but this is not the Greek order, for the ἡμῶν belongs to God before the conjunction, reading, "Our God and Savior Jesus Christ." It then is evident that Peter also looks upon Jesus Christ as God, not just a man or a heavenly messenger. He was one with God, and was God with man. The matter of saviorhood will be dealt with later.

#### IV. SUMMARY

The word *Κύριος* is not of New Testament origin, but is found first in ancient Greek literature as an adjective, denoting power,

---

<sup>1</sup>Titus 3:4.    <sup>2</sup>Titus 3:6.    <sup>3</sup>II Peter 1:1.



might and strength, which operates subtly within man. As a noun it was used to address the head of a family and later acquired the meaning of owner of slaves and subjected peoples. Originally this meaning was conveyed with **δεσπότης**, but because of the hard connotation which it carried, related to the English despot, the slave owners preferred to be called Lord. The word was not applied to the Greek gods, for it did not convey the absolute mastery concept which **δεσπότης** had, so that the first ascription to a God is found in the LXX.

Before the first century **κύριος** was generally used to denote power or might, but gradually by the time of Christ, kings and rulers had begun to cause others to use it in reference to them. When it was used to speak of a ruler or god it was spoken to denote subjection, but for this subjection protection was granted by the Lord.

**κύριος** is used in the LXX to translate **יהוה** and **יהו** or **יהוה**. It was also used to denote ownership and respectful address. By the time of Christ, the Jews would not pronounce the name Jehovah or Yahweh, and **יהוה** was only occasionally used in reference to a king or high priest, but they used it in reference to slave holders and owners as well as address of inferiors to superiors. In later Judaism, God was called the Lord and Judge of the universe.

**κύριος** in the New Testament is used to address another person, as a ruler, head of a house or just another man. It is used to denote master or owner, as well as being ascribed to God. It is used many times with reference to Jesus without any other name or title being affixed to him, as well as being affixed to the name Jesus Christ. It is applied to the name Jesus alone and also with the possessive, our,

as well as to the full name Jesus Christ with the possessive. Jesus also used it to denote his ownership or possession, but there are also usages where the ascription is not exactly clear.

An examination of the scriptures, reveals that Lord is ascribed to God to denote his ownership, and sovereignty over the metaphysical universe. It has also been seen that these references are not to be confused with those ascribed to Christ, for in many of them Jesus Christ is the one who calls God, Lord. Not only does Jesus ascribe Lordship to God, but the writers of the New Testament do the same thing numerous times, and often in the same passage they also ascribe Lordship to Christ.

Jesus claimed Lordship over the Sabbath. The Angel, at the empty tomb called Jesus Lord. Peter ascribed Lordship over all to Jesus when he ministered to the Roman, Cornelius, and in Paul's formulas for salvation he ascribes Lordship to Jesus Christ. To the Corinthians he holds up the Lordship of Christ as being the sign of the purity of all things, even though they were not to eat because of their influence upon others. He tells them also that no one can declare Christ to be Lord apart from the Holy Spirit. In his second letter to them he declares Christ to be his Lord, and he the servant of Christ. To the Philippians he writes the full meaning of Lord. He presents a process of Christ's setting aside of his form of God to take the form of a servant, that he might live as a man, die, and be exalted. He presents a process of exaltation, humiliation, exaltation. The exaltation is not a result of his death, but of the fact that he humbled himself to become man, and thus God restored him to

his former form of God. Paul repeatedly holds up the monistic concept of Lord to the heathen, as opposed to their many lords. Peter calls for men to make Christ Lord by a sanctifying of themselves, while John in the Revelation calls Christ King of kings and Lord of lords.

The problem was noted of there being two lords, for Lordship is ascribed to God as well as Jesus Christ. This problem is reconciled by understanding the nature of the relationship that is sustained between God and Christ. Jesus repeatedly called God his heavenly Father, but he also told the disciples that he was their heavenly Father. In the preamble to John's Gospel, he presents Jesus as being One with God, and that he existed eternally with God. He was active in creation, and was God, and it is this One who came to be with man in the person of Jesus Christ.

Jesus also held this concept and taught it, for he claimed such close affinity with God that to look on him was to see God. His words and his works he declared were not really his but his Father's. At his temptation he claimed to be the Lord God to thwart the temptation of the devil.

Paul also held this concept when he declared that Christ existed in the form of God, but set aside this form to take the form of a servant. He also makes little effort to make a clear distinction between God and Christ either in the matter of Lordship or Saviorhood, while Peter does much the same thing in his writings.

## V. CONCLUSION

Therefore it is evident that the scriptures teach God is Lord by right of creation and the will of creation, and also, that Jesus Christ is Lord. Jesus Christ is God in the form of man, for he emptied himself of the form of God, that he might be "God with us." He emptied himself of the form of God, but not the being of God, for he could not be "God with us" if he were not God. The problem of a duality of Lords is reconciled in the fact Jesus Christ is "God with us". There is not a duality of Lords for Christ is one with the Father, but this oneness must not be carried to the point of a modalism. His Lordship is a result of his being one with the Father, for if God is Lord, so is Christ.

Jesus Christ did not divest himself of his Lordship when he came to earth as the Incarnate God, for he did not set aside his nature, but only his form. Christ being Lord is a part of his nature, for he is "God with us." The scriptures do not say how he became Lord, but only that he is Lord, because he is God the Son.

#### CHAPTER IV

#### THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S LORDSHIP

## CHAPTER IV

### THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S LORDSHIP

In this study thus far it has been seen that Jesus Christ is both divine and human, according to the scriptures, and thus God-man. In the second chapter an examination was made of the scriptures, indicating that Jesus Christ is Lord with God the Father, because he was one with God, and was God. It now is necessary to examine the nature of his Lordship, which he shares as one with God the Father. One cannot be a King of kings and Lord of lords without a realm over which to be Lord, and it is in an examination of the realm or "Kingdom of God" that one is able to understand the nature of the Lordship of Christ. This is not intended as a comprehensive study of the kingdom but rather an examination of the characteristics of the kingdom so the nature of Christ's Lordship may be seen. There are many problems in a study of the kingdom which could be traced, but this study is not designed to deal with all aspects of the kingdom but only its basic characteristics as related to Christ's Lordship.

#### I. THE KINGDOM

##### The Limitation of the Kingdom

There must be a careful delineation at this point as to the realm of the "Kingdom of Heaven or God", for great misunderstanding can arise. God, is absolute sovereign and Lord of the Universe, for

it was he who brought it into existence, however that might have been. He created the earth and all that is in it, as well as the vast, almost unfathomable, reaches of the celestial universe. The Psalmist rose to the heights of praise when he sang:

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, And night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language; their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world.<sup>1</sup>

Over this universe Christ is Lord by virtue of creation. Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof."<sup>2</sup> The Psalmist makes a like statement with the addition of "the world and they that dwell therein."<sup>3</sup> Again the Psalmist said, "Our God is in the heavens; he hath done whatsoever he pleased."<sup>4</sup> This is a weak scripture to cite as it is uttered in contrast to heathen idols and is not uttered as an absolute doctrinal statement, though it does convey that the Jews looked upon God as sovereign in their worship.

David declared in a prayer at the beginning of the gathering of materials for the temple:

Thine, O Jehovah, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heavens and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom O Jehovah and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honor come of thee, and thou rulest over all; and in thy hand is power and might; and in thy hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all.<sup>5</sup>

Here David clearly ascribes sovereignty to God. Paul marvels at the riches and wisdom of God and the unsearchableness of God's judgement

---

<sup>1</sup>Psalms 19:1-4.    <sup>2</sup>I Corinthians 10:26.    <sup>3</sup>Psalms 24:1.

<sup>4</sup>Psalms 115:3.    <sup>5</sup>I Chronicles 29:11-12.

and his ways. Finally he declares, "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things."<sup>1</sup> Certainly Paul sees God as the sovereign of the universe.

In one sense man is a part of this creation, but he sustains a different relationship than the created universe which must be held in distinction. He is Lord over the universe, and he is Lord over man, but the Lordship is not of the same nature in both instances. The sovereignty of God over the universe is not taught in the scriptures ipso facto, but is certainly there in spirit and is recognized by most theologians,<sup>2</sup> however some fail to see the distinction between sovereignty over the universe and his relation to the moral being called man, which he created by an act of his sovereignty. It must then be seen what Lordship over man actually is, according to the scriptures, to clearly note this distinction.

#### The Centrality of the Kingdom

The first thing about the kingdom is that, in the scriptures, it is never mentioned in any connection except in relation to man, or man's relation to it. It then also must be noted that the kingdom is the center of what Christ came to accomplish. There seems little if any significance between the term "kingdom of heaven" and "kingdom of God". They are the same kingdom. Eternal life is also equated to the kingdom by Jesus, in his dealing with the rich young ruler.<sup>3</sup> He

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 11:36.

<sup>2</sup>H.O. Wiley, Christian Theology, I, 247-8; J. Miley, Systematic Theology, I, 211-213; Charles Hodge, Systematic Theology, I, 440-441.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 19:16-24, Mark 10:17-23.



came and asked Jesus how he might inherit eternal life. Jesus told him his riches were in the way of his reception, upon which he went away. Jesus' reply to his disciples was, "It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven."<sup>1</sup> It is obvious here that he is using the kingdom as synonymous with eternal life.

John began his ministry by declaring through his preaching in the wilderness, "Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."<sup>2</sup> Jesus began his ministry by declaring, "Repent ye for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."<sup>3</sup> Upon the clamor of the multitudes to have him stay and minister to them, Jesus replied, "I must preach the good tidings of the Kingdom of God to other cities also,"<sup>4</sup> which he proceeded to do with his disciples.<sup>5</sup> The writer of the book of the Acts declared also that the space of forty days, in which he appeared to his followers, he spoke many things about the Kingdom of God.<sup>6</sup> Of the twenty-nine parables recorded in the New Testament, seventeen are definitely an exposition of the Kingdom, and the remaining twelve are related to the kingdom, though it is not mentioned in them.<sup>7</sup>

Not only was the ministry of Jesus Christ characterized by teaching concerning the kingdom, but he also told his disciples to preach "the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand."<sup>8</sup> It is well to note also

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 19:23.      <sup>2</sup>Matthew 3:2.      <sup>3</sup>Matthew 4:17.

<sup>4</sup>Luke 4:43.      <sup>5</sup>Luke 8:1.      <sup>6</sup>Acts 1:3.

<sup>7</sup>G. C. Morgan, The Teaching of Christ, p. 202.

<sup>8</sup>Matthew 10:7, Luke 9:10, Luke 9:60, Luke 10:9-11.

that Phillip preached the Kingdom to the Samaritans,<sup>1</sup> while Paul delivered the same message to other Gentiles.<sup>2</sup>

When John the Baptist became discouraged from languishing in prison, and doubts arose in his mind as to whether Jesus was the Christ, he sent some of his disciples to question Jesus. Jesus' reply to them was,

Go tell John the things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he who finds no occasion of stumbling in me.<sup>3</sup>

Now note that John had heard of the works that Jesus was doing,<sup>4</sup> and that is why he sent disciples to question if Jesus was the one who was coming. John's question was not whether he was doing these works, but his question was as to whether this is what the King should be doing. John preached the coming of the Kingdom, and saw Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God, but he did not understand what he was doing as being that which the King of the Kingdom should be doing. Jesus' reply only pointed to the mighty works. It is important not to stop with this analysis, but one must note what Jesus said when the disciples of John had left to deliver their message. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force."<sup>5</sup> He has here declared two things. First that the kingdom has suffered violence, and some want to bring

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 8:12.      <sup>2</sup>Acts 19:8, 20:25, 28:23 and 31.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 11:4-6.      <sup>4</sup>Matthew 11:2.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew 11:12.

it about by violence. This seems to be John's position. Evidently John wanted an army, not healing. It suffered violence because they misunderstood the kingdom. Jesus rejects the violent position of John, by declaring the nature of the kingdom to be related to restoration. Thus Jesus makes his mighty works a part of the kingdom. This is also observable when he sends out his disciples to preach. They were to preach the kingdom, and to heal the sick and cast out demons.<sup>1</sup>

It seems obvious from this brief examination that the Kingdom was the central facet of Christ's ministry. His forerunner preached the kingdom. Christ preached the kingdom, commissioned his disciples to do so, and declared his miracles to be the works of the kingdom.

#### The Nature of the Kingdom

In all probability, one of the earliest discourses concerning the kingdom is the one Jesus delivered to Nicodemus, but by no means is it the most insignificant, for Nicodemus was a well educated man and a deep thinker, as well as the teacher in Israel. Jesus also told Nicodemus more than he did the multitudes, for he stands in contrast to them. The multitudes believed on the name of Jesus because of the signs that he did, but Nicodemus saw him as a teacher sent from God. He thus came to Jesus by night, evidently not to slip around without being seen, but that he might talk to Jesus alone, and ask one question. He came and declared that he knew Jesus was a

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 10:7.

teacher sent from God, and it is apparent he desired to hear the latest word from God. To this Jesus replied, "Except one be born of the water and the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."<sup>1</sup> The kingdom idea was not foreign to Nicodemus for he was a teacher of Israel, and the concept of the kingdom is found in the Old Testament. In the Pentateuch it is recorded that God spoke to Israel through Moses saying:

Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation.<sup>2</sup>

God would have given Saul an eternal kingdom had he not sinned,<sup>3</sup> but to David the promise was fulfilled.<sup>4</sup> As a side light it is interesting to note again that the throne of David, along with the kingdom, is given to Jesus Christ by God the Father, according to the annunciation of the angel to Mary.<sup>5</sup>

Indeed the concept of the Kingdom of God was not new to Nicodemus, but the prerequisite for seeing, or understanding, and entering into it was new. The idea of a new birth was beyond his comprehension. All he could see was physical birth over again, and this he saw as impossible. Jesus does not leave him there, but leads him on to the relation of the Son of God to the kingdom, for the Son of man must be lifted up as the serpent was in the wilderness, and the one believing in him could have eternal life, or entrance into the

---

<sup>1</sup>John 3:3 and 5.

<sup>2</sup>Exodus 19:5-6.

<sup>3</sup>I Samuel 13:13.

<sup>4</sup>I Kings 2:45.

<sup>5</sup>Luke 1:32-33.

kingdom. Thus the entrance to the kingdom hinges upon the new birth, and the new birth hinges upon believing in the Son of God, the one who is exalted by God.

This idea of one's entrance into the kingdom is not conveyed here alone, for Christ spoke of it in relation to the temporal things of the world. He begins by admonishing men to lay up treasures in heaven,<sup>1</sup> and proceeds to the necessity of a singleness of purpose, for man is not able to serve two masters, nor see two objects clearly.<sup>2</sup> From this he sets the temporal cares in contrast to spiritual cares, and declares at the end, "But seek ye first the kingdom, and his righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you."<sup>3</sup> Here man is called upon to seek, and if he is to seek, then it is his responsibility to put forth effort to find. This is his first responsibility, even before the temporal cares of life. Luke adds another concept to the idea of man's responsibility. Jesus says, "Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."<sup>4</sup> Here the distinction is made that man does the seeking, but the Father is the awarder of the kingdom, thus the disposition of the kingdom is in the Father's hands. Man seeks and the Father gives the entrance upon proper seeking, but proper seeking never goes unrewarded, for it is God's pleasure to do so.

The pattern prayer, which Christ gave to his disciples is in this vein also for he admonished the disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 6:19.      <sup>2</sup>Matthew 6:22-24.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 6:33, Luke 12:31.      <sup>4</sup>Luke 12:32.

come. Thy will be done as in heaven, so on earth."<sup>1</sup> If one prays in real sincerity for the coming of the kingdom on earth in the same relation as is found in heaven, it appears that the one praying is actively seeking for the kingdom of God.

Jesus places supreme importance upon the kingdom, even to the point of self destruction for he says:

And if thy hand cause thee to stumble, cut it off: it is good for thee to enter into life maimed, rather than having thy two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire. And if thy foot cause thee to stumble, cut it off, it is good for thee to enter into life halt, rather than having thy two feet to be cast into hell. And if thy eye cause thee to stumble, cast it out: it is good for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, rather than having two eyes to be cast into hell;<sup>2</sup>

It seems here that Christ places almost the highest premium upon the kingdom, for what is more precious to man than a hand, a foot or an eye? Man will go to any length to save his members from destruction, yet Christ declared that self mutilation was to be desired before missing the kingdom. But note that the responsibility was placed upon the individual for his missing. He is the one to cast off the offending hand, foot and eye. It is the individual who is to take measures to stop the offending members from causing destruction in hell.

This same concept of detachment from the things of the world in relation to spiritual industry is again presented to some who would follow Jesus, but found other things in the way. One declared his determination to follow, but Jesus pointed out his lack of a home.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 6:10.

<sup>2</sup>Mark 9:43-47.

<sup>3</sup>Luke 9:57-58.

Jesus called another to follow, but this one had a funeral to take care of, while another had to go home and say good-bye to his family.<sup>1</sup> To these Jesus replied: "No man having put his hand to the plow, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."<sup>2</sup> The kingdom requires singleness of attention and direction. One cannot be attached to other interests, and the kingdom at the same time. Other things cannot take one's attention away from the prime task and be fit for the kingdom.

In this same vein Jesus said,

If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it. For what shall a man be profitted, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?<sup>3</sup>

Nothing is of greater value than eternal life, according to Jesus and is to be sought at all cost, but note again that he lays the responsibility before man to do the seeking.

Jesus Christ linked the kingdom to righteousness, but he separated self righteousness from it, when he said, "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."<sup>4</sup> This was spoken in context with his fulfillment of the Law and the prophets. He came to fulfill, but his fulfillment stands in contrast to the fulfillment of the scribes and Pharisees. The commandments have not passed away,

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 9:59-61.      <sup>2</sup>Luke 9:62.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 16:24-26; similar reading in Mark 8:24 and Luke 9:32.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 5:20.

and the one teaching men so "shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven," but the one who teaches and observes "shall be called greatest in the kingdom of heaven."<sup>1</sup> Note, that the one teaching not to keep the commandments is least, but he is in the kingdom. Yet if one holds the position of the Scribes and Pharisees he shall not even enter into the kingdom. How then did the scribes and Pharisees keep the law? Later Jesus brought up this same subject, declaring that "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses seat:"<sup>2</sup> and the things which they commanded of men they were to do, but he cautioned that men were not to follow their works. They place heavy burdens upon others yet they themselves would not bear them. They do what they do, to be seen of men, such as making their phylacteries broad, and seeking the most prominent seats at feast and in the synagogues. They love to be called teacher, father and master, and though they keep others from entering into the kingdom, they refuse to enter themselves.<sup>3</sup>

The scribes and pharisees were extremely careful to pay tithes even of the smallest herbs, but were not as careful of such matters as faith, mercy and justice. He also upbraided them for being concerned with the cleansing of the outward man, but they gave less attention to the cleansing of the inner man.<sup>4</sup> They were self righteous men who did what they did to be seen of men, as portrayed by the parable of Jesus about the Publican and the Pharisee who went to pray.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 5:19.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 23:2.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 23:1-13.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 23:23-26.    <sup>5</sup>Luke 18:9-14.



One prayed to impress the crowd, while the other prayed for mercy. Thus it is evident that Jesus is saying that the righteousness that is a part of the kingdom is not a superficial, self righteousness, but a true righteousness which is a part of the being.

Jesus was at times rather harsh in his dealings with the spirit of self righteousness which so characterized the Jewish leaders, for he placed even the hated Publicans and harlots ahead of them. When they questioned Jesus concerning his authority, Jesus replied with a question concerning the baptism of John. Knowing that if they answered they would push themselves into a trap, they declined, upon which Jesus uttered a parable against them. He said that a father asked his two sons to go and work in the vineyard. One gave an outright refusal, but later repented and went, while the other promised to go but did not. Without saying so, he likened them to the latter son, who professed to do the will of the Father and did not. The Publicans and harlots are like the first, in that they refused, but repent, and thus find entrance into the kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

It is evident from these scriptures that the kingdom is a relation that man sustains to God, which is not bound primarily to what a man does, but rather what he is. It is not a matter of keeping certain forms and ceremonies, but rather the total being of man centered in God, by an act of the choice of man himself. According to what Jesus taught, man is morally responsible to God himself, to seek the kingdom first and foremost, to destroy any hindrances that

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 21:23-32.

may be in one's way of entering the kingdom, and to have real righteousness and not a hypocritical righteousness as the scribes and pharisees. Thus entrance into the kingdom is a voluntary act upon the part of man, and not something that is forced upon him. This will be seen more clearly in later discussions.

### The Sphere of the Kingdom

To this point it has been seen that the kingdom is limited to a dealing with man, but it is true also that all kingdoms are limited to dealing with men. Earthly kingdoms may have physical areas of land which they encompass, but unless a kingdom has some human subjects there is no kingdom. The Kingdom of God, however, has some distinct characteristics which set it totally apart from all others. Kingdoms, generally speaking, encompass one nationality or ethnic group. In this day and age there is a great intermingling of peoples, yet the statement still holds true. To a degree, kingdoms are bound by location and domain. In the kingdom of God, however, there is no limitation of any kind, except the limitation that the individual places upon himself. When the centurion came to Jesus in behalf of his sick servant, he marveled at the man's faith, and declared,

many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.<sup>1</sup>

Luke records a similar denunciation, though it is in a different context.<sup>2</sup> There are several things that are important to note in

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 8:11.

<sup>2</sup>Luke 13:28.

this statement. First, Jesus said that many would be in the kingdom from the east and west. There seems little reason to claim that he was speaking of a gathering back of the Jews of the dispersion, in the light of his recorded statement before his ascension. "Ye shall be witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."<sup>1</sup> It seems rather that he had in mind a supra-national kingdom. Men may live under the yoke of many kingdoms, and still be a part of the kingdom, even as Jesus lived under the heel of Rome, yet he had a kingdom not subject to Rome. National barriers, political barriers, and semantic barriers, are not barriers to the kingdom, for some shall come from everywhere to be a part of the kingdom, if they have met its conditions.

Secondly, note that Jesus included Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as a part of the kingdom. The scribes and pharisees boasted that they had for their Father, Abraham. They were in a sense, ancestor worshipers, for they looked to Abraham as the recipient of the covenant. John remonstrated with them for this very thing, when they came out to watch the proceedings at his great meetings in the wilderness. He called them a generation of snakes, who needed to repent. He warned them against relying upon their father Abraham, saying that God was able to bring forth children out of the stones at hand.<sup>2</sup>

They rested in Abraham again, when Jesus said, "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."<sup>3</sup> Their reply was a resting

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 1:8.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 3:5-9, Luke 3:7-8.    <sup>3</sup>John 8:31-32.

in Abraham, declaring that they had always been free in him. Jesus pointed out that they did not the works of Abraham. He acknowledged that they were by blood the descendants of Abraham, but by works they were of their father the devil.<sup>1</sup>

Jesus was far from mild in his denunciation of their rejection of the kingdom as conveyed in the parable of the wicked husbandmen. He related how a certain man had a vineyard and let it out to husbandmen, with the agreement of a payment at every harvest. The servants who came to collect were all beaten, stoned or killed by the husbandmen, with no payment made. Finally the owner sent his son to make collection. They conceived that if they destroyed him, they would own the vineyard, for the heir would be destroyed. Jesus posed the question as to what the owner should do to the husbandmen. Their reply was to destroy them and let the vineyard out to those who would be faithful husbandmen. Upon this Jesus replied: "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."<sup>2</sup> They were claiming to be part of the kingdom, by virtue of their father Abraham, Jesus pointed out that they were not producing the fruits of the kingdom, and therefore they were to have it taken away from them. Evidently the kingdom is here again linked to the covenant of Abraham. However, the covenant was to be given to others, because they had broken it, for the condition of the covenant was to walk before God and be perfect.<sup>3</sup> Thus it was to be taken away from them.

---

<sup>1</sup> John 8:33-44.    <sup>2</sup> Matthew 21:43.    <sup>3</sup> Genesis 17:1.

Now note the original passage under consideration. Jesus declared that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, their Fathers, were a part of the kingdom, but they, their children, were not. They, "the sons of the kingdom," or in this instance, in reference to the covenant, they who were born under its privileges, were to be cast out. The kingdom was to include the Jews in provision, but was not all inclusive, for many were hindered from entrance by their rejection of the conditions of the kingdom.

Because the kingdom was supra-national, it was to be declared unto all nations, for the end of the world will only come when this is accomplished.<sup>1</sup> How this is to take place, the scriptures do not declare, just simply the fact that it will be. The early church had trouble for a time in seeing this fact of a supra-national kingdom, but gradually it became an accepted fact.<sup>2</sup>

Indeed the Jews were looking for the coming of the kingdom. They were looking for the Messiah to come, who was promised in the prophets. Jesus warns, however, that the kingdom would not come by looking for it. Jesus declared, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall ye say, Lo, here! or there! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you."<sup>3</sup> This seems to indicate two things in their thinking. First, that they were looking for a restoration of a physical kingdom. They were looking for a leader who would restore Israel to her glory as a kingdom. Secondly, it appears that they thought the restoration of the kingdom to be an inevitable thing.

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 24:14.

<sup>2</sup>Acts 10 and 11.

<sup>3</sup>Luke 17:20-21.

They had no responsibilities in it. All they had to do was watch for its coming, but Jesus pointed out the fallacy of their position. First it was not a physical kingdom, for it came not with observation. It would not be a kingdom that they could see, for it was a kingdom within man. Coupled with what Jesus said already in this study, it is apparent that more was required of them than observation to bring the kingdom about. They had some responsibilities toward seeking the kingdom, not just watching for its coming. Thirdly, the kingdom was a spiritual kingdom, not a throne and a palace type of thing. The kingdom was within man. Man did not live within it, as in the sense of a state, but he himself was a part of its existence.

Jesus witnessed concerning the kingdom to Pilate, when Pilate asked him if he were the King of the Jews.

My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.<sup>1</sup>

Note that Pilate asked if he were king of the Jews. This Jesus did not deny, but declared that his was not a physical kingdom. Jesus was king of the Jews in the sense that he held the throne of David,<sup>2</sup> but as has been noted, this was not a physical throne, which ruled over all within the confines of his realm, but now the kingdom was within the men who were willing to meet its conditions and become a part of it.

---

<sup>1</sup>John 18:33-36.

<sup>2</sup>Luke 1:32-33.

It is quite apparent that Matthew is presenting Jesus Christ as the king, and his relation to the kingdom, and it has been well said that the Sermon on the Mount is the greatest dissertation upon the kingdom that is recorded. There are several things to note about this manifesto of the king, before it is considered. To whom was it delivered? It says that Jesus beheld the multitudes and went up into the mountain and taught his disciples. The multitude was obviously the impetus for the teaching, but the teaching was delivered to the disciples. There is great significance in the difference. The multitudes were obviously composed of a cross section of the society of the day. There were the sick, and afflicted who were almost always around for healing. The scribes and pharisees were always in evidence, as well as a cross section of the population. The poor, and the rich, as well as the beggar and the harlot. The publican and the priest were all a part of many of the multitudes which followed Jesus. Jesus saw this gathering, and departed into the mountain, where he taught his disciples. Some of the multitude may have followed, but the discourse was not directed to them. It was directed to the disciples who had come under the influence of the king, for only the one who is under the domination of the king has a right to know the principles of the kingdom.

Note the principles he presents to his subjects.<sup>1</sup> The kingdom belongs to the poor in spirit, or the ones who are willing to be subjects and be led by the king. The mourning ones in the kingdom are

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 5:3-13.

blessed, for they will find comfort in the kingdom. Blessed are the meek ones in the kingdom, for the world is inherited by meekness not might. The ones showing mercy will obtain mercy. Only the pure in heart will see God. Only the ones making peace will be called the sons of God. The ones who have been persecuted for righteousness sake are happy, for it is because they are a part of the kingdom that they are persecuted. A man is blessed when he is persecuted and reviled for the name of Christ because the rewards of being in the kingdom are not to be found in this life, but in heaven. Note that he does not say that one will receive a blessing for doing these things, for that is not the point. One does not enter the kingdom to receive a blessing, but rather he is blessed when he is, in his very being, a part of the kingdom.

The members of the kingdom are the very salt of the earth, but if they have no savor they are worthless.<sup>1</sup> Light is to see by, not to be hid, and thus the subjects of the kingdom are to shine as lights so that the world might see works and give praise to the Father in Heaven.<sup>2</sup> The commandments of the law are to be kept, but not with a superficial righteousness of the scribes and pharisees or the kingdom will never be seen.<sup>3</sup> The law commands not to kill, but one who is angry with another is in danger of losing the kingdom.<sup>4</sup> Adultery is forbidden, but one who looks upon a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery. Far better to destroy an erring member of

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 5:13-14.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 5:15-16.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 5:17-20.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 5:21-26.



the body than to lose the kingdom. One marrying a divorced person is committing adultery, for marriage cannot be broken by divorce.<sup>1</sup> Oaths are not needed to confirm one's word, but his word is to be yes and no.<sup>2</sup> The subject is not to act upon the principle of an eye for an eye, but rather to give one's coat also when the overcoat is demanded, and go a second mile when one is demanded.<sup>3</sup> The subjects of the kingdom are to treat all men the same, friend and foe alike, for the heavenly Father seeks perfection like his own. He makes rain to fall and bless both just and unjust.<sup>4</sup>

Righteousness is to be a matter of nature not demonstration. When one gives alms it is to be a private matter, not a matter of show. Praying is not uttered to be heard of men, but rather of the Father in Heaven, and he must be willing to extend the same privileges to others that he would like to receive. Fasting is not a demonstration for men, but to be seen of the Father, so one should not appear to fast.<sup>5</sup> The treasures of life are to be stored in heaven, not on earth, for one can not have a divided loyalty between the treasurers of the kingdom and earthly things. The necessities of life must not be one's prime concern, but the kingdom is to be sought first, before anything else. The concerns of life are to be met a day at a time.<sup>6</sup>

Judgment is not to be a characteristic of the subjects of the kingdom, but rather every member is to look after himself, to see

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 5:27-32.

<sup>2</sup>Matthew 5:33-37.

<sup>3</sup>Matthew 5:38-42.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 5:43-48.

<sup>5</sup>Matthew 6:1-18.

<sup>6</sup>Matthew 6:19-34.

that he has not greater faults in himself than he sees in others.<sup>1</sup>

That which is holy is not to be cast out to the undeserving and unappreciative lest both be destroyed by so doing.<sup>2</sup>

Subjects of the kingdom are to rely upon the king for the things needed, for he is as willing to give good things as a father is willing to give good things to his son, but one must be willing to give to others in the same generosity that one desires to receive.<sup>3</sup>

To this discourse Jesus utters an admonition which in a sense sums up the whole manifesto for he defines the way by saying:

Enter in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth unto destruction, and many there are that enter thereby. For narrow is the gate and straitened the way that leadeth unto life, and few there are that find it.<sup>4</sup>

If these were things to do, such as tithe, pray at certain hours, memorize prayers, offer certain offerings, the whole concept would be extremely simplified, but this is not the case. The subjects are to be the savory salt of the earth and a light to reveal the Father. Not only are they not to kill, but they are not to hate or be angry with a brother. They are not to commit adultery, but they are also not to look in lust. They are to be noted as people of truth, who love their enemies with the same kind of love that they have for their friends. Their righteousness is to be performed before God and not men, as well as be singly devoted to God. They are not to be judges, but examiners of themselves. Indeed it is a strict standard, but what is important to this study is not the strictness of the standard

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 7:1-5.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 7:6.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 7:7-12.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 7:13.

alone, but of whom is it exacted. This is addressed to the subjects. It is they who are to do these things. The responsibility is upon the individual. It is true that they are to ask of the Father to receive good gifts, which one can assume includes help also, but even in this case the responsibility rests upon the individual asking.

Jesus then warned of false prophets who would do many works in the name of the kingdom, but only the ones bearing the fruit of the kingdom will have a part of it. What then are their fruits? Jesus said that they professed many mighty works, but he would have nothing to do with them. They were not bearing the fruits of the kingdom, which he has just described. Therefore the principle is again, not what a man does, but what he is; that will govern what he does. According to what Jesus taught in this discourse it is man's responsibility to seek entrance into the kingdom.

## II. THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM

As has been mentioned, parables play an important part in the teaching of the concept of the kingdom. They must be examined, but in this study it is not of primary importance to give them full analysis. An examination will be made to note certain characteristics of the kingdom, and not to develop a full study of them.

In the parable of the sower, which is recorded in the three gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke,<sup>1</sup> the emphasis is not upon what is sown nor the sower but how it is received. The thing that is sown

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 13:3-9, 18-23; Mark 4:1-20; Luke 8:4-15.

is called by Matthew, "The Word of the kingdom",<sup>1</sup> by Mark simply, "The Word",<sup>2</sup> and by Luke, "The word of God".<sup>3</sup> As Matthew is presenting the king and the kingdom, one would expect him to connect the "word" with the kingdom, but it is obvious that the same thing is being conveyed by all.

In some men it is absolutely rejected, and thence Satan takes away even the truth, but the rejection comes before it is taken away. Some receive the word and it springs forth, but because it is only a superficial reception, with no depth, tests come and it withers away. Others receive the word, but other things crowd it out, while some receive and bring forth fruit. Note the progression of logic in the teaching: first, absolute rejection; secondly, a superficial acceptance; thirdly, a duality of loyalty in the acceptance; and lastly a complete acceptance with production of fruit according to ability.

One must be careful to note the admonition which Jesus attaches to the end of the parable. "He that hath ears to hear, Let him hear."<sup>4</sup> He is crying to men to hear the word of the kingdom. All men have the ability to hear, unless deaf. The responsibility is placed upon each man to receive. It's his choice whether he rejects, accepts superficially, accepts with a duality of loyalty, or accepts and produces fruit according to ability.

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 13:19.    <sup>2</sup>Mark 4:14.    <sup>3</sup>Luke 8:11.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 13:9, Mark 4:9, Luke 8:8.

The parable of the marriage feast<sup>1</sup> conveys this principle of choice also, for the king sent forth the invitations, but the guests refused to come. They made light of the invitation, and went about their business. Others went so far as to do harm to the servants bearing the invitation. The king did not force the attendance of the ones invited, but rather destroyed them and sent the invitation to others, who at first were less worthy. Many came, but one came without the wedding garment and he was cast out.

There is much to note in this parable. First, the guests did not receive a mandatory invitation. Though they rejected, they still had to pay the consequences of their rejection. They were not forced to attend the feast. They could not because they rejected, but their rejection does not separate them from the responsibility they had to attend. Secondly, the feast is not dependent upon certain guests, for the feast is an inevitable thing, which will be held whether the guests all come or not. The first guests did not come, at least not all of them, so the invitation was sent out to others. Thirdly, even though the guests who finally came were by later invitation, the requirement of the wedding garment was still in force. Because one is invited later does not release him from the responsibility of the requirements. Here again is seen the responsibility of man, in answering the call of the invitation, and in having on the wedding garment. Though there are many differences in the parable on the great feast,<sup>2</sup> the point important to the study

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 22:2-14.      <sup>2</sup>Luke 14:16-24.

remains the same.

The parable of the ten virgins<sup>1</sup> is avowedly a parable of the kingdom which conveys this same concept of responsibility. Ten virgins went out to meet the bride, but only five of them were wise enough to take oil in their lamps. It is true that they had some oil, for their lamps had gone out while waiting. At last the call came that the bridegroom was coming, but five found that they had no oil and their lamps were out. They tried to beg oil from the others, but none would give unto them. While they were away getting oil, the bridegroom came and the door was shut. They found no entrance to the marriage feast for they were too late. Had it been the responsibility of the bridegroom, they would have waited and let him give them oil; but they had to get oil themselves. They had failed in the beginning to bring enough oil. One must not carry this analysis too far, but it is clearly evident that the responsibility to have oil lay with all of the Virgins equally, but only five accepted the responsibility.

Connected directly to this parable is the parable of the servants and the talents.<sup>2</sup> A man delivered to each of his servants talents, according to their ability, before he took a journey. The one who had received five talents invested his and earned an additional five. The one receiving two also doubled his, but the one who received only one buried his for safe keeping until his master's return. Upon the return of the man an accounting was required, with the blessing going to the ones who had invested. The one who had

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 25:1-13.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 25:14-30.

buried his talent received a severe reprimand and was cast out for his unfaithfulness. The responsibility is placed at the feet of the servants of the king. They were to act upon the stewardship that was theirs, but the one who failed to act was cast out. When responsibility is exacted, noting but action upon the responsibility will be accepted. The king does not conform to the man but the man must conform to the king or pay the penalty. The parable of the king going to receive a kingdom<sup>1</sup> is possibly the same parable as the one of the talents, but the emphasis for this study remains the same as this parable. Each was responsible for the execution of his trust and would be judged for what he did with it.

Jesus also likened the kingdom to a man who hired others to work in his vineyard. Some worked the whole day for a shilling, while others labored from the third, sixth and ninth hour, yet all were paid the same amount as the one who had labored all day. The emphasis is not here upon the equality of reward, nor the equality of the social order, (that of all men sharing equally,) but rather the fidelity of the service offered in the time of opportunity. Some had not the opportunity to labor all day, but did labor as they had opportunity. The emphasis is upon man taking the opportunity he has and making the best use of it. The lack of opportunity is not the responsibility of the laborer, but his use of the opportunity afforded is his responsibility.

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 19:11-16.

There are several kingdom parables of Jesus, which are not relevant to this study, for they are concerned with other aspects of the kingdom. The parables of the tares,<sup>1</sup> the mustard seed,<sup>2</sup> and the leaven<sup>3</sup> are all concerned with the parallel of the Kingdom of Heaven and the kingdom of Satan. The parables of the pearl, and the treasure hid in a field,<sup>4</sup> deal with the part that Jesus has in the obtaining of the kingdom, which subject will be considered in the next chapter. The parable of the net<sup>5</sup> deals with the end of the world and the gathering of the kingdom, but this phase of the kingdom is outside the limits of this study.

### III. THE KINGDOM IN THE EPISTLES

In one sense there is little need to look at the epistles concerning the kingdom, for it is the King who presents the concept of the kingdom that is necessary. But one must examine the concept that the rest of the writers held, to note how they are in harmony with the kingdom as presented by Jesus Christ.

Paul is quite in agreement with Jesus' teaching concerning the Kingdom being of a spiritual nature when he declares, "for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit."<sup>6</sup> This he spoke in a context of dealing with the responsibility one has to his brother. Nothing is clean or unclean as far as he was concerned, and whether one ate or not, was

---

<sup>1</sup>Matthew 13:24-30, 36-43.    <sup>2</sup>Matthew 13:31-32.    <sup>3</sup>Matthew 13:33.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 13:44-46.    <sup>5</sup>Matthew 13:45-50.    <sup>6</sup>Romans 14:17.



not a matter of importance to the kingdom for the kingdom did not consist of such things. The kingdom consists of spiritual qualities of righteousness, joy and peace. But, he notes that these qualities govern whether one will eat or not. Not from the standpoint of ceremonial cleanliness, but from the influence it may have upon a brother.

To the Corinthians Paul again holds up the spiritual nature of the kingdom when he says, "For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power."<sup>1</sup> The Corinthians had the tendency of looking upon demonstration as a sign of spirituality, but Paul holds up to them the spiritual nature of the kingdom as opposed to this demonstrative type of thing. Not what a person does, but rather what he is, and out of this will work what he does. The Corinthians reversed the order, but Paul upheld the dynamic nature of the kingdom.

Again he declared unto them that "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."<sup>2</sup> This he uttered in connection with a section concerning the resurrection of the dead. The Greeks glorified the body, and evidently this concept was still prevalent in the church so that it was looking for a physical, bodily resurrection. But Paul said flesh and blood do not inherit the kingdom of God. They were misunderstanding the order of the kingdom completely.

Paul also lays the responsibility of entrance and perseverance of the man in the kingdom at the feet of man. To the Romans he writes, "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom also we have our access by faith

---

<sup>1</sup>I Corinthians 4:20.      <sup>2</sup>I Corinthians 15:50.

into this grace wherein we stand."<sup>1</sup> Faith being the exercise of the individual toward God, and justification hinging upon faith, it is evident that one can find entrance to the kingdom only upon his own volition. It is true that there are other facets to salvation, but this one point is pertinent to this study. Add to this the fact that he exhorted men to walk worthy of their calling in God.<sup>2</sup> He places strong emphasis upon one's responsibility to conform to the kingdom even after one is a part of it. Much more could be said, and many more passages could be examined, as well as a complete exegetical study of all the books, but these will suffice as illustration of the point in question.

#### IV. SUMMARY

It has been seen that Jesus Christ, with God the Father, sustain the office of absolute Lord and sovereign over the universe, but to man a different relationship is sustained, which relationship is seen through the concept of the kingdom. The kingdom is a central theme of the ministry of Jesus. His forerunner began his ministry on the note of the kingdom. Jesus also commanded his disciples to preach the kingdom. The works of Jesus were held up to John as being the works of the kingdom, as opposed to force being used to bring the kingdom.

The kingdom is not within the realm of the physical, but the spiritual, for it is not entered by physical birth, but spiritual or the new birth. To be a part of the kingdom one must have a singleness

---

<sup>1</sup>Romans 5:1-2.   <sup>2</sup>II Timothy 4:8, I Thessalonians 2:12.

of affection, two masters cannot be served at the same time. The temporal cares of the sustenance of life are not to take precedence over one's seeking after the kingdom. One is to pray for the coming of the kingdom, through the doing of the will of God, first. The kingdom is so important that the loss of a hand, eye, or foot by self destruction is to be preferred to a losing of it. Family, friends and loved ones are not to stand in one's way of his pursuit of the kingdom. One's righteousness is to be more than a superficial keeping of ordinances in form only, disregarding the inner keeping of them. Self righteousness is such a dreadful crime against the kingdom, that it is easier for a publican and harlot to enter the kingdom than a self righteous person.

The kingdom is not an ethnic or national kingdom, such as one confined to the Jews, but is to be preached to all men and nations. Men are a part of the kingdom from every direction, as well as the Jews and their fore fathers. The kingdom is not earthly and national but spiritual and supra-national. The kingdom is not a thing to be looked for, but is within man.

The Sermon on the Mount is the manifesto of the king, delivered to the members of the kingdom, giving to them the principles of the kingdom, which were all spiritual in nature. They are not rules for conduct, but rather the principles upon which one would conduct himself. The kingdom belongs to the poor in spirit, mourning ones are comforted, meek ones inherit, and the ones hungering for righteousness are filled. One who is persecuted for the kingdom is called blessed. The subjects of the kingdom are so basic that they are the

salt of the earth. They are light in the world to show the works of the Father.

So strict are the principles of the kingdom, that a man can commit adultery with a look. Righteousness is not a matter of demonstration, but a matter of being righteous. The treasure of the life is not to be on earth, but in heaven, so that the affections will be centered there. One is not to judge another, but to judge himself, and remove the faults in his own life, rather than attempt a removal of the faults in the life of another.

Jesus indeed acknowledged that the way was narrow and the gate straight, but it is pre-eminently worth the effort, for even the loss of a member of the body is to be preferred to a loss of the kingdom.

Guards were thrown up around the kingdom, for not everyone who professes to be a part of it, is, for only the ones who manifest the fruit of the kingdom are of it.

The parables perhaps give us the best definition of the kingdom, for they reveal the nature of its operation and existence. The Word of the kingdom is sown, but the growth of the seed hinges upon the reception it received from the hearer. If he closes himself to it, in absolute rejection, he destroys any possibility of spiritual growth, for the enemy comes and takes away even what he has. If one accepts only superficially he will not be able to endure for lack of depth. If one accepts, but without singleness of affection, the cares of the world will soon choke it out and destroy it. But, in the midst of all of these there are those who accept fully and bring forth fruit according to their ability. To this Jesus adds the responsibility of

man for he calls for them to hear if they have ears to do so. He laid the choice of reception at their feet.

This matter of choice is conveyed in the parable of the wedding feast as well as the one concerning the ten virgins who were invited to the marriage feast. The parable of the servants and the entrusted talents, also placed the responsibility for action at the feet of man, for it was their choice whether they invested or did not invest, not the will of the one entrusting the talents. The laborers in the vineyard were rewarded not according to the length of their labors, but according to their industry in laboring at the opportunity. This again is man's responsibility.

#### V. CONCLUSION

Therefore, there is a distinct separation between the relationship of Christ to the metaphysical realm of the universe and the moral realm of man. Over the universe Christ is sovereign, ruling with decrees, but over the moral realm he is Lord in a somewhat different manner. The call is to seek the kingdom, or for man to receive the kingdom. Man can reject the invitation, but this does not release him from his responsibility, for he must suffer the consequences of his rejection. All hindrances to reception of the kingdom must be removed by man, even to the mutilation of erring members of his body, if such drastic measures are necessary. Man's relation to the kingdom is his moral responsibility. The choice of conforming to the concepts of the kingdom or rejection lies within his hands. He is not free not to choose, for he will suffer the consequences for rejection.

Thus Lordship of Christ is over those who will make him Lord. If he were to force his sovereignty upon man he would be a despot, but the call is always an invitation to come. Were he to exercise a sovereignty, he would destroy the moral nature of man, for man would not have a power of choice.

## CHAPTER V

### CHRIST THE LORD AS SAVIOR

## CHAPTER V

### CHRIST THE LORD AS SAVIOR

In this study thus far Christ has been examined in the scriptures from the standpoint of his humanity, and his divinity. His office of Lord was examined and seen to be an outgrowth of his being one with God. He exercises his office of Lord over the metaphysical universe, but over man it is through the Kingdom that he is Lord. Man may enter it by meeting the conditions of the kingdom. There remains one facet of this study yet to be explored, that of Christ as Savior, and the relation that this office holds to Lordship and the kingdom. This is not intended as a complete soteriological study, but rather an examination of the fact of Saviorhood.

#### I. THE PRESENTATION OF CHRIST AS SAVIOR

It is clear from an examination of the scriptures that the office of Savior is ascribed to Jesus Christ. This is evident by the use of an exhaustive concordance, yet many of the instances bear examination.

The word Savior *σωτήρ* appears only three times in the Gospels. The first instance is in Luke, where Mary, after the rejoicing of Elizabeth, utters a Psalm in which she says, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior."<sup>1</sup> This

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 1:46-47.



passage is not without its problems, for it is doubtful that Mary uttered such a song as she stood before Elizabeth. If she did one has to reckon with the problem of transmission. It is a possible hymn of the New Testament Church, but even this is doubted by some.

Alexander Bruce states:

Mary's song, *Μαγάλουνε* : magnificat, Vulgate, whence the ecclesiastical name for this hymn, which has close affinities with the song of Hanna in I Samuel 2:1-10; variously regarded by critics: by some e.g., Godet and Hahn, as an extemporised utterance under inspiration by Mary, by others as a remnant of old Jewish-Christian Hymnology (J. Weiss, etc.), by others still as a purely Jewish Psalm, lacking distinctive features (Hillman). There are certain difficulties connected with the first view, e.g., the conventional phraseology and the presence of elements which do not seem to fit the special situation.

- *ψυχὴ πνεῦμα* Synonyms in parallel clauses.<sup>1</sup>

Because of these problems it seems more proper to ascribe this to the early church, than to Mary. It however must be noted that the office of Savior is here ascribed to God, even though the origin of the passage is perhaps in doubt.

The second passage is the appellation of Savior to Christ in the utterance of the angel who appeared to the shepherds and said:

Be not afraid; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people: for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord.<sup>2</sup>

The appellation of Lord has been noted above, but now it is important to note that this appears after he is called Savior. There is born a Savior, but this Savior is already "Christ the Lord." The message is conveying the concept, that, this is the crux of why Christ came

---

<sup>1</sup>W. R. Nicoll, The Expositor's Greek Testament, I, 466.

<sup>2</sup>Luke 2:10-11.

to earth. He came to be Savior but when he came to be Savior he was already Lord.

The last instance of usage in the Gospels is uttered by the men of Sychar when they were convinced that this indeed was the Christ. Not only by the testimony of the woman, but because they had heard for themselves. "Now we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Savior of the world."<sup>1</sup> Sanday casts doubt on the title, "Savior of the World", supposing that it was put in the mouth of the Samaritans by the evangelist,<sup>2</sup> but this is to assume that Jesus did not declare to them that he was the Savior of the world in the two days that he taught them. There seems little reason to doubt the validity of the application of the title on so little evidence. To the woman he declared himself to be the Christ,<sup>3</sup> and it is also possible that he declared himself to be Savior to the multitude. It must, however, be acknowledged, that, according to the record they did call him the "Savior of the World."

Though he is not called specifically Savior, it must be noted that the angel, in the annunciation to Joseph, declared, ". . . Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins."<sup>4</sup> Though his name meant Savior, he was to be a Savior of men from their sins, and not a Savior in the sense of Joshua.

---

<sup>1</sup>John 4:42.

<sup>2</sup>W. R. Nicoll, The Expositor's Greek Testament, I, 732.

<sup>3</sup>John 4:25-26.

<sup>4</sup>Matthew 1:21.

Joshua saved from Egypt, but Jesus was to save men from the bondage of sin.

Even though the Gospels use the term Savior in reference to Christ only three times, it is evident that Peter, and John all held him to be the Savior. Peter, in his defense before the council of Jerusalem, did not argue the divinity of Christ, but declared:

The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew hanging him on a tree. Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a prince and a Savior, to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins.<sup>1</sup>

It is possible to interpret the reading of this passage in two ways. The problem lies in one's interpretation of ἤγειρεν raised up. Does the raising up refer to the crucifixion, resurrection, or to the fact that God raised up a Savior and a Prince in Jesus Christ? In the next verse it refers to God's exaltation of Jesus Christ to be a Prince and a Savior. If his raising up is his resurrection, it appears that his exaltation is a result of his resurrection, which in the light of the previous study is out of harmony with the scriptures. Rather it seems that this "whom ye slew, hanging on a tree", is a statement to identify the one whom he is saying God hath exalted to be a Savior. This is in harmony with what Peter quoted Moses as saying, for he declared, "Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise (ἀναστήσει) up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me."<sup>2</sup> It is true that he declared God raised up Jesus from the dead a few verses previous,<sup>3</sup> but this is not said in connection with his being a Prince and Savior. It is not denied that God did raise Jesus Christ from the dead, but

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 5:30-31.    <sup>2</sup>Acts 3:22.    <sup>3</sup>Acts 3:15.



the problem is whether his dying and being raised from the dead made him a Prince and a Savior. This fact is doubted, but the author is not alone in this view. R. J. Knowling agrees for he declares:

**ἡγέρην**: does this word refer to the Resurrection, or to the sending of Jesus into the world, and his raising up by God as the Messiah? The former is the view taken by St. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and amongst moderns by Meyer-Wendt, Nosgen, Alford, Overbeck, Felton, Blass, Holtzmann, Weiss, Hilgenfeld; but in 3:15, 4:10 the phrase is . . . **ἡγέρην ἐκ νεκρῶν**

One of the chief arguments for the former interpretation is the contrast marked in the next clause (4:10) between the death of the cross and the Resurrection but this contrast would still be marked by the following verb. Is it not possible that, as in the days of old God had raised up a Savior, or saviors for Israel, Judges 2:18, Judges 3:9 and 15, Peter may now speak of him as raising up Jesus a Savior?<sup>1</sup>

The death on the cross was a humiliation and debasement to the victim, and Peter made reference to this to increase their feeling of guilt, for this was the one God exalted, but they tried to destroy him. His point is not the emphasis of the death or resurrection, but the fact that the one who was killed was the one who God had exalted as Savior.

To the people in the synagogue of Antioch of Pisida, Paul began with Israel in Egypt, examining their history to David and then declared, "Of this man's seed hath God according to promise brought unto Israel a Savior, Jesus."<sup>2</sup> He again speaks of the raising up of Jesus as being God's setting up of a Savior for he states:

And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he raised up Jesus; as also it is written in the second Psalm, thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Nicoll, op. cit., II, 153.      <sup>2</sup>Acts 13:23.

<sup>3</sup>Acts 13:32-33.

He goes on to speak of his raising him from the dead, but here he is speaking of God's providing Jesus as Savior. Then he declares,

Be it known unto you therefore, brethren, that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins: and by him, everyone that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.<sup>1</sup>

The fact of Savior is not linked here to Christ's death but to Christ as Savior.

In the midst of advice to husbands and wives concerning their conduct toward one another, which Paul writes to the Ephesians, he brings an analysis of the church and Christ's relation to it, using it as an illustration to emphasize his other point. He declares: "For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the church, being himself the savior of the body."<sup>2</sup> Obviously he is using the illustration of the body which he uses in Corinthians. Christ is the head of the body, the church, which is made up of the redeemed, for He it is who has redeemed or saved them. He is the Savior of the body, and by virtue of this, He is head over the body.

Speaking of the second coming of Christ, Paul writes to the Philippians, "For our citizenship is in heaven; whence also we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>3</sup> He is here speaking of the ultimate of salvation, that is the saving of the soul unto eternity in heaven, or the final consummation of one's salvation. It cannot be taken in any other way, for it would be out of harmony with the context. Emphasis is that the saving of the one whose citizenship is in heaven, is through the Savior Jesus Christ.

---

<sup>1</sup>Acts 13:38-39.    <sup>2</sup>Ephesians 5:23.    <sup>3</sup>Philippians 3:20.

Again Paul writes to the young minister Timothy concerning Christ as Savior.

Be not ashamed therefore of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but suffer hardship with the gospel according to the power of God; who saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before times eternal, but hath now been manifested by the appearing of our Savior Christ Jesus, who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.<sup>1</sup>

He is here exhorting the young minister to boldness in the exercise of his calling, and to keep his gift in the ministry stirred up. He is to be willing to suffer hardships because of the power of God which we receive by the calling of God. This grace which is extended to man is not a new thing, but was extended to man from time immortal. Not until the coming of Jesus Christ as Savior was it made clear to man, for it is through him that death is abolished and life eternal is made clear to all men. Thus men are saved from death to eternal life through Jesus Christ who is our Savior from all eternity.

To Titus, Paul writes,

For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us to the intent that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world; looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a people for his own possession, zealous of good works.<sup>2</sup>

Paul was writing to Titus concerning the danger of worldliness that was creeping into the church. Note what he presents as the argument

---

<sup>1</sup> II Timothy 1:8-10.

<sup>2</sup> Titus 2:11-14.

against such infiltration. Salvation has appeared to all men in the person of Jesus Christ, who is Savior, and who gave himself that he might redeem man from his iniquity unto purity, that he might have a pure people who are earnest to do good works. The giving seems, rather than the cross alone, to be his laying aside of the form of God to come to man.

Peter in his second letter is burdened that the brethren might be established in the faith, for all things have been granted to them that are needed for their establishment, even to the partaking of the divine nature. They are to add to their faith, virtue and knowledge, and self control, and patience, and godliness, and brotherly kindness, and last of all love. The one who has lack in these has forgotten the cleansing he had received from his old sins.

Wherefore, brethren, give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never stumble: for thus shall be richly supplied unto you entrance into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.<sup>1</sup>

Though Peter does not state that all of this is a result of Christ's saving work, it is none the less implied in this last statement. They are to give diligence to this calling that they might have entrance into the eternal kingdom. Note to whom the kingdom belongs: The "Kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." It has been seen that Christ is Lord over the kingdom, but he is also Savior of the kingdom. Thus it is evident that Peter conceives of the kingdom being possible through the saving work of Jesus Christ.

---

<sup>1</sup>II Peter 1:10-11.

He again brings them back to the Saviorhood of Christ when

he says:

For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the last state is become worse with them than the first. For it were better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after knowing it, to turn back from the Holy commandment delivered unto them.<sup>1</sup>

It is through Christ that they overcame the defilements of the world.

It is by his office of Savior that they received the commandment, and

it is by a rejection of this that they fell away.

John in his refutation of the gnostics declared that,

We have beheld and bear witness that the Father hath sent the Son to be the Savior of the world. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him, and he in God.<sup>2</sup>

He states the fact that the Son is sent of the Father to be the Savior of the world, and then he declares that Jesus Christ is the Son, and consequently the Savior of the World. He states that the one who confessed this fact has God abiding in him, and he abides in God, but it is contingent upon Jesus Christ being the Savior of the world. Thus, it is by Christ that man has access to God, and God to man.

## II. GOD AS SAVIOR

One other fact must be observed here, that is, that these same writers call God, Savior also. It has been seen how Paul referred to Christ as Savior in his letter to Timothy, but note also that he calls God, Savior. He begins his first letter: "Paul an apostle of

---

<sup>1</sup>II Peter 2:20-21.

<sup>2</sup>I John 4:14-15.



Christ Jesus according to the commandment of God our Savior, and Christ Jesus our hope;"<sup>1</sup> Again he says, "This is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; who would have all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth;"<sup>2</sup> He goes on to say, "For there is one God, one mediator also between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all."<sup>3</sup> It is evident that he here refers to God the Father as Savior, but he refers to Christ as doing the saving work of being a ransom. Again he says, "For to this end we labor and strive, because we have our hope set on the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of them that believe."<sup>4</sup> Here again Saviorhood is ascribed to God, but note also that he has called Jesus Christ Savior.

To Titus he writes in much the same way, for he says,

. . . I was intrusted according to the commandment of God our Savior; to Titus, my true child after a common faith: Grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Savior.<sup>5</sup>

He does the same thing in the second chapter, where in verse ten he speaks of "The doctrine of God our Savior", and then in verse thirteen he says, "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." Again he says, "But when the kindness of God our Savior, and his love toward man appeared . . ."<sup>6</sup>, but two verses later he makes reference to Jesus Christ being our Savior, for it is through him that we are saved by the "washing

---

<sup>1</sup>I Timothy 1:1.    <sup>2</sup>I Timothy 2:3-4.    <sup>3</sup>I Timothy 2:5-6.

<sup>4</sup>I Timothy 4:10.    <sup>5</sup>Titus 1:3-4.    <sup>6</sup>Titus 3:4.

of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."<sup>1</sup> It is by Christ that we are made heirs of the hope of eternal life.

It then is evident that these writers do not make any point of laboring over the separation of whether God saves man or whether Christ saves man. They merely ascribe Saviorhood to both. It is true that Christ is linked to the redemptive work which was carried on through the incarnation, but this cannot be separated from God the Father, as has been noted in the study of Lordship. They ascribe Saviorhood to both, but the point at hand is that the scriptures clearly call Christ Savior.

### III. CHRIST'S TEACHING CONCERNING HIS SAVIORHOOD

In looking at Christ's teaching concerning his Saviorhood, one must also get a clear glimpse of what he came to do. What was his mission, and what did he hope to accomplish? It is true that this is not a whole picture but it is sufficient to see his mission of Saviorhood, which is important to this study.

The publicans once came to Jesus to dine with him, much to the disgust of the Pharisees, for they questioned why he did so. Obviously they would not, and if Jesus were as deeply religious as he claimed to be, they felt that he should not. Out of this situation comes a statement concerning his mission, for in his defense he said:

They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick. But go ye and learn what this meaneth, I desire mercy and not sacrifice: for I came not to call the righteous but sinners.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Titus 3:5.

<sup>2</sup>Matthew 9:13.

It is thus apparent that he came not to be a teacher but to take the part of a physician. A physician works with those who are sick, but he is interested in health. No true physician fosters ill-health that he might have a job, but he is forever interested in man being healthy. He deals with the cure of disease. Jesus came to call sinners because they are the ones who need the physician, for they are diseased by sin. He did not say that the Pharisees were not in need of the same physician for he warned that man's righteousness was to exceed the righteousness of the Pharisees. A physician is powerless when man will not come to the physician admitting his sickness. He ate with the publicans and sinners for they came to him. His message was not to the righteous, but to the sinner, and it was to the sinner that he made his appeal.

Zacchaeus, the rich chief publican of Jericho, after his sojourn in a Sycomore tree, had Jesus as the honored guest at his house for dinner. This action of Jesus incurred the criticism of the multitudes that were at hand, for they said he was going to the house of a sinner to eat. Zacchaeus, it is true, repented with the promise to give half of his goods to the poor and to restore fourfold what he had taken wrongfully, but Jesus' reply is not to Zacchaeus, but to the multitude. He acknowledged that salvation had come to another son of Abraham, but he said more. "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which is lost."<sup>1</sup> This is an answer to their charge that he was eating with a sinner. His answer was that

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke 19:10.

he came to sinners. He came to seek out sinners and save them. This was his mission.

During one of the three days after his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Jesus taught the people concerning his relation to the Father, declaring that anyone who believed on him was really believing on the one sending him. To see him was to see the one who sent him. He came to bring light to the ones believing in him, and then declares: "And if any man hear my sayings and keep them not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world."<sup>1</sup> Jesus declared that the word that he spoke judged men, but this was not his mission. His mission was to save the world. He came as Savior, but the ones rejecting him were judged by their rejection of him as Savior.

After the parable of the door to the sheep fold, Jesus declared himself to be the door, and anyone entering in by him would be saved.<sup>2</sup> He had reference to the door of the Kingdom of Heaven, but he goes on to say that he is the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep, which he does voluntarily that he might take it again.<sup>3</sup> He does not, however, say that this laying down of his life makes him Savior.

The conversation which Nicodemus had with Jesus by night is perhaps one of the most concise and complete statements concerning his saving mission which we have in the scriptures. Christ is talking to a scholar who is the teacher of Israel, and well versed in the Law and the Prophets. He asks Jesus for the latest word from God, for

---

<sup>1</sup>John 12:47.    <sup>2</sup>John 10:9.    <sup>3</sup>John 10:15-18.

he recognizes in Jesus a teacher sent from God. Jesus tells him that his latest word is that "ye must be born anew."<sup>1</sup> This is not another physical birth, but a spiritual birth in the Spirit. Nicodemus cries out in the despair of his lack of understanding, "How can these things be?"<sup>2</sup> Jesus chides him for his lack of understanding, but this chiding must not be taken for his answer.

And no one hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of man, who is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God sent not the Son into the world to judge the world: but that the world should be saved through him. He that believeth on him is not judged: he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the judgement, that light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil.<sup>3</sup>

Jesus, in answering Nicodemus' question of how, does not begin with the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness, but with the descending of the "Son of man". The "Son of man descended out of heaven," is the first part of his answer. Secondly he states that the Son of man must be lifted up as was the serpent in the wilderness. There is nothing here to suggest that this is a reference to his crucifixion. There was no way that Nicodemus could know of this, but he could understand the lifting of the serpent. Moses made the bronze serpent and hung it on a pole in the center of the camp, so that anyone who was bitten by the serpents could look upon the serpent and be delivered from the sting. How this took place is not certain, but

---

<sup>1</sup>John 3:3.    <sup>2</sup>John 3:9.    <sup>3</sup>John 3:13-19.

it in fact was by the looking upon the serpent. It was by its place of exaltation that this was made possible.

Jesus is then declaring that he must be exalted to a position of prominence that "whosoever believes on him should have eternal life."<sup>1</sup> What this lifting up is, Jesus does not state to Nicodemus. John later interprets this to mean his death on the cross,<sup>2</sup> but Jesus does not place this interpretation upon it. After the great confession of Peter at Caesarea, Philippi, Jesus told them how he would be killed the third day and rise again, but he does not connect this with this idea of being lifted up.

When the serpent was lifted in the wilderness it was not lifted as a fetish over the camp to deliver all, but the ones who were willing to obey by looking upon the thing. It was an act of faith upon their part to look. Jesus is saying that those who look upon him in the same way will be saved. The serpent was a savior from the serpents which were plaguing the camp, and Christ, like the serpent which was lifted up, is a Savior to the world, that the ones believing in him as Savior are saved.

Those who refused to look upon the serpent in the midst of the camp died of the bites that they incurred, but the ones who looked were saved. By their own action of refusal they incurred the judgment of God, for God had sent these serpents to punish them for murmuring against him. The serpent of brass was given because they acknowledged their sins,<sup>3</sup> and by a look at it they found deliverance

---

<sup>1</sup>John 3:16.

<sup>2</sup>John 12:33.

<sup>3</sup>Numbers 21:7.

from them. By their refusal to look upon the serpent they judged themselves, for they rejected the way of deliverance, but the one who looked was not judged for his sins.

Note well how Jesus carries out this analogy. He declared that he came not to judge the world, but to save it. The brass serpent was not given in judgement, but as a salvation. To reject Christ is to incur the same judgement of turning one's back on the way provided for deliverance. The one who believes on Christ escapes judgement for he has taken the way provided. Men then are condemned because of their rejection of the provision of salvation, not because the provision is limited to certain ones. Light came to the world, and men rejected the light, and thus the light that they reject condemns them. Christ is lifted up as Savior, by the fact that God exalted Jesus Christ as Savior. God loved and gave his Son as Savior. His life is redemptive process, not just one phase of it, for the lifting up is the exaltation of Christ as Savior when he was incarnate.

#### IV. SUMMARY

It has been seen, in this brief study, by the references cited, that Christ is indeed presented as Savior in the whole of the New Testament. In the annunciation it was noted that the shepherds were told that a Savior was born. Not that he was to be a Savior, but that there was born a Savior, who was the Christ. The men of Sychar did not declare that Christ was to be a Savior, but that he was Savior. Peter before the council at Jerusalem declared that Jesus Christ was

the one raised up of God to be Savior, but the Jews had rejected and killed him. In other places he spoke of him being raised from the dead, but this is not the raising that Peter had in mind, rather the providing of a Savior. Paul speaks of Christ being the Savior of the body, and head of it by virtue of the fact that he is its Savior.

Paul in his exhortation to Timothy presents Christ as the Savior of the world from time eternal, and that through his coming he abolished death and made eternal life clear to all men. In his letter to Titus, Paul holds up Christ as the answer to the problems of worldliness in the church, for it is Christ who is Savior and who is purifying unto himself a pure people, for he is the Savior.

Peter declares that entrance into the kingdom is by virtue of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. He again declares that one escapes the defilements of the world through the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. John proposed that the test of a true follower of God was one who confessed that the Son of God, was the Savior of the world, and that this Son was Jesus Christ.

It has also been seen, that the title of Savior is ascribed to God as well as Jesus, and that the Epistle writers take no pains in making any distinction.

It is evident from the teaching of Jesus that he came as Savior, for he came to seek and to save the lost, to be a physician to the sick of sin, and to save the world. It is through him that one may enter into salvation. In his teaching to Nicodemus it was seen that Jesus was a Savior exalted in the same manner as the Serpent in the wilderness, and that as one was saved from the serpents by looking



in Faith unto the serpent on the pole, so one is saved by looking to Jesus Christ as Savior. He has been exalted by God as the Savior of all who believe in him.

It is to be noted that there are no passages that give the sense that Jesus Christ became a Savior by his death on the cross, but rather he was Savior because he was raised up to be Savior by God the Father. It is granted that this does not deal with the how of Salvation, but that is not the concern of this particular study.

#### V. CONCLUSION

Therefore Jesus Christ is the Savior of the world. He came as Savior, and his whole life is redemptive process. No one fact in his life made him Savior, but he is Savior by the exaltation of God. As God is called Savior also, it is evident that Jesus Christ is Savior by virtue of the fact that he is one with God, thus God is reconciling man unto himself.

**CHAPTER VI**  
**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### I. SUMMARY

The scriptures present Jesus Christ, as person, to be fully human and fully divine, the incarnate Son of God, or "God with us". Before he came to the earth he was "with God" and "Was God." This was not a modality of God, but the incarnation of the Son of God who is distinct from the Father, yet one with him. Jesus Christ is then God-man.

The scriptures present God as Lord by the right of creation and the will of creation, but Jesus Christ is also presented as Lord. Because Jesus Christ is God in the form of man, having divested himself of the form of God, He is also Lord. Though he emptied himself, it was not of his nature, but his form that he set aside. Lordship is an essential element of Christ's relationship to man, and was not set aside in the incarnation. The problem of a duality of Lords is reconcilable in the oneness of Christ with the Father, or his being God. Thus Lordship is a result of his being God.

According to the scriptures Christ is Lord over the metaphysical universe, but the Lordship is rather the nature of a sovereign, for the universe is controlled by decrees. Man, however, does not come under the same relation as the universe, for he is a moral creature. There is a call to man to seek the kingdom of God with his

whole being. Christ extends to man an invitation to come, but man can and does reject this invitation. His rejection does not release him from the consequences, for he will pay the penalty for doing so. It is man's responsibility to remove all the hindrances of entering the kingdom. He is to destroy every hindrance, even to the point of the destruction of one's most valued treasures, and thus the choice of entering the kingdom is within the power of man.

According to the scriptures the nature of Christ's Lordship is one of inviting man to make him Lord. His invitation is from the position of a Lord, for if he demanded honor he would be a despot. He rather always invites man to come, leaving him the power of choice.

The scriptures present Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world. He came as Savior, for he was exalted to that office by God the Father. No single facet of his life made him Savior, but his whole life is redemptive process. God is also called Savior, and thus Jesus Christ is Savior by virtue of the fact that he is one with the Father, thus God is reconciling man to himself.

## II. CONCLUSIONS

Therefore it is concluded that, the exercise of the Lordship of Christ is made possible through the fact that Jesus Christ is Savior. He could not be Lord over man unless he be first Savior of man, for it is through his Saviorhood that man finds entrance into the kingdom. It is over this Kingdom of redeemed men that Christ is Lord. Consequently one cannot say that Jesus Christ is Lord and not Savior, for except he be Savior, it is not possible for him to exercise Lordship. Neither

can one say that he is Savior and not Lord, for Lordship is a result of one coming to him as Savior. One cannot believe on him as Savior unless he is willing to make him Lord, for his being Savior provides entrance into the kingdom. Those who are a part of the kingdom are under the Lordship of Christ.

If one says that Christ is Lord apart from the moral choice of man, he is using the word Lord in an improper way. One who is harsh and demanding is a despot not a Lord. A subject fears a despot, but loves a Lord, and Christ invites man to love him. Though conditions are placed upon man for entering the kingdom, man is invited to meet the conditions. A demand is never placed upon him. Jesus Christ is then Lord over those who will make him Lord of their lives, by coming to him as Savior.

It is therefore the conviction of this author that one is not really a Christian until he makes Christ Lord, for when one comes to Christ as Savior he must also make him the Lord of his life. Either Jesus Christ is Lord of all or he is not Lord at all. If he is not Lord at all, then neither is he Savior of that individual. Therefore Lordship and Saviorhood are separable in analysis but are inseparable in fact.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clarke, A., Clarke's Commentary. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d., 6 Vols.
- Clark, E. T., The Small Sects in America. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1937.
- Edersheim, A., The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903.
- Ferre, Nels F. S., The Christian Understanding of God. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1951.
- Frost, Eric, This Jesus. Great Neck Long Island, New York: Channel Press, 1959.
- Hodge, C., Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1946.
- Holy Bible, American Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1901.
- Kittel, G., Kittel's Bible Key Words, trans. and edited by J. R. Coates and H. P. Kingdom. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1958, II.
- Lang, J. P., Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, trans. by Phillip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, n.d.
- Liddell, H. and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1846.
- Machen, J. Gresham, The Virgin Birth of Christ. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1930.
- Miley, J., Systematic Theology. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1892.
- Morgan, G. C., The Gospel According to John. New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1929.
- The Gospel According to Luke. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1929.
- The Gospel According to Mark. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1929.

- The Gospel According to Matthew. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1929.
- The Teaching of Christ. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1913.
- Moulton, J. H. and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.
- Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden, Concordance of Greek New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- Nestle, D. Eberhard, and D. Erwin Nestle, Greek New Testament. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt for the American Bible Society, 1952.
- Nicoll, W. R., The Expositor's Greek Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., n.d., 5 vols.
- Phillips, J. B., Letters to Young Churches. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1955.
- Rops, Daniel, Jesus and His Times, trans. from French by Ruby Millar. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1954.
- Sampson, Martin C., M. D., "When the Curtains of Death Parted," The Reader's Digest, LXXIV (May, 1959).
- Smith, David, The Days of His Flesh. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.
- Thayer, J. H., Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: American Book Company, 1889.
- Trench, C. R., Synonyms of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1947.
- Wiley, H. O., Christian Theology. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1953. 3 vols.



## APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

Κύριος addressed to another person

Ascribed to another man

Matthew 13:27

John 12:21

Acts 16:30

Matthew 15:27

Ascribed to a ruler

Matthew 27:63

Acts 25:26

Ascribed to the head of a house

Matthew 21:30

Matthew 25:11

I Peter 3:6

Spoken of others professing to be Lord

I Corinthians 8:5

# APPENDIX B

**Κύριος** used to denote a master or owner

Matthew	6:24	Luke	16:5
	9:38		16:5
	10:24		16:8
	10:25		16:13
	18:25		19:16
	18:26		19:18
	18:27		19:20
	18:31		19:25
	18:32		19:33
	18:34		20:13
	20:8		20:15
	21:40		20:42
	24:45		20:44
	24:46	John	13:16
	24:48		15:15
	24:50		15:20
	25:18	Acts	2:25
	25:19		16:16
	25:20		16:19
	25:21	Romans	14:4
	25:21		14:4
	25:22	Galatians	4:1
	25:23	Ephesians	6:5
	25:23		6:9
	25:24	Colossians	3:22
	25:25		4:1
	25:26		
Mark	12:9		
	13:35		
Luke	12:36		
	12:37		
	12:42		
	12:43		
	12:45		
	12:46		
	12:47		
	13:8		
	13:25		
	14:21		
	14:22		
	14:23		
	16:3		

# APPENDIX C

## Kύριος used in reference to God

Matthew 1:20	Luke	5:17	Hebrews	8:9
1:22		10:21		8:10
1:24		19:38		8:11
2:13		20:42		10:16
2:15	John	12:13		10:30
2:19		12:38		12:5
5:33		12:38		12:6
9:38	Acts	2:20		12:14
11:25		2:25		13:6
21:9		2:34	James	5:10
21:42		3:19	I Peter	3:12
22:44		4:26		3:12
23:39		5:9	Jude	5
27:10		5:19		9
28:2		7:31		14
Mark 11:9		7:33	Revelation	4:17
12:11		7:49		11:15
12:29		10:33		15:4
12:36		12:23		17:14
13:20		13:47		
Luke 1:6		13:48		
1:9		15:17		
1:11		15:18		
1:15		17:25		
1:17	Romans	9:28		
1:25		9:29		
1:28		10:16		
1:38		11:3		
1:45		11:34		
1:46		12:19		
1:58		14:11		
1:66		15:11		
1:76	I Corinthians	3:20		
2:9		7:17		
2:15		14:21		
2:22	II Corinthians	6:17		
2:23		6:18		
2:24	I Timothy	6:15		
2:26	II Timothy	2:19		
2:39		2:19		
4:18	Hebrews	7:21		
4:19		8:2		

## Appendix C continued

Kúptos affixed to

Matthew	4:7
	4:10
	22:37
Mark	12:29
	12:30
Luke	1:16
	1:32
	1:68
	4:8
	10:27
	20:37
Acts	2:39
	3:22
Revelation	1:8
	4:8
	4:11
	11:17
	15:3
	16:7
	18:8
	19:6
	21:22
	22:5
	22:6

# APPENDIX D

**Κύριος** applied to Jesus without use of name or further title

Matthew 3:3	Luke 11:1	John 13:36
8:2	11:39	13:37
8:6	12:41	14:5
8:8	12:42	14:8
8:21	13:15	14:22
8:25	17:5	20:2
9:28	17:6	20:13
14:28	17:37	20:15
14:30	18:6	20:18
15:22	18:41	20:20
15:25	19:8	20:25
15:27	19:8	20:28
16:22	19:34	21:7
17:4	22:33	21:7
17:15	22:38	21:12
18:21	22:49	21:15
20:30	22:61	21:16
20:31	22:61	21:17
20:33	24:34	21:20
22:43	John 4:1	21:21
22:44	4:11	Acts 1:6
22:45	4:15	2:25
26:22	4:19	2:47
Mark 7:28	8:49	4:29
10:51 not	5:17	5:14
in all Mss.	6:23	7:59
12:37	6:34	7:60
Luke 1:43	6:68	8:25
5:8	(8:11)	9:1
5:12	9:36	9:5
6:46	9:38	9:10
7:6	11:2	9:10
7:13	11:3	9:11
7:19	11:12	9:13
9:54	11:21	9:15
9:59	11:27	9:27
9:61	11:32	9:29
10:1	11:34	9:31
10:17	11:39	9:35
10:39	13:6	9:42
10:40	13:9	10:4
10:41	13:25	11:8

## Appendix D continued

Acts	11:16	Romans	16:13	II Corinthians	5:6
	11:21		16:22		5:8
	11:21	I Corinthians	1:31		5:11
	11:24		2:8		8:5
	12:7		2:16		8:19
	12:11		3:5		8:21
	12:17		4:4		10:8
	12:36		4:5		10:17
	13:2		4:17		10:18
	13:10		4:19		11:17
	13:11		6:13		12:1
	13:12		6:13		12:8
	13:44 not		6:17		13:10
	in all Mss.		7:10	Galatians	1:19
	13:49		7:12		5:10
	14:3		7:22	Ephesians	2:21
	14:23		7:22		4:1
	15:35		7:25		4:17
	15:36		7:25		5:8
	15:40		7:32		5:10
	16:32		7:32		5:17
	18:8		7:34		5:19
	18:9		7:35		6:1
	18:25		7:39		6:4
	19:10		9:2		6:7
	19:20		9:5		6:8
	20:19		9:14		6:10
	20:28		10:21		6:21
	21:14		10:21	Philippians	1:14
	22:8		10:22		2:24
	22:10		11:11		2:29
	22:10		11:23		3:1
	22:19		11:26		4:1
	23:11		11:27		4:2
	26:15		11:27		4:4
	26:15		11:32		4:5
Romans	10:12		12:5		4:10
	12:11		14:37	Colossians	1:10
	14:6		15:58		3:13
	14:6		15:58		3:18
	14:6		16:7		3:20
	14:8		16:10		3:22
	14:8		16:19		3:23
	14:8		16:22		3:24
	16:2	II Corinthians	2:12		4:7
	16:8		3:16		4:17
	16:11		3:17	I Thessalonians	1:6
	16:12		3:18		1:8
	16:12		3:18		3:8

## Appendix D continued

I Thessalonians	3:12	II Peter	3:8
	4:6		3:9
	4:15		3:10
	4:15	Revelation	11:8
	4:16		14:13
	4:17		
	5:2		
	5:12		
	5:27		
II Thessalonians	1:9		
	2:2		
	2:13		
	3:1		
	3:3		
	3:4		
	3:5		
	3:16		
	3:16		
II Timothy	1:16		
	1:18		
	2:7		
	2:14		
	2:22		
	3:11		
	4:8		
	4:14		
	4:17		
	4:18		
	4:22		
Philemon	16		
	20		
Hebrews	1:10		
	2:3		
	7:14		
James	1:7		
	3:9		
	4:10		
	4:15		
	5:7		
	5:8		
	5:11		
	5:11		
	5:14		
	5:15		
I Peter	2:3		
	2:13		
II Peter	2:9		
	2:11		



## APPENDIX E

### *Kúptos* used with Jesus Christ

Acts	11:17
	15:26
	20:21
	28:31
Romans	1:7
	15:6
I Corinthians	1:3
	6:11
	16:23
II Corinthians	11:31
	13:14
Ephesians	1:2
	6:23
Philippians	3:20
	4:23
I Thessalonians	1:1
II Thessalonians	1:1
	1:2
	1:12
Philemon	3
James	1:1
II Peter	2:20
	3:2
	3:15

## APPENDIX F

### *Kýrios* applied to Jesus or our Lord Jesus

Mark	6:19
Luke	24:3
Acts	1:21
	4:33
	7:59
	8:16
	9:17
	11:20
	15:11
	16:31
	19:5
	19:13
	19:17
	20:24
	20:35
	21:13
Romans	14:14
I Corinthians	5:4
	5:4
	5:5
	9:11
	11:23
II Corinthians	4:14
Ephesians	1:15
Philippians	2:19
Colossians	3:17
I Thessalonians	2:15
	2:19
	3:11
	3:13
	4:1
	4:2
II Thessalonians	1:7
	1:8
	1:12
	2:8
Philemon	5
Hebrews	13:20
II Peter	1:2
Revelation	22:20
	22:21

# APPENDIX G

**Κύριος** used in the phrases, Jesus Christ our Lord, Christ Jesus our Lord, Our Lord Jesus Christ

Romans	1:4 5:1 5:11 5:21 6:23 7:25 8:39 13:14 15:30 16:20	II Thessalonians	3:6 3:12 3:18
I Corinthians	1:2 1:7 1:8 1:9 1:10 15:31 15:57	I Timothy	1:2 1:12 1:14 6:3 6:14
II Corinthians	1:2 1:3 1:14 8:9	II Timothy	1:2
Galatians	1:3 6:14 6:18	Philemon	25
Ephesians	1:3 1:17 3:11 5:20 6:14	James	2:1
Philippians	1:2 3:8	I Peter	1:3
Colossians	1:3 2:6	II Peter	1:8 1:11 1:14 1:6 3:18
I Thessalonians	1:3 5:9 5:23 5:28	Jude	4 17 21 25
II Thessalonians	2:1 2:14 2:16		

## APPENDIX H

**Κύριος** applied to Jesus as owner, ruler, etc.

Matthew	10:25
	12:8
	28:6
Mark	1:3
	2:28
Luke	2:11
	6:5
Acts	10:36
Romans	4:24
	10:9
	10:12
	10:13
I Corinthians	7:22
	8:6
	10:26
	12:3
II Corinthians	4:5
Ephesians	4:5
Philippians	2:11
II Timothy	1:8
	2:24
James	2:1
	5:4
I Peter	3:15
Revelation	19:16

## APPENDIX I

**κύριος** probably applied to Christ

Matthew	3:3
Mark	1:3
	16:20
Luke	3:4
	10:2
John	1:23
Acts	8:22
	8:24
	12:24
	16:14
	16:15
Ephesians	6:9
Colossians	4:1
Hebrews	8:2

## APPENDIX J

**κύριος** used in an uncertain application

I Corinthians	1:4	II Thessalonians	1:2
	1:9		1:12
	6:14		3:5
	8:6	I Timothy	1:2
	10:9	II Timothy	1:2
II Corinthians	1:3	Philemon	3
	8:5	I Peter	1:3
	11:31		1:25
Galatians	1:3	II Peter	1:2
Ephesians	1:2	Revelation	7:14
	1:3		11:4
	5:20	Acts	1:24
Philippians	1:2		2:21
	2:11		8:26
Colossians	1:3		8:39
I Thessalonians	1:1		20:32
	1:3	Romans	4:8
	3:11		
	3:13		
	5:23		
II Thessalonians	1:1		