

**The view of EW Kenyon of the Word of Faith Movement on the person of Christ:  
A Dogmatic Study**

**Rev. A.G. Heathcote B.S., M.Div.**

**Mini-dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree Master  
of Theology at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University**

**Supervisor: Prof. C.F.C. Coetzee**

**November 2011**

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The first person to be thanked is the Lord. He is the one who saved me from sin and has since changed my life and desires. If it were not for His gracious intervention in my life, I would not have even desired to start this project. Looking back, I know that only He could have kept me going through what turned out to be a marathon. Thank you Lord.

Secondly, my wife Deanna is to be thanked for her continual encouragement and the hours she spent listening to the things I had discovered and learned during the research. She is also to be thanked for holding back on many “honey-do’s” around the house, but whose turn has now come. If I thought this document was hard work.... My two sons have also had to sacrifice much while their father set to this task. Ryan and Erik, may you not be frightened away from academia and may you both go way beyond your father in your studies.

Professor Callie Coetzee is also to be thanked. During a visit to his office, we had a discussion on a subject that had nothing to do with the research direction then. A remark he made at the end of the dialogue, “this has to be written up”, set me off in a totally new direction and gave me permission to research a subject I did not even think fell within the realm of academic research. This work is the result. Thanks are also due for his patience in converting me from employing an American method of research to the European one reflected in this document. It was a steep learning curve but he helped me climb the mountain. Many thanks.

Professor David Levey is to be thanked for his painstaking work in editing my English in order to bring it to an acceptable level for submission. Thank you also to Professors Kevin & Martie Mearns who translated my Abstract into Afrikaans. Baie Dankie.

There are many people who prayed for and supported me during the course of this study. The bulk of these folk are in America, but mention must also be made of Kanana Baptist Church and Benoni Bible Church here in South Africa who faithfully stood by me.

Finally, but not least, is a larger group: the various professors and administrators at North West University who were so gracious to me at so many key points; my pastoral colleagues, and co-facilitators at the Church Ministries Institute of Gauteng; and, the CMIG students in my classes – thank you all very much.

4<sup>th</sup> November 2011.

## **ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the Christology of E.W Kenyon, the forefather of the Word Faith Movement (WFM). His theological system forms the foundation of the WFM's doctrine as promoted by its many pastors and leaders all over the world. The Bible is the point of departure for this work: therefore a representative Reformed understanding of the Scriptures is established in order to conduct a Biblical evaluation of Kenyon's Christology.

Kenyon did not document his beliefs in a systematic manner. Therefore, in chapter two, selected volumes of his writings were minutely examined and organised in order to arrive at a representative statement of his Christology.

Chapter 3 is a summary statement of Christology from a Reformed perspective. The writers scrutinised are of a more recent era in order to increase the likelihood of their responding to Kenyon's theological construct, which dates from the first half of the twentieth century. Scriptural backing for all points of view is noted so as to build a Biblical basis for the representative Reformed definition.

In chapter 4 the problematic areas of Kenyon's Christology are assessed. The statements from chapters two and three are compared and Kenyon's Christology is critically evaluated from a Biblical standpoint in order to arrive at a statement of conclusion.

Chapter 5 is a concluding statement. It also gives recommendations for future study. There is considerable scope for an ongoing investigation of Kenyon's theology.

## **OPSOMMING**

Die studie ondersoek die Christologie van E.W Kenyon, die stigter van die Woord van Geloofbeweging (WGB). Sy teologiese stelsel dien as die fondasie van die WGB doktriene en word deur verskeie pastore en geloofsleiers wêreldwyd voorgestaan. Die Bybel is die vertrekpunt van hierdie studie: 'n verteenwoordigende Gereformeerde begrip van die Skrif is bewerkstellig ten einde 'n Bybelse evaluasie van Kenyon's se Christologie te kan maak.

Kenyon het nie sy geloofsoortuiging op 'n sistematiese wyse opgeskryf nie. Daarom ondersoek hoofstuk twee geselekteerde volumes van sy skrywe noukeurig, en kom tot 'n verteenwoordigende stelling van sy Christologie.

Hoofstuk drie is 'n opsommende stelling van 'n Gereformeerde Christologiese standpunt. Meer onlangse skrywers, wat uit die eerste helfde van die twintigste eeu dateer, is ondersoek om die moontlikhede te verbeter dat hulle wel Kenyon se konstruksie aanspreek. Skriftuurlike ondersteuning vir al die standpunte is genoteer om 'n Bybelse basis vir die verteenwoordigende Gereformeerde definisie te bied.

Die problematiese gebiede van Kenyon se Christologie word in Hoofstuk vier aangespreek. Die stellings wat in Hoofstuk twee en drie gemaak is word vergelykend met Kenyon se Christologie geassesseer en krities vanuit 'n Bybelse standpunt geëvalueer om 'n gevolgtrekking te kan maak.

Hoofstuk vyf kom tot 'n slotsom en maak aanbevelings vir toekomstige studies. Aansienlike ruimte bestaan vir voortdurende ondersoek van Kenyon se teologie

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

WFM = Word of Faith Movement, or Word-Faith Movement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Opsomming .....	iv
Abbreviations.....	v
Table of Contents .....	vi
<b>1 CHAPTER 1: ACCOUNT OF STUDY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Formulating The Problem .....	1
1.1.1 Background.....	1
1.1.2 Problem Statement.....	2
1.1.3 Central Research Question .....	5
1.2 Aims & Objectives .....	5
1.2.1 Aim.....	5
1.2.2 Objectives .....	5
1.3 Central Theoretical Argument.....	6
1.4 Methodology .....	6
<b>2 CHAPTER 2: THE WFM CHRISTOLOGY OF E.W. KENYON .....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 The Word Faith Movement .....	7
2.2 Introduction .....	7
2.3 Background and Spiritual Influences .....	8
2.4 Underlying Features of Kenyon's Dogma .....	10
2.5 Kenyon's Christology .....	12
2.5.1 The Deity of Christ .....	12
2.5.1.1 His Pre-existence.....	12
2.5.1.2 His Divinity .....	13
2.5.2 The Humanity of Christ .....	15
2.5.2.1 The Reasons for the Incarnation.....	15
2.5.2.2 The Virgin Birth .....	16
2.5.2.3 The Nature of His Humanity.....	17
2.5.3 The Union of the Deity and Humanity of Christ .....	18
2.5.4 The Kenosis of Christ .....	19
2.5.5 The Impeccability of Christ .....	20
2.5.6 The Earthly Life of Christ .....	22
2.5.6.1 The Events of His Life.....	22
2.5.6.2 The Offices He Occupied.....	23
2.5.7 The Crucifixion.....	24
2.5.7.1 Jesus Died Spiritually.....	24
2.5.7.2 Punishment and Re-creation in Hell .....	26
2.5.8 From the Resurrection to the Ascension .....	28
2.5.8.1 The Resurrection .....	28
2.5.8.2 The Presentation of His Blood in the Holy of Holies. ....	29
2.5.8.3 The Announcement in Paradise.....	30
2.5.8.4 The Work is Finished .....	30
2.5.8.5 The Implications of the Resurrection .....	31
2.5.9 The Present Ministry of Christ .....	32
2.5.10 The Future Ministry of Christ .....	33

2.6	Problem Areas.....	34
3	CHAPTER 3: A REFORMED STATEMENT OF CHRISTOLOGY .....	35
3.1	Introduction.....	35
3.2	A Statement of Reformed Christology .....	36
3.2.1	The Deity of Christ .....	36
3.2.1.1	His Pre-existence.....	36
3.2.1.2	His Divinity .....	37
3.2.2	The Humanity of Christ.....	41
3.2.2.1	The Reasons for the Incarnation.....	41
3.2.2.2	The Virgin Birth .....	43
3.2.2.3	The Nature of His Humanity.....	43
3.2.3	The Union of Deity and Humanity of Christ .....	44
3.2.4	The Kenosis of Christ .....	45
3.2.5	The Impeccability of Christ .....	46
3.2.6	The Earthly Life of Christ .....	47
3.2.6.1	The Events of His Life.....	47
3.2.6.2	The Offices He Occupied.....	47
3.2.7	The Crucifixion.....	48
3.2.7.1	Events between the Cross and the Resurrection.....	51
3.2.8	From the Resurrection to the Ascension .....	53
3.2.8.1	The Resurrection .....	53
3.2.8.2	The Presentation of His Blood in the Holy of Holies. ....	56
3.2.8.3	The Announcement in Paradise.....	56
3.2.8.4	The Implications of the Resurrection .....	57
3.2.8.5	The Ascension .....	59
3.2.9	The Present Ministry of Christ .....	60
3.2.10	The Future Ministry of Christ .....	61
3.3	Conclusion.....	62
4	CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION.....	63
4.1	Introduction.....	63
4.2	Kenyon versus Reformed Theology: an Evaluation.....	63
4.2.1	The Faulty Foundations of Kenyon's Dogma.....	63
4.2.1.1	The Nature of Sin.....	63
4.2.1.2	The Nature of Man .....	65
4.2.1.3	Imputation .....	67
4.2.1.4	Substitution .....	68
4.2.1.5	Propitiation .....	70
4.2.1.6	Satan.....	72
4.2.2	Christological Problems .....	73
4.2.2.1	Christ's Representation of Man.....	73
4.2.2.2	The Deity of Christ (Immutability).....	75
4.2.2.3	The Substitution .....	77
4.2.2.4	The Place and Timing of Christ's Payment for Sin.....	79
4.2.2.5	The Blood of Jesus .....	80
4.2.2.6	The Salvation of Christ.....	83
4.2.2.7	The Authority of Satan .....	84
4.2.2.8	The Return of Christ.....	86
4.3	Conclusion.....	86
5	CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	88
5.1	Conclusions .....	89
5.2	Recommendations for Future Study .....	92
5.3	Bibliography .....	94

# **1 CHAPTER 1: ACCOUNT OF STUDY**

Keywords: Neo-Pentecostal, Charismatic, Word of Faith Movement, Christology.

Sleutelwoorde: Neo-Pinkster, Charismatiese, Woord van Geloof Beweging, Christologie.

## **1.1 Formulating The Problem**

### **1.1.1 Background**

The Word of Faith Movement (WFM) has become arguably the most vocal segment of Christianity in the last decades (cf. MacGregor, 2007b:53). The media reporters increasingly seek the opinion of their pastors when they want a comment from a church on an item in the news. For example, Pastor Ron Steele of Rhema Bible Church, Randburg, was frequently heard on 702 Talk Radio, Johannesburg, during the late 1990s and early 2000s. When a matter was particularly important, their senior Pastor, Ray McCauley, was called on to comment. A simple check of the TV guide will reveal that the majority of so called Christian programmes stem from the WFM (cf. MacGregor 2007b:53-54). Since they tend to build mega-churches (e.g., Rhema Bible Church or Christian Family Church), which in turn start many other congregations, they have a rapidly expanding footprint. As a result, an astounding number of people have either visited or attended one of their churches or are currently attending one. It almost appears that their adherents are ubiquitous. Therefore, as the movement spreads its reach, so its distinctive doctrines become more widespread.

Starting in 1979 and extending to the present, this writer had regular contacts with people who promote the doctrines of the WFM. Differences were noted between a more orthodox body of belief and that of the WFM. This resulted first in a curiosity, and now in the motivation to conduct a more extensive investigation of one area, the Christology of the WFM, and within that field, the Christology of the “foundation” (Boa & Kruidenier, 2000:324), the “grandfather” (Boyd, 2003:200; Atkinson, 2007:169; cf. Hollinger, 1988:142-143) of the movement, E.W. Kenyon.

### 1.1.2 Problem Statement

Much has been written about the WFM in popular-type sources. A simple search on the internet will reveal copious amounts of this non-academic material. However, not much has been written in academic journals (MacGregor, 2007a:87) and that which does exist, focuses on specific issues, two in particular: healing (e.g. Boyd, 2003:189-206; and Moo, 1988:191-209), and prosperity (e.g. Jones, 1998:79-85; Kaiser, 1988:158-171; and, Liroy, 2007:41-64). One article deals with both issues, adds a third focus area, positive confession, and also gives a brief history of the WFM along with an introduction to its major personalities, including E.W. Kenyon (Hollinger, 1988:131-149). While explaining several erroneous views on the Saviour's blood, Bigalke Jr. (2009:36-58) briefly demonstrates that E.W. Kenyon holds a mystical view with regard to the blood of Christ. He also identifies Kenyon as one who was "greatly opposed to evangelical" doctrines, but does not develop that statement further. Mentioned often are the excesses of the movement, including the so called "Toronto Blessing" (e.g. Easton, 1999:23-39). Certain of the foundational beliefs of the WFM are explained and evaluated by MacGregor (2007b:53-71). In fact, his article would provide some useful background for this study. However, the Christology of the WFM receives only a passing reference. In an article about the Brownsville Revival, Spencer writes a one paragraph analysis of some of the problems with the Christology of the WFM, which is useful, albeit brief (Spencer, 1999:1-14). One more recent article has examined Christ's taking on a sinful, satanic nature while dead (Atkinson, 2007:169-184). Atkinson focuses on this specific doctrine in the teachings of Hagin, Copeland and Kenyon. He summarises his response to this WFM doctrine and then discusses its original source before it was adapted and redeveloped by Kenyon. MacGregor (1997a:87-102) holds a different view on the background and proposes that the WFM was influenced by the Nation of Islam and Mormonism. Despite the Atkinson article, the situation as it stands is that the systematic theology of the WFM has received treatment only in those aspects which overlap with the aforementioned focus areas. This means that the Christology of the WFM, barring the satanic-nature doctrine, has largely escaped dedicated systematic examination.

Most of the focus within dissertations and theses has fallen on the Pentecostal movement, consequently, this whole field of study remains almost completely untouched. However, Gittens (1990) investigated the ideas that influenced Kenyon's thought, his hermeneutic, and its subsequent influence on his disciples. His broad study concludes that the divergences in their doctrine place them outside of orthodoxy.

In the realm of books, a brief treatment of the movement is found in an appendix in Martin (1997: originally 1965).<sup>1</sup> Bowman Jr., (2001) and Perriman (2003) are examples of authors who focus on health, prosperity and faith. Bowman defends Pentecostalism, fearing that if the WFM fails, so too will Pentecostalism. Simmons (1997) theorised that Kenyon's thought was dependent on two sources, New Thought and Higher Christian Life. A recent work by Jones and Woodbridge (2011) also demonstrates the WFM's roots lie in New Thought. However their greater contribution is to give a theological evaluation of its prosperity teachings before explaining the Bible's teachings on suffering, wealth, poverty, stewardship and giving. Two other notable but slightly dated works must also be mentioned: McConnell (1995), writing from a Charismatic perspective, distinguishes the WFM from the Charismatic Movement, since, he suggests, so many erroneously think that the former stems from the latter. Also, from the perspective of exposing cultic heresy, Hanegraaff (1993) includes a section on the Christological heresies of the WFM.

One distinctive feature of the WFM is that its proponents, although prolific writers, have not written a systematic theology. Boyd (2003:199) suggests that the reason lies in its motion, impulsiveness, disorganisation, and numerous sources of teaching. Ultimately, it is an anti-intellectual grouping which does not encourage the presence of theologians. Another reason for the lack of a written systematic theology may be found in its root-level reaction to modernism (e.g., Kenyon, 1998:11), the scientific approach to life. This means that its theology has to be pieced together from a variety of sources, many of them popular. There is therefore room for the systematic statement of their theology in order that their beliefs might be understood and countered.

MacGregor (2007b:55-56) gives some insight into why they have not written a systematic theology by comparing the WFM with the Mormons, the Church of Jesus Christ and Latter Day Saints. He suggests that its public message "never explicitly presents its *sine qua non* doctrine of eternal progression" that one must become a god, "have spirit-children" and "eternally rule over our own worlds", as that would scare-off prospective proselytes. Instead, one "assimilates over time" the doctrines that back up beliefs one has come to love. He then compares this with the WFM TV shows and churches which promote "the prosperity message" with just a touch of doctrine, which the listener ignores. Then later, when they love the effect, they start listening for the doctrines and slowly they come to "apprehend the overall theological fabric". Understanding it, they would then not disbelieve as they would want to keep the benefits. His conclusion is the clincher: "From this point forward, the person is on a path leading to divorce from biblical

---

<sup>1</sup> Distinction should be drawn between the 1997 update of previous editions by Hank Hanegraaff, and the 2003 edition updated by Ravi Zacharias. The latter does not include anything on the WFM, and no word of explanation for this major omission has been found.

Christianity and initiation into a new religion devoid of salvific power”. This explains both why it is so difficult to find the systematic statement of their doctrine, and why it is so important that it be understood.

The multi-faceted character of this movement, so ably pointed out by Boyd (2003:199), also means that any older evaluation tends to have been dismissed by WFM proponents as being inaccurate or incomplete. For example, Hanegraaff and McConnell's works were answered and dismissed by Vreeland (2001) and Lie (2003) who also respond to Simmons. McConnell is also answered by Lie (2000:85-114), who denies that Kenyon held the positions exactly as McConnell claimed. There is therefore a need for a more up to date examination, and where necessary, a response.

Previous studies, as mentioned above (e.g. Boyd, 2003:189-206; Moo, 1988:191-209; Jones, 1998:79-85; Kaiser, 1988:158-171; Lioy, 2007:41-64; and Hollinger, 1988:131-149), have evaluated specific teachings of the WFM, for example, prosperity, healing or positive confession. This study will not focus only on that which is different or problematic, but will examine, and subsequently evaluate, a whole sector of their systematic theology, that is, Christology. Inside that large focus area, it will collate and focus on the Christology of the “grandfather” of the WFM, E.W. Kenyon. The two men, Kenneth E. Hagin and Kenneth Copeland, who are acknowledged as the original leaders of the movement, were not however the originators of its theology. Its theology stems from Kenyon (Boyd, 2003:200). This fact is verified by McConnell (1995:4-11) who specifies the plagiarism of Kenyon by Hagin. The foundational role of Kenyon is also confirmed by Park in an article on a later WFM leader, David Yonggi Cho (Park, 2003:123-125). Perhaps the loudest statement of Kenyon's key role is the fact that his books are still being published and reprinted over 50 years after his death in 1948 (cf. Bibliography). Therefore, this study excludes all who came later and examines the Christology of the foundational thinker of the WFM, E.W. Kenyon. This leaves open future study into how his thought was developed and adapted by those who followed him.

The study of Christology is always important in the defence of the faith. It has been said many times that each generation must take ownership of the body of doctrine that constitutes the Faith. They need not only understand it, but also to explain and communicate it to their generation so that the truth is proclaimed and errant teachings are identified. We must answer the questions of our generation, especially those questions that have not been asked before. Some questions will essentially be re-statements of matters, which earlier generations have already answered. The ongoing task of systematic theology is that each generation of theologians speaks to contemporary society the essential truths of Christianity. This is especially true of Christology. It is a non-negotiable doctrine in Christianity – if one's doctrine of

Christ is errant, one is in danger of being eternally wrong – as MacGregor (2007b:55-56) so clearly stated, as mentioned above.

### **1.1.3 Central Research Question**

Is the view of E.W. Kenyon of the Word of Faith Movement regarding the person of Christ in accordance with a Reformed understanding of the Scripture?

The specific questions that will be addressed are the following:

- How did E.W. Kenyon state his Christology?
- How do the Reformed state their Christology?
- In the light of Reformed theology, how should one evaluate the WFM Christology of E.W. Kenyon?

## **1.2 Aims & Objectives**

### **1.2.1 Aim**

The aim of this study is to critically evaluate the Christology of the WFM's E.W. Kenyon from a Reformed theological perspective.

### **1.2.2 Objectives**

The specific objectives of this study are:

- 1 Examine the literature of the foundational WFM proponent and demonstrate his doctrinal beliefs as regards the person of Christ.
- 2 Outline a representative Reformed systematisation of Christology.
- 3 Evaluate the WFM Christology from a Reformed viewpoint.

### 1.3 Central Theoretical Argument

The Christology of the Word of Faith Movement's E.W. Kenyon is scripturally unsound according to a Reformed understanding of the Scripture.

### 1.4 Methodology

This dogmatic study is conducted from within the Reformed tradition.

1. The following works of Kenyon will be studied to determine his Christology. A literature study will be carried out on the books by E.W. Kenyon: *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne* (1998), *The Bible in the Light of our Redemption: Basic Bible Course* (1999) and, *Advanced Bible Course: Studies in the Deeper Life* (2004) and other web-based material.
2. For the study of Reformed Christology, the following literature from two contemporary proponents will be studied: *Foundations of the Christian Faith: a Comprehensive and Readable Theology* (Boice, 1986) and, *A New Systematic Theology of the Christian Faith* (Reymond, 1998). Since this author holds a dispensational perspective within Reformed theology, the literature of a current leader of that standpoint will also be studied: *Basic Theology: a Popular Systematic Guide to Understanding Biblical Truth* (Ryrie 1999).
3. The evaluation of WFM Christology from a Reformed perspective will involve works from the previous two chapters. Various other sources cited in the problem statement will be used to add further insight where they offer unique contributions.

## 2 CHAPTER 2: THE WFM CHRISTOLOGY OF E.W. KENYON

### 2.1 The Word Faith Movement

As previously noted, the fathers of the WFM were Kenneth E. Hagin and Kenneth Copeland, but its theology largely stemmed from E.W. Kenyon, who is termed the “grandfather” of the movement (Boyd, 2003:200; Atkinson, 2007:169). Differing slightly in terminology are Jones and Woodbridge (2011:51) who call Kenyon “father” of the prosperity gospel, which they say was the immediate predecessor of the WFM. They give the status of “father” of the WFM to only one man, Kenneth E. Hagin (2011:54). The WFM emerged from the Charismatic movement in the “early 1970s”. Hagin’s Rhema Bible Training Centre in Tulsa, Oklahoma (which has branches in South Africa and Australia), was the seedbed for the dispersion of WFM doctrine into churches (Barron, 1990). The WFM teaches that health and prosperity are God’s will and these are realised through positive confession (Anon., 2001) – “a positive statement of confident faith”. Some of the more “extreme” proponents also hold to the inherent power of spoken words, God being subject to rules of faith, the concept that believers become like God, and the doctrine of Jesus’ spiritual death on the cross before his rebirth in hell (Barron, 1990). Well known WFM names are Frederick Price, Charles Capps, Marilyn Hickey, Lester Sumrall, Bob Tilton (Anon., 2001), Creflo Dollar, Benny Hinn, Joel Osteen, Joyce Meyer, T.D. Jakes (Anon, 2007), and here in South Africa, Ray McCauley and Theo Wolmarans.

### 2.2 Introduction

A systematic theology by definition arranges material in an ordered manner. One reason for that order is that the theologian **wants** his readers to understand what he believes. This was not the case with E.W. Kenyon. Kenyon was not writing a systematic theology but was attempting to teach his disciples how to get the most out of their Christian life – how to claim that which was theirs due to their new nature (Kenyon, 2004:41-54). Therefore, the challenge for this study was to gather the little pieces of theology which were scattered throughout his volumes. As the pieces were sorted into categories, a picture of his Christology began to emerge. This chapter sets out that picture.

Prior to that however, his life is summarised, giving insight into his spiritual background and the influences that helped to shape his thinking. This is followed by a summary of certain distinctive

aspects of his theology and thought which most readers would not know or understand and are essential background to his Christology, and the impact on his beliefs.

Since no other theological structure existed in Kenyon, a generally chronological approach has been followed as far as the Christology is concerned. It begins in heaven with His deity and pre-existence, followed by the matters relating to His taking on humanity, which naturally leads to the Kenosis and His impeccability. Subsequently, Kenyon's Christological beliefs are laid out in the order of Jesus' earthly life, before the post Incarnation sections are explained. Finally, the problematic areas, when looking at this system from a Reformed point of view, are listed in preparation for chapter three.

### **2.3 Background and Spiritual Influences**

Essek William Kenyon was born in Hadley, New York in April 1867 and died in 1948 (Anon, n.d. c). His family was poor and he was not well educated (Anon, n.d. d), the latter becoming a reason for both his mental drift when he encountered thinking to which he had not been previously exposed, and also his desire to see others enjoy education, which he had never received. His spiritual background during his late teens and early twenties was Methodist (Anon, n.d. c). After his conversion at the age of 17, he began to "enthusiastically win souls". Although he was interested in becoming an educator, he lacked the knowledge of the foundational doctrines of the Christian life. He then became "infected" with "doubt" and drifted away from the Lord. Later he would lament not having "received the Holy Spirit" during this phase of his life (Anon, n.d. d). 1892 witnessed him pursuing acting at the Emerson School of Oratory in Boston (Anon, n.d. c). Those who suggest Kenyon's later system of doctrine was influenced by "the metaphysical cults" believe that he had been exposed to them while at Emerson (Anon, n.d. a; cf. McConnell, 1988). Hollinger (1988:144) identified the following emphases of "New Thought metaphysics": "the immanence of God, the primacy of the mind as a cause of all effects, freedom from disease and poverty, the divine nature of humans, and the role of incorrect thinking in all sin and disease".

Around this time Kenyon met Evva Spurling, "a divorcee nine years his senior" (Anon, n.d. a). When they were married in May 1893, they both claimed to be "agnostic". However, it was not long before they began attending Clarendon Street Church, Boston, and "became Christians" (Anon, n.d. c). The pastor of the church was A.J. Gordon (Anon, n.d. b), a man who believed that the believer must "receive the Holy Spirit" by a conscious decision of the will, in the same manner in which he accepted Christ (Gordon, 1894:68). Just months thereafter, Kenyon was ordained by the Free Will Baptists (Anon, n.d. d). Enns (1989:489) observes that the Free Will

Baptists (and Charismatics) are Arminian in doctrine – a tendency that would be evident in Kenyon’s thought. Over the next few years, he pastored a number of Free Will Baptist churches in New England. Thereafter, he left the Baptists and started an independent work so that he could emulate his hero, George Muller, and trust the Lord “completely” for his income. Around the turn of the century, he opened Bethel Bible Institute in order to solve a problem for others that he had experienced early in his Christian life – poor “grounding” in the Word. Students did not pay any fees, nor did members of the faculty receive any pay, as it was “a faith work” (Anon, n.d. d). The Institute moved and changed several times before it eventually merged with Gordon College. In 1914, Evva died. Kenyon later married Alice M. Whitney, who subsequently gave birth to a son and a daughter (Anon, n.d. c). In 1923, Kenyon resigned from Bethel in the middle of a “swirl of controversy” (Hollinger, 1988: 143), as he was “the overseer” of a “suicide” (Anon, n.d. a).

In 1924, the Kenyons moved to Oakland, California. Despite his lack of theological education, he accorded himself a doctorate – he was now known as “Dr. E.W. Kenyon of Massachusetts” (Anon, n.d. a). Later, he began a radio broadcast while living and pastoring in Los Angeles, CA (Anon, n.d. d). Despite not being a Pentecostal, he approached the Assemblies of God requesting that they ordain him in about 1925, but was turned down (Lie, 2008:1). At the peak of his “popularity” in 1930, his wife left him, accusing him of numerous affairs. Kenyon then “fled” to Seattle where he closed his life as both an “evangelist” and productive author (Anon, n.d. a). During this time, he continued his radio ministry in Seattle (Anon, n.d. d). He died of a “malignant tumor in his back” in 1948. He did not die in a “mystical and disease-free way” as claimed by some WFM proponents (Anon, n.d. a).

There is one other influence in Kenyon’s early background that contributed to his ultimate theological construct. Lie (2008:1-2) suggests Kenyon was exposed to dispensational thought from the Plymouth Brethren, especially during his early ministry. He further claims that Kenyon later “rejected” this influence, but agrees it never fully left his thinking. He further suggests that “remnants” of this system were present in Kenyon’s books even though they disagreed with his “overall teachings”. The article further specifies the Dispensational influence and cites examples of its influence in Kenyon’s writings (Lie, 2008: 2-17). Perhaps Lie’s most compelling proposition is that Kenyon “attempted to make himself and his teachings somewhat unique”, and even that he was “eclectic” (2008:12). However, it must be remembered that Lie is an advocate of Kenyon.

## 2.4 Underlying Features of Kenyon's Dogma

A systematic theology will contain a certain amount of overlap between its sections. This is because, for the sake of clarity and understanding, a finite mind attempting to organise the revelation of the Infinite God is a task that is simply too great for a relatively small mind to effectively organise. However, to the best of their God-given ability, theologians attempt to do so. Therefore, owing to the categories employed, overlaps cannot be avoided, for example, the Saviour in Soteriology is the Christ in Christology, a member of the Tri-unity,<sup>2</sup> who enters somewhat into anthropology in that He took on humanity in the Incarnation.

Therefore, as background to this study of the Christology of Kenyon, certain key elements of his overall systematic theology must be stated first as they influence his Christology and the rationale for some unique features thereof. Kenyon's writing style is unusual in that at times it appears that he is speaking to a person across the room from him. This was caused by the fact that he dictated his thoughts onto a tape-recorder which were later transcribed (Kenyon, 2004:98). For this reason, his percentage of re-statement and overlap with other sections is perhaps higher than among other authors. At times, he even disagrees with his own statements found elsewhere in the same volume. One therefore has to make a decision as to which is his actual belief and which is a misstatement. Generally, this author has followed the approach of taking the weight of statements as being the deciding factor.

There are two points of a general nature that help to understand Kenyon. Firstly, modernism was popular at the time that Kenyon wrote; consequently some of his concepts constitute a reaction to the tenets of modernism, which he viewed as being problematic (Kenyon, 1998:11). Secondly, the term "Word of Faith", used to describe the followers of Kenyon's doctrine and its derivative forms, derives from Kenyon's emphasis on acting on the Word, that is, as the Word becomes more a part of the believer, and he becomes more like its Author, the words of his mouth become more like the Word. His living demonstration of faith is therefore described as the "Faith-God's Word", or more popularly, the "Word of Faith" (Kenyon, 2004:208). While the version of the Bible that Kenyon most frequently used was the American Standard Version, he also quoted from others, for example, the Twentieth Century Version (Kenyon, 2004:225).

Certain aspects of Kenyon's theology have influenced his Christology. Adam had a "Universe-wide" legal "dominion" from God. His sin, performed in the "white light of absolute knowledge", was to turn over to Satan that rule (Kenyon, 1999:26). During His temptation, by not disputing

---

<sup>2</sup> This term is an attempt to show that God is a unity of three distinct and yet equal Persons. He is not one Person in three modes of expression. He is three distinct and equal Persons who are unified as one. The term Trinity tends to stress the threeness of the Godhead, while dismissing the unity therein. The term Tri-unity is an attempt to show both the threeness and the unity.

the right to offer the rule of all human realms, Christ recognised that Satan was indeed the holder of “authority and dominion” over the human race (Kenyon, 1999:27). The result of Adam’s original sin was that he was “born again of Satanic nature” (Kenyon, 1999:38), that is, he became a possessor of Satan’s nature (Kenyon, 1998:20). Consequently, being in union with Satan (Kenyon, 2004:187), he was governed by the devil (Kenyon, 1999:25). This is better understood when one discovers that Kenyon equates salvation with possessing the nature of God (Kenyon, 1998:14; 2004:165). By this he means an exchange of nature takes place at salvation; Satan’s nature is replaced by God’s so that the believer can stand in God’s presence (Kenyon, 2004:41). It is no surprise then to discover that the ransom for sin had to be paid to Satan (Kenyon, 2004:41, 152).

One point of anthropology that will affect the Christological study to follow is that the part of man that is born again is his spirit, not his body (Kenyon, 2004:181, 226). This becomes critical when Jesus is on the cross. In the presentation of Christ’s cross-work, this anthropological point will be more fully developed by showing its hamartiological roots and its substantial influence on the Christology of Kenyon. It is best to explain it once other facts have been established and a context has been furnished.

Finally, to a person outside the WFM there is apparent confusion in the following: “the Logos of God is a living thing”; “Jesus is the Logos”; “Jesus is the Word”; “the Word is called the Logos”; “the Logos is a living thing – not in the book, not on the written page, but in the lips of the believer” (Kenyon, 2004:9); “I knew that by looking into the Word and acting on it I brought Jesus on the scene instantly” (Kenyon, 2004:13); “Christ and the Word are one” (Kenyon, 2004:11); “the Word is God speaking to you” (Kenyon, 2004:9); “the Word prevailing in Jesus’ lips over the laws of nature”; and, “God honors the human language by calling Jesus the Word. The whole Universe was brought into being by words” (Kenyon, 2004:15). While it may appear confused and even circular at times, there is no confusion to a member of the WFM, due to the emphasis on the spoken word.

When God the Father speaks, He speaks the Word of God (Kenyon, 2004:53, 77-78). That Word, when spoken by Jesus, or a believer who is acting on it, becomes “manifested in the flesh” (Kenyon, 2004:16). It gives God the occasion to move in a situation (Kenyon, 2004:21). The spoken Word was later written down as the Word of God (Kenyon, 2004:20). Therefore, when Kenyon refers to Jesus Christ as the Word, he is rather referring to the Word of God on the lips of Jesus, being acted on by Jesus. An example of this is (Kenyon, 2004:80-81) “Psalm 107:20, ‘He sent His Word and healed them.’ That Word was Jesus. Then that Word was given to us by Revelation and we have it in the New Testament. That Word is in your heart and lips”. Finally, the Word is referred to as “living” not because He is speaking of Christ, but because of

its inherent power to work in a situation (Kenyon, 2004:13). The ministry of Jesus, and of present day believers, is to speak the Word of God and let it loose in everyday life so it can go to work (Kenyon, 2004:210).

The doctrines just mentioned form a crucial background to Kenyon's Christology. If they are not taken into account, the reader could simply miss what Kenyon was actually saying.

## **2.5 Kenyon's Christology**

### **2.5.1 The Deity of Christ**

#### **2.5.1.1 His Pre-existence**

There is not much mention of this doctrine in the writings under consideration. Based on the fact that he spends much time writing on nuances of his doctrine that are new or unique when compared with his earlier beliefs, the fact that he has not written much on this aspect or any other aspect of Christology means that in this work, it will be assumed there is no alarming deviation from the representative Reformed statement of faith. The few statements that were discovered with regard to Christ's pre-existence follow.

Firstly, consideration is given to his indirect statements regarding the pre-existence of Christ. These are: His being revealed as a man (Kenyon, 2004:133); His speaking of His residence, prior to the Incarnation, in Heaven, with God the Father (Kenyon, 1998:149; 1999:149); His remembering His glory before the creation (Kenyon, 2004:237; 1999:149); the eternity of Christ (Kenyon, 1998:26; 1999:149); the fact that He is the Son of God (Kenyon, 1998:37; 2004:237); His involvement in the creation of all things (Kenyon, 2004:78, 93, 133; 1999:13); and God's sending of His Son to earth (Kenyon, 2004:79).

Secondly, certain statements explicitly state that Jesus pre-existed: He had an existence before taking on humanity (Kenyon, 2004:237); He existed with the Father "through the ages" (Kenyon, 2004:239); the Incarnation "presupposes" He had an existence before it took place (Kenyon, 1999:148, 251); and, the Incarnation "proves" His prior existence (Kenyon, 1999:151).

It can therefore be concluded that Kenyon believed that Christ existed before His Incarnation, before the creation of all things, and at those times was resident in heaven sharing glory with the other Persons of the Tri-unity.

### 2.5.1.2 His Divinity

There is more evidence pointing to Kenyon's understanding of the deity of Christ, than there is of His pre-existence. The testimony to his view of the deity of Christ is not found in one place, but rather as a by-product of a number of the wide-ranging lessons in his books.

The first sample of data emanates from statements regarding the bigger picture of theology. Although there were glimpses of the "Trinity" in the Old Testament, it took the Incarnation of Jesus Christ to reveal that the "Trinity" consisted of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. They were also involved in the Creation (Kenyon, 1999:13). They are "Three Persons in the Godhead" (Kenyon, 1999:249). They are each equally "infinite" and "eternal" (Kenyon, 1999:250). There is another factor in Kenyon's understanding of the Godhead that requires an extended quote as his wording is very deliberate:

In an absolute Threeness each one is distinct from the other two; no one of the three could possibly be either of the other two; and no two of the three can exist without the third.

God is manifest as an absolute Threeness; yet, He is also an absolute Oneness. The Three are absolutely One. Each One is represented as God. That does not mean that each one is a part of God, but each one is God. Each one is the Whole of God. Personality is not divisible. God cannot be divided.

God is Three in One. Each One of the Three is God, and each One is the Whole of God.

The Three are represented as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; Three modes of Beings which God is. It is not primarily three ways in which God acts, but Three modes of Being. (Kenyon, 1999:249-250).

In the quote above (Kenyon, 1999:249), he identified the members of the "Godhead" as "Persons". Yet starting just a few paragraphs later (Kenyon, 1999:249-250) he explained a modalistic concept of God. It is only then that the preceding paragraphs reveal that their wording was deliberate. He has a modalistic understanding of the "personality" of God, that is, that the one God exists and has three distinct manifestations which are termed "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." These are not to be understood as three distinct Persons, but rather one who has three modes of expression. This appears to tie together his conception of Jesus, the Word and the Logos mentioned in Section 2.4 (cf. Kenyon, 2004:9-15) in which words become living things on the lips of believers or Christ and become empowered by God, as He reveals Himself in this different mode.

Christ existed for eternity on "equality" with God the Father (Kenyon, 1999:219). His actions and

very being were the same as God's (Kenyon, 1999:235). The salvation of mankind<sup>3</sup> required an Incarnation of deity (Kenyon, 1999:45, 145), by the God-man, who is "very man" and "very God" (Kenyon, 1999:102-103). Finally, Paul received unique revelation regarding Christ, but in that, he always saw deity residing in the humanity Christ put on (Kenyon, 1998:116).

The second grouping of lessons that points to Kenyon's view of the deity of Christ is found when he refers to Jesus being the Son of God. There are numerous direct statements that He is the Son (e.g., Kenyon, 1998:27, 37; 2004:32). He calls God His Father, and says He is the "only begotten Son" (Kenyon, 2004:100). Kenyon cites two examples of the Father expressing His pleasure that His Son does His will, i.e., Matthew 3:17 and Luke 9:35 (Kenyon, 2004:157). Direct revelation was given to Paul regarding what Jesus, whom he identifies as the Son, did for man (Kenyon, 2004:161). Jesus, the Eternal Son (Kenyon, 1999:188) of God, He who was equal with God, was the only one who could save mankind (Kenyon, 1999:180).

Thirdly, he mentions Jesus' own assertions that He is God. He and the Father are one (John 10:30), (Kenyon, 1999:249); anyone who has seen Jesus has seen the Father (John 12:45, 14:9); and, He has announced the Father (John 1:18), (Kenyon, 2004:110). He came to earth from the Father and is returning to Him, and is from "above" not below like his listeners, (Kenyon, 2004:141). He made two "I am" claims: "the light of the world" (John 8:12), and the "way", the "truth", the "life" (John 14:6), which are clear claims of deity (Kenyon, 2004:141-142).<sup>4</sup> He remembered His "glory" which He had enjoyed with the Father before the creation of the world (John 17:5) (Kenyon, 2004:237).

The fourth group of evidence derives from comments made about the works of Christ. The first surprising matter is that Kenyon says by the medium of miracles and physical healing Jesus was not attempting to make a statement about His deity (Kenyon, 1998:28; 2004:263). Rather he was meeting the physical needs of people (Kenyon, 1998:28), and demonstrating that His motivation was love. Ironically, Kenyon then undermined his point by suggesting that it had regard to His deity: "He healed the sick because He was Love, because He was God manifest in the flesh" (Kenyon, 2004:263).

In a discourse about the Trinity, Kenyon speaks of the large part Christ played in the creation (Kenyon, 1999:13). He then goes further and says in a paraphrase of John 1:1-4 that He created absolutely everything (Kenyon, 2004:133). The final work mentioned in the books which

---

<sup>3</sup> Whenever either "mankind" or "man" are used in this document, they are used in accordance with the historic theological usage and meaning i.e., the entire human race, apart from any considerations for ethnicity or gender.

<sup>4</sup> On these pages, rather than trying to prove the Deity of Christ, Kenyon was giving examples of Jesus' "confessions". This is why he only mentioned the two "I am's".

is evidence of Christ's deity is His sway over "the forces of Nature", a characteristic He has in common with God (Kenyon, 2004:141).

Fifthly, mention is made of certain of His characteristics which point to the fact that He is God. Jesus is omnipotent (Kenyon, 2004:311), "absolutely righteous" (Kenyon, 2004:152, cf. 39), the brightness of His glory and the "image of His substance" (Kenyon, 1999:186). He is also holy in the same manner as the Father is (Kenyon, 1998:31; 1999:236), and loves with the Father's love (Kenyon, 2004:168; 1999:235).

Sixthly, the author refers to ascriptions by others that point to the deity of Christ. He said that Satan "hated Jesus" for the simple reason of His being God (Kenyon, 1998:20). The temptation of Christ is described as a battle between Satan and God, who is equated to "the Incarnate One" and Jesus (Kenyon, 2004:69) – the wording is such that it allows for the modalistic conception of God which was seen earlier. The disciples believed that Jesus was "the Messiah, the Son of God" (Kenyon, 2004:111). Finally, God the Father saw the Lord as "our perfect Redeemer" (Kenyon, 2004:149).

All of these pieces of evidence in his writings build a case that strongly suggests Kenyon's view of Jesus Christ is that He is deity, albeit with a modalistic concept of deity.

## **2.5.2 The Humanity of Christ**

It is in the humanity of Christ that the more distinct elements of Kenyon's Christology are seen. His anthropology, briefly mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, directly affects his construct of the humanity of Christ in a manner that is a cause for concern.

### **2.5.2.1 The Reasons for the Incarnation**

Various reasons and purposes are given for the Incarnation. The first is that it was the will of the Father. Kenyon indicates that God created mankind with full knowledge of the coming Fall, so therefore He Himself must take responsibility for it by going to man (Kenyon, 1998:21). While such anthropocentric thinking is normal in Kenyon's writings, he is essentially saying that God willed the Incarnation. He adds that Jesus was driven by love (Kenyon, 1998:27), and a "desire" for fellowship with man (Kenyon, 1999:156). Jesus left glory with the express purpose of fulfilling the Father's will on earth (Kenyon, 2004:144).

The second reason for the Incarnation is to reveal the Father to mankind. Kenyon believed that God had not been made known to the human race before Christ came, in the sense that He had not been seen. Therefore Christ's Incarnation was to reveal Him to man (Kenyon, 1999:268). He came to show the loving nature of God, that He was holy yet approachable (Kenyon, 1999:157). He did it knowing that to reveal the Father, would cost Him His life (Kenyon, 2004:237), as His own people would reject Him (Kenyon, 2004:110).

A third reason for the Incarnation is to redeem man from Satan. For Kenyon, man had a problem in that he was "spiritually dead, a child of Satan, without any approach to God" and thus ruled in life by the Devil (Kenyon, 1999:145). Christ had to come to redeem the race from Satan (Kenyon, 2004:152), who had power over death (Kenyon, 2004:149), and to "destroy" his achievements (Kenyon, 2004:32). The Incarnation was the only way to provide a Deliverer who could both pay the penalty and defeat the Devil – a God-man was therefore required (Kenyon, 1999:45).

Fourthly, He came to provide a legal substitution. Since the condemnation had come because of the acts of one man, so one righteous man, who had no sin, could legally substitute for man and pay the penalty (Kenyon, 1999:45). The substitute would have to be a union of both God and man (Kenyon, 1999:57) and so "legal Substitution would be impossible without an incarnation" (Kenyon, 1998:21). The reason it would have to be a God-man is that neither angel, nor a man, could be the substitute (Kenyon, 1998:21). Since God could not satisfy the situation on His own, as a human was required, the only solution was a union of God with man (Kenyon, 1998:22; 1999:145). Therefore God was required to Incarnate (Kenyon, 2004:69), and so the Son came to identify with man (Kenyon, 2004:99).

### **2.5.2.2 The Virgin Birth**

For Kenyon, Genesis 3:15 is the first clue of the virgin birth. The prophecy said a woman would have a human child who would be born "independent of natural generation" (Kenyon, 1999:58). Adam called his wife Eve, thereby indicating she was both the "mother of all living" and would be the mother of the Christ (Kenyon, 1999:59). A later prophecy, Isaiah 7:13-14, indicated that the mother would be a virgin and the Child, "Immanuel, God with us, or Incarnation" (Kenyon, 1999:147).

Why was the Virgin Birth needed? Since man is fallen and "a child of Satan", the Christ could not be the result of a normal human birth (Kenyon, 1999:145), as He would then be "a subject of Satan" (Kenyon, 1999:147), and a possessor of "spiritual death" (Kenyon, 1999:44). If God

changed one man's nature by eliminating the fallen nature, and then came into Him, He would not be able to solve the sin problem nor serve justice. He must come in a man, yet not one under Satan's dominion (Kenyon, 1999:145).

Therefore it must be a "unique conception", a "Supernatural birth", a distinctive performance of God's ability (Kenyon, 1999:147-8). The "Incarnate One" would be conceived by the Spirit of God and placed in the virgin's womb until birth (Kenyon, 1999:147). The Holy Spirit conception meant Joseph would not be the father (Kenyon, 1998:21), nor would the Child have the blood of sinful man, since the blood of man comes from the male sperm (Kenyon, 1998:19). The conception would take place in Mary's womb (Kenyon, 1998:37), and the Babe would be her first born (Kenyon, 2004:82).

Therefore, for Kenyon, the virgin birth was the only way to get around the satanic-nature-in-man problem. The man born in this way would not be subject to the Devil and could therefore free the race. The special blood that would be His as a result of this birth is detailed in the next section.

### **2.5.2.3 The Nature of His Humanity**

When Christ took on a human body, it was as if "he had never been anything else", yet He remained what He had always been. Further, He did not do it only for his lifetime on earth, but from that point forward and forever (Kenyon, 1999:150).

Kenyon describes the Son of God's body as "special" (Kenyon, 1999:148). He took "human form" (Kenyon, 1998:25). He did not "partake" of the nature of either of His human father, as seen before, or His physical mother – although she provided Him with "sinless flesh" (Kenyon, 1998:21). This body was the same as Adam's before the Fall – including the critical facts that it was neither "mortal" (Kenyon, 1998:21), nor "immortal" (Kenyon, 1998:31). Adam's human body became "mortal" at the Fall, and was therefore subject to "disease and death" (Kenyon, 1998:150). However, Christ had to be like the pre-Fall Adam, not belonging to "spiritual death" (Kenyon, 1999:44), but "a partaker of man's physical body", having a perfect human body (Kenyon, 1998:31). It is stressed that "disease had no dominion over" Jesus' body, because disease is a symptom of "spiritual death" (Kenyon, 1999:158).

The nature of Jesus' blood ties in with His physical nature. For Kenyon, blood represents life (Kenyon, 1998:20). The blood in a child comes from the father's seed, not the mother's (Kenyon, 1998:19). He also links sin with blood, so that sin is in the blood of a fallen man. When

therefore a child is born, he receives his blood from his father and with it sin, that is, the sin nature. For this reason Christ could not have human blood, and so His blood came from His Father, God (Kenyon, 1998:19). Jesus therefore had received from His Father in His blood, “the life of God”. He did not receive the blood of Adam, and therefore the sinful nature, as a direct result of His conception by the Holy Spirit (Kenyon, 1998:19-20). Kenyon’s Soteriology confirms the transfer of the sin nature in the blood. He teaches that at “recreation”, his term for the entrance of spiritual life and the reversing of spiritual death, the “nature of God” enters the person, and “they also get a change of blood i.e., the new life enters the man through his blood stream. There is a union of blood and spirit. We are now cleansed of sin in that the life of God enters us” (Kenyon, 1998:20). It is noted here since this subject will not arise again, that when referring to the cross and post-cross events in the life of Christ, Kenyon made no reference to this change of blood when it would seem that Jesus should have undergone two changes of blood, one when He died spiritually and a second when he was re-born.

Finally, to conclude a full treatment of His humanity and as just alluded to, certain changes occurred in the body of Jesus on the cross. It was while hanging on the cross, that the body of Jesus became mortal (Kenyon, 1998:20). The precise moment of His spiritual death and His becoming mortal is that moment when sin, “Spiritual death”, was “laid” on Him by God. For Kenyon the key issue is that Christ could now die physically (Kenyon, 1998:43; Kenyon, 1999:159). Everything accomplished through the virgin birth is now reversed, and Jesus partakes of the sin nature, even the nature of Satan, and the Devil becomes “His master” (Kenyon, 1998:33). The matter of Jesus humanity is tied together and summarised in Kenyon’s own unorthodox words:

This, however, was not a complete identification with man. He had not identified Himself with the nature of man. If Christ had partaken of the nature that reigned in the spirit of man at His Incarnation, He would have been spiritually dead during His earthly ministry. He could not have revealed Him to man. Therefore, His identification with the spirit nature was during His Crucifixion, when the time had come for Him to fulfill the purpose for which He had come into the world. (Kenyon, 1999:165).

### **2.5.3 The Union of the Deity and Humanity of Christ**

Since Kenyon is not writing a doctrinal treatise, it is not surprising that there is almost nothing written on the details of how deity and humanity were united in the person of Jesus Christ. Certain facts, which will be restated briefly, have already emerged. One anomaly will also be pointed out. Those facts will establish some broad parameters within which a more widespread study of other sources might find the minute details of his position, which is as close as this study can get.

As a direct result of the anomaly, a two stage approach to this section must be adopted. In the first stage, consideration is given to Jesus until the event of the cross. During that period of the Incarnation, Jesus is both God and man at the same time (Kenyon, 1999:102), a “perfect unity” of the two (Kenyon, 1998:22). The humanity he took on was like Adam’s pre-fall (Kenyon, 1998:31), sinless (Kenyon, 1998:21), and neither mortal nor immortal (Kenyon, 1998:31). How these two natures united is not stated by Kenyon, but he has clearly presented a God-man.

Further evidence of Kenyon’s modalism emerges in his discussion of this phase of the Incarnation. He writes: “Christ's life was a rare and beautiful union of humanity and Divinity. Yet there was a mysterious distinction between His humanity and deity. With perfect ease He went from the sphere of His human ability to the sphere of His deity. He was equally at home within one or the other” (Kenyon, 1999:115). It appears that modalism, with its fluidity of shifting between modes, helped Kenyon solve the problem that his construct had caused, that Christ needed to change His nature while incarnated as a man.

The major anomaly in this section comes in the second stage when Jesus hung on the cross. At that time He became mortal, and was made sin (Kenyon, 1998:31). His becoming sin meant a separation from God, a change in His nature, to that of the Devil, who also became His master (Kenyon, 1998:32-33). He also acquired a sin nature (Kenyon, 1999:45) and died spiritually (Kenyon, 1999:159). This leads to the conclusion that on the cross when Jesus was made sin, and His nature changed, that His deity was restricted in some manner so as to permit the changes, or it might have even left Him until He was recreated in hell (Kenyon, 2004:282; 1999:159, 165; 2004:150, 165). Aspects of this subject will gain greater clarity when further facts are established in later sections, for example, Sections 2.5.5, and 2.5.7.1.

#### **2.5.4 The Kenosis of Christ**

In Kenyon’s writings under consideration there are only brief mentions of matters relating to this doctrine. The topic must also be considered in two stages, as in Section 2.5.3.

With regard to the process of leaving Heaven and coming to Earth as a man, Kenyon said that he must “lay aside His Glory and Majesty”, leave the Father’s presence, and then take “upon Himself” a human body (Kenyon, 1999:45). In another place he said Christ “emptied Himself of his glory” when taking the human “form” and became like man. Then he said: “He exchanged the form of God for the form of a man”. He took the form of a creature He Himself had made. He “emptied and limited Himself”, which he defined as living on earth, despite being the Creator

(Kenyon, 1999:236). The issue that concerns Kenyon most in this adoption of humanity, is that the birth was not normal, meaning, the sin nature was not transmitted to the incarnate Christ (Kenyon, 1999:147-8).<sup>5</sup> While here on earth, Christ would have to live like a man and be subject to temptation by Satan, yet without either giving in to it or living in a way that displeased His Father (Kenyon, 1999:45). It remains unclear exactly what is meant by the “exchanging” of forms.

Then Christ went to the cross and was made sin, that is, He as God, took “man’s sin-nature” onto His spirit (Kenyon, 1999:45). It is at this point that Christ is said to have “humbled Himself” and surrendered to death, and all its “suffering” (Kenyon, 1999:236). It must be remembered from the previous Section (2.5.3), that He changed on the cross and became a mortal man. Therefore, the “emptying” which took place in conjunction with the Incarnation has now progressed into an additional level of emptiness with the departure of deity from the incarnate Jesus.

### **2.5.5 The Impeccability of Christ**

This doctrine is considered in the same two stages as in Section 2.5.3. In the pre-cross stage, Kenyon is very clear that Christ did not sin (Kenyon, 1998:27, 31). While living on this earth, Jesus was tempted (Kenyon, 1999:26-27) in all areas in which humans are tempted (Kenyon, 1998:31; Kenyon, 2004:79). Though living in the presence of sin (Kenyon, 1999:39), He did not yield to sin, even when He was tempted by Satan himself (Kenyon, 1999:45). The reason He did not yield was that He “did not belong to the realm of spiritual death” (Kenyon, 1999:39), “sin had never become part of Him” (Kenyon, 1998:31). By this Kenyon means that He was not yet mortal, and so sin, which is spiritual death (Kenyon, 1999:159), had no control over Him (Kenyon, 1998:27). Commenting on the trial the night before He died, Kenyon observes that Christ was found “faultless” when measured against the Law and tested by the Priesthood. He adds that not being able to find any “fault” in Him, they had to manufacture fictitious charges (Kenyon, 1999:122). Therefore, in this phase of the Incarnation, in Kenyon’s construct of Christology, Christ was absolutely incapable of sin.

The second stage of His life on earth began on the cross. Man’s nature, his sin-nature, is equated with spiritual death (Kenyon, 1999:46). Until the cross, Christ’s nature was not identical to man’s, in that He was neither mortal, nor a partaker of sin, that is, spiritual death (Kenyon,

---

<sup>5</sup> On page 236 Kenyon did not cite a Scripture passage, despite the obvious wording from Philippians 2. Yet on page 147-8 he quoted Isaiah 42:6, Philippians 2:6-8 and Hebrews 10:5 and used them to suggest that the generation of Jesus was a distinct process from a normal human birth. Philippians 2:6-8 is therefore the likely background to his thinking on page 236.

1999:46). On the cross, He made “complete identification” with man when He took on man’s nature (Kenyon, 1999:165). He was made sin: His nature changed (Kenyon, 1999:159), His body became mortal, and the Father placed man’s sin nature, spiritual death, on His Son (Kenyon, 1999:46). The spiritual death of Christ is dealt with in greater detail later. It was only after He had died spiritually, that He was able to die physically (Kenyon, 1999:159), although at this point he had died only spiritually, not physically (Kenyon, 1998:43). This process meant that Jesus was not only sin, that is spiritually dead, but was also subject to His new master, Satan (Kenyon, 1998:33), whose nature He now possessed (Kenyon, 1998:32). The Father therefore turned from His own Son (Kenyon, 1998:79). In conclusion, sin was not “reckoned” to Kenyon’s Christ, rather “He was made to be sin” (Kenyon, 1998:63) with man’s sin (Kenyon, 2004:44). He was made sin so thoroughly, that “His spirit absolutely became impregnated with the sin nature of the world” (Kenyon, 1998:63). Lest there be any misunderstanding, Kenyon removes all doubt (Kenyon, 1999:236): “This Divine suffering caused by Christ’s becoming sin is unique. It has no analogy. We cannot measure it by anything with which we are acquainted. The sin of Adam, the sin-nature that passed upon all men, all its horribleness, penetrates the heart of God, Himself.”

Kenyon’s view on the impeccability of Christ has now been stated from his point of view. The question arises as to why he has arrived at this construct with its dramatic change mid-stream, that is, at the cross. It will be found that heretofore in this work a crucial controlling factor has only been hinted at. In Section 2.4, it was noted that it would be developed at a later point in the study. It was suggested that it would be better understood after certain facts had been established and a context laid. Here, the concept is explained along with its impact on the impeccability of Christ, even his Christology.

The critical matter is that for Kenyon sin is spiritual (Kenyon, 2004:226; 1998:47, 61) and therefore the sin problem cannot be solved physically (Kenyon, 2004:226; 1998:61). Hence, as stated earlier, it is the spirit of man that is re-created, not his body (Kenyon, 2004:181, 226). In Kenyon sin is closely linked with another spiritual problem, disease (Kenyon, 1998:61). Both sin and disease are a “spiritual fact” (Kenyon, 1998:61). Accordingly, these problems must be solved at a spiritual level (Kenyon, 1998:47). Therefore both sin (spiritual) and disease (spiritual) were laid on Christ. This was carried out when He was made sin for man (Kenyon, 1999:159). When sin and disease were dealt with at a spiritual level, they had also been taken care of at a physical level (Kenyon, 1998:108). This is why the believer only has to claim his healing – it has already been taken care of. Christ on the cross is described as being “sick”, the “sickest being the universe ever knew” because He had our spiritual diseases laid on Him (Kenyon, 1998:108).

Since in Kenyon's mind sin was a spiritual rather than a physical thing and could not be dealt with physically (Kenyon, 2004:226; 1998:61), it is now evident how this is a controlling factor in much of his Christology. The Scriptures clearly indicate that Christ died physically on the cross (Matthew 27:50ff.; Mark 15:37ff.; Luke 23:46ff.; John 19:30). Yet Kenyon's Christ was not mortal and so could not die physically (Kenyon, 1999:159), nor could a physical death deal with sin for all mankind (Kenyon, 1999:165). Christ had to die spiritually before he could die physically (Kenyon, 1999:159). As soon as Christ died spiritually he was no longer sinless (Kenyon 1999:165). However, Christ was sinless during his life, as was proved by the trial the night before He went to the cross at which He was found faultless (Kenyon, 1999:122). Therefore, in Kenyon's system, Christ's death, which had to be spiritual to deal with sin and disease, could have taken place only after that trial as He had to be sinless at that point, and it had to happen before his physical death, in order to enable the latter. The spiritual death of Christ therefore occurred when Christ was made sin and became mortal, an event that occurred when He was on the cross, just prior to His physical death.

The logical conclusion of this is that Christ was impeccable until He died spiritually on the cross. He then became mortal, ceased to be impeccable, and remained sinful until the moment of victory which took place in Hell – a matter that will be detailed later. Therefore, the fact that sin is spiritual and cannot be dealt with physically has been shown to be a critical, even controlling factor, in the Kenyon system of Christology, in that it demanded a change in Christ's nature during His Incarnation.

## **2.5.6 The Earthly Life of Christ**

### **2.5.6.1 The Events of His Life**

The details of His earthly life can be found in any study of the Life of Christ (e.g. Edersheim, 1896; Farrar, 1874; and, Guthrie, 1982). However, certain events are relevant to a study of Christology. Of those events, the following were found in Kenyon's writings. Firstly, he cited some events that validated His claim that He was the Saviour: He fulfilled the Law's requirements (Kenyon, 2004:86), cured those who were sick, fed the famished, raised the deceased (Kenyon, 1998:14), overruled nature's laws (Kenyon, 2004:70), expelled demonic beings (Kenyon, 1998:113), and always obeyed His Father's will (Kenyon, 1998:49-50).

Secondly, He was also an example for all believers of all subsequent ages to imitate, by His: love for others (Kenyon, 1998:22), submission to the Spirit of God (Kenyon, 1998:33),

“confessions” (Kenyon, 1998:160), and use of the Father’s “Word” to perform the ministry (Kenyon, 2004:77-78). Thirdly, he introduced new teachings or clarified previous doctrines while here on earth. Many times the teachings were not understood or accepted (Kenyon, 2004:101). Amongst other subjects, He taught on: the Trinity (Kenyon, 1999:13), the Father (Kenyon, 2004:110-111; 237-241), and the Spirit (Kenyon, 2004:98). Kenyon also maintained that the Gospels do not mention Him teaching on the “substitutionary sacrifice” (Kenyon, 2004:110-111).

Finally, the Incarnation and the events of Passion Week have relevance to the study of Christology and are mentioned by Kenyon. Since they are covered under separate headings, no further mention will be made of them here.

### **2.5.6.2 The Offices He Occupied**

In Kenyon, there is no mention of Christ exercising the office of Prophet. The nearest He came to being a prophet was in His use of the “living, spoken Word” (Kenyon, 2004:208). Christ’s “confessions” were more important to Kenyon than His giving of revelation (e.g., Kenyon, 2004:141-142; 1998:160). His writings give more emphasis to the subsequent and more detailed revelation that came through Paul (Kenyon, 1998:24-25, 116).

Christ as Priest is often mentioned in the three volumes under consideration. He entered the Priesthood with an oath (Hebrews 7:20-25) (Kenyon, 1999:114). He was qualified to be the Saviour (Kenyon, 1999:55). He offered Himself as the sacrifice for the sin of mankind and then took His blood into the heavenly sanctuary – a subject that will be dealt with in further detail later (Kenyon, 2004:301-302). He served as the Mediator between God and man (Kenyon, 1998:93). Presently, Jesus is our High Priest (Kenyon, 1998:79), having been qualified in His Incarnation to empathise with man and fully represent him (Kenyon, 1999:114). Kenyon called the order of priesthood that Jesus served under the order of “the power of endless life” (Kenyon, 1999:114), otherwise known as the “order of Melchizedek” (Kenyon, 1998:74).

Although Kenyon hardly mentions Christ exercising the office of King, he did speak of Christ in the trial the night before His crucifixion, stating that despite all the enemies “He walked as a King” (Kenyon, 1998:34). The foundation for this thought is found in his explanation of the Old Testament Tabernacle: at that time he stated Jesus was “Royalty” and He was already the sovereign of the Jews (Kenyon, 1999:102-103).

## **2.5.7 The Crucifixion**

### **2.5.7.1 Jesus Died Spiritually**

The spiritual death of Christ has already been mentioned with a broad stroke of the brush in previous sections, but is now detailed. Jesus had to die spiritually because of two foundational arguments in the theology of Kenyon. Firstly, fallen man is born spiritually dead, which means that he has the nature of the Devil ruling within himself. He is further described as being “born again” to the Evil One (Kenyon, 1999:30). This means man is in bondage to Satan because he is a partaker of Satan’s nature (Kenyon, 1999:43). Secondly, sin is a spiritual matter and the sin problem cannot be solved physically (Kenyon, 2004:226; 1998:61). This presented a challenge to Kenyon in that his Christ could not die physically as He was not mortal (Kenyon, 1999:159), nor would that physical death solve the sin problem (Kenyon, 1999:165). These two background doctrines mean that for Christ to die physically He would first have to die spiritually (Kenyon, 1999:159).

When He was put on the cross, Christ was neither “mortal nor immortal”, and so was completely separate from sin (Kenyon, 1999:159), “absolutely righteous”. Satan had no right to anything in Jesus (Kenyon, 2004:152). For the entire Incarnation so far, Satan had never been “lord over Christ”. He was the same as Adam before the fall (Kenyon, 2004: 219-220). All this was about to change when Jesus died spiritually.

Christ went to the cross to become the substitute for man (Kenyon, 1999:159). However, His cross-work was not sufficient to complete the substitution – it was merely the beginning (Kenyon, 2004:280). The completion would take place after His physical death (Kenyon, 2004:280). The word for death in Isaiah 53:9 is plural and therefore Christ had a “twofold” death on the cross – the order being spiritual death first, and then physical death (Kenyon, 1999:159). His spiritual death took place at precisely the moment when “sin was laid on Him” by God (Kenyon, 1998:43; 1999:45). At this point he was “made Sin with our Sin” (Kenyon, 1998:46). The last two quotes are not accidental wording, for indeed they mean that Christ did not have sin “reckoned” to Him, but rather “He was made to be sin” (Kenyon, 1998:63). His very spirit “became sin” instantly (Kenyon, 2004:282) and was completely “impregnated” with sin (Kenyon, 1998:63). This was all done so that He could become “utterly one” with man (Kenyon, 2004:150). “Then God must take man’s sin-nature, that hideous, monstrous thing, spiritual death, and lay it upon the spirit of His Holy Eternal Son” (Kenyon, 1999:45).

Several things occurred simultaneously at the moment sin was laid on Christ and He died spiritually. One is that he acquired a sin nature (Kenyon, 1999:46). Earlier, when Adam sinned he died spiritually and immediately man's body "became death-doomed" or mortal (Kenyon, 1999:159) and his resultant state was "Spiritual Death". "Spiritual Death" also meant he was "born again" to Satan, thereby becoming a possessor of Satan's nature (Kenyon, 1999:28, 30, 43). Satan's nature was "poured" into man's spirit (Kenyon, 1998:60). He was "demon-indwelt", specifically by Satan's nature (Kenyon, 2004:153). For Christ to be man's substitute he had to become "absolutely human" and be made exactly what man was (Kenyon, 1999:103). Similarly, when Christ was made sin and acquired a sin nature, He became mortal, that is, subject to death (Kenyon, 1998:117), or able to die physically (Kenyon, 2004:282; 1998:43). Also, "Spiritual Death" was put on Him (Kenyon, 1999:45), that is, He became a possessor of Satan's nature (Kenyon, 2004:150), and the devil became His "master" (Kenyon, 1998:46). It is no surprise therefore, that when Jesus was made sin, a "separation" took place (Kenyon, 1998:32) and God abandoned Him, He "turned His back" on Him (Kenyon, 2004:278). Finally, when He was made sin, Jesus experienced corruption (Kenyon, 2004:44).

It is stated as fact therefore that changes occurred in Christ on the cross at the moment He died spiritually. Kenyon himself asserts that "His spirit underwent a change" (Kenyon, 1999:159). Most noticeably He became subject to Satan, and possessed the devil's nature as mentioned above. The biggest conundrum this presents is that if He is still the God-man, then God is subject to Satan (Kenyon, 1999:147). So it is assumed (see under Section 2.5.3) that His deity left Him at the moment He was made sin, until a later point, most likely His recreation. Lest there be any doubt that there were changes in Christ, Kenyon makes the observation—the diseases he refers to are spiritual in nature (Kenyon, 1998:61): "the spirit of Jesus had been so deformed by the sins and the diseases of the human, that He no longer resembled a man" (Kenyon, 1998:66).

The spiritual death of Jesus had to occur for Kenyon in the manner in which it did in order that He could die physically (Kenyon, 1998:43; 2004:282; cf. Section 2.5.5). Until the spiritual death took place, with all its implications, "it was impossible for man to have taken the life of Christ", and if for man, Christ could not give it up either as He was not yet mortal (Kenyon 1999:159). After He had died spiritually, the physical death followed shortly thereafter (Kenyon, 2004:282).

Some might wonder where Kenyon obtained the doctrine of Jesus spiritual death as set forth here. While speaking of the Holy Spirit's ministry in the present age, he stated that He, the Spirit of God, would be the "Unveiler of what Jesus actually did in His substitution" (Kenyon, 2004:215). It is very likely, in view of the fact he says twice on the same page that truth is revealed to present-day believers, that Kenyon is claiming to have somehow received this

information directly from God's Spirit.

### **2.5.7.2 Punishment and Re-creation in Hell**

Just before His physical death, Jesus uttered the words, "It is finished". While this meant that the Covenant with Abraham was "fulfilled", it did not mean that the entire redemption was complete, but merely that the first phase had run its course. Since sin is spiritual it could not be dealt with physically. Kenyon notes that if it was physical, then every man could "die for himself" and take care of his sin. He says that it rather had to be dealt with in "the spirit realm". Therefore Satan took Jesus to the place of man's punishment (Kenyon, 1998:47). It would be totally finished when He had resurrected and taken His own blood to the heavenly temple and it had been received (Kenyon, 1998:60).

A substitution could only be successful if the "spiritual penalty" was paid for man's sin, and that payment would have to be made by Christ (Kenyon, 1998:60). Since He was representing man, He would have to "satisfy the claims of Justice against the human race" (Kenyon, 1998:47). The satisfaction would involve His being punished and His suffering on our behalf (Kenyon, 1998:32). He would be "smitten of God" and "afflicted" with all "the diseases" and all "the sins" of man (Isaiah 53), (Kenyon, 1998:66). He must also experience "judgment", the "wrath" and "indignation" of "Eternal Justice" (Kenyon, 1999:45).

At times Kenyon uses some unusual terminology. So far it has been shown that when the reader might assume one meaning, in actual fact Kenyon has another in mind (e.g., Word of God in Section 2.4, and "Threeness" in Section 2.5.1.2). The preceding paragraph is another example of this. The terms "Justice" (Kenyon, 1998:47) and "Eternal Justice" (Kenyon, 1999:45) might be assumed to signify the Godhead, and more especially so since he specified "God" (Kenyon, 1998:66), a context in which he was loosely quoting Isaiah 53. The reader would be wrong to assume it signified the Godhead, because it has been seen previously that Kenyon believes the payment must be made to Satan (Kenyon, 2004:41, 152), and Kenyon clearly states that the "judgment of Satan must fall upon Him. He must meet the demands of Justice" (Kenyon, 1999:45). This apparent conflict disappears when it is discovered that after Satan's judgement was over, God announced its end (Kenyon, 2004:281). It is therefore no surprise to discover that the place in which Christ was punished was "Hell" (Kenyon, 1999:43, 45), or "Hades" (Kenyon, 1998:59, 63), because as man's representative, He had to go to the same place man would have been punished (Kenyon, 1998:32; Kenyon, 2004:44).

As if to remove any doubts in this regard, Kenyon tells his readers that Satan (Kenyon, 1998:47)

and the demons (Kenyon, 2004:277) took Jesus and jubilantly led him to the “Dark Regions of Hades”. In the next sentence Kenyon equates “Hades” with “Hell” when he says that Hell’s entire arsenal of “sufferings and torments” was piled on Jesus and that He suffered its “agonies” (Kenyon, 1998:89). This is in agreement with the identity of “Justice” in the previous two paragraphs and confirms that it means Satan. This judgement by Satan involved every demon in Hell (Kenyon, 1998:65; 1999:187). They tried to “swamp”, to “overwhelm”, Jesus while holding Him in “fearful bondage” (Kenyon, 1999:187). He further suggests that this suffering endured by His spirit was portrayed in Isaiah 53 (Kenyon, 1998:61).

While Jesus’ spirit was suffering in Hell, His body remained in the grave (Kenyon, 1999:163). Jesus endured Hell for “seventy-two hours” (Kenyon, 2004:280-281), or “three days and three nights” (Kenyon, 1998:89; 2004:281). This time of suffering was ended when Jesus had made the complete payment for the sin of the “human race” to “justice” (Kenyon, 2004:281). At the precise point at which He had paid in full, God, “the Supreme Court of the Universe”, exclaimed (Kenyon, 1998:89) from “the throne of God” (Kenyon, 1999:187) “Enough.” The suffering ended immediately (Kenyon, 1998:89).

The drama continues in Hell (Kenyon, 2004:72) with the victorious phase of the conflict (Kenyon, 1998:65). Firstly, Jesus is “justified in spirit” by God (1 Timothy 3:16) (Kenyon, 1998:62, 64; 2004:72, 281) (1 Peter 3:18) (Kenyon, 2004:281). Satan and the demons of Hell were witness to both this and the next event.

Secondly, He is made “alive in Spirit” (Kenyon, 1998:89; 2004:72), which Kenyon also calls being “born again” (Kenyon, 1998:62, 64), “recreated”, “declared Righteous”, “made a New Creation” (Kenyon, 2004:41), and “begotten of God” (Kenyon, 1998:62; 2004:281). It is noted that the word “Spirit” in “alive in Spirit” does not refer to the Holy Spirit. Rather it is Jesus’ “Own Spirit”, which earlier had died spiritually, and which now must be brought back to life or be re-born (Kenyon, 2004:44). He is the first “person” who was recreated after having died spiritually (Kenyon, 1998:62). Being made “alive in spirit” is also equated with receiving the “Life of God”, and being “called the Son of God” (Kenyon, 2004:150). This reception of “Eternal Life” is equated with receiving the “Nature of God”. Jesus was the first to receive it, thus classifying Him as “First Born from the Dead” (Kenyon, 1998:84). Acts 13:29-34 and Psalm 22 are used to prove that Jesus was born again before His resurrection (Kenyon, 1998:64; 2004:72). Jesus is now able to re-enter God’s “presence” as He Himself is righteous. Kenyon defines the righteous state as having the “ability to stand in the Father’s presence without the sense of guilt, condemnation or inferiority” (Kenyon, 1998:63). In review of previous material, Christ had this ability to stand before God, then lost it when He as Jesus was made sin, and regained it when he was reborn in Hell.

Thirdly, there is another event that occurs during this victory phase in Hell. Kenyon's Jesus then "in the power of His deity ... met Satan and triumphed over him as a man" (Kenyon, 1999:167). This means that after the penalty had been paid by Jesus and He had been born again, that deity's ability returned to Him. This is consistent with Kenyon's Soteriology mentioned in the previous paragraph and in Section 2.4, in which a person is recreated when Satan's nature is removed and replaced by God's (cf. Kenyon, 1998:14; 2004:41, 165). Two other statements confirm the return of His deity: Kenyon believed that Jesus possessed the full attributes of deity when He rose from the dead (Kenyon, 1999:109); and, during the battle in Hell after His re-birth, it is stated that "Christ arose to the full stature of His Godhead in the presence of the adversary" (Kenyon, 1998:69).

Fourthly, in the victory phase in Hell: immediately after Jesus' re-birth in Hell another battle took place (Kenyon, 1998:65, 79) in which Satan and his forces were beaten (Kenyon, 1998:89). Satan did not understand anything of God's plan for Christ on the cross or for Jesus in Hell afterwards: only God and Jesus did (Kenyon, 1998:91). After "awful combat" Jesus captured the "keys of death and hell" along with all of Satan's "armor" (Kenyon, 1999:186-187). Jesus "stripped" the Devil of all his "authority" (Kenyon, 2004:150, 282), and took away the "dominion" over the earth which Adam had surrendered to him in the garden (Kenyon, 2004:42, 73). A celebration followed in which Jesus manifested their defeat by overtly exalting over all the forces of hell (Kenyon, 1999:186; 2004:282) confidently exhibiting them as His "conquests" (Kenyon, 2004:73). Satan and his cohorts were forever vanquished (Kenyon, 2004:151).

## **2.5.8 From the Resurrection to the Ascension**

### **2.5.8.1 The Resurrection**

At this time, Jesus was raised from the dead (Kenyon, 2004:42), a process that involved "Christ's spirit" returning to His body in the tomb and then raising it to "immortality" (Kenyon, 1999:174). The timing of this change to immortality appears to be the moment of the reunion of His spirit, on its way back from Hell, with His mortal body, still in the tomb (Kenyon, 1998:117; 1999:174).

Kenyon pointed out that Jesus could not have risen from the dead unless sin had been properly dealt with (Kenyon, 2004:41) and Satan had been defeated (Kenyon, 2004:309). The reason this is so important is that for Kenyon the legality of the redemption is essential. Therefore

Jesus could only rise from the dead if the redemption had been legally wrought. Jesus' resurrection therefore proves for Kenyon that this is the legally correct method of achieving salvation for man (Kenyon, 1998:79; 1999:202; 2004:158).

In Kenyon's system, there is a critical link between this legality and "the Name" of Jesus. After the resurrection Jesus inherited "His Name" with all its "greatness" (Kenyon, 1999:188). It represents and stands for all that He is and did (Kenyon, 1999:189), and is invested with "all authority" (Kenyon, 2004:199). It took His place on earth just as the "Word" also took his place when He left (Kenyon, 2004:205). It was given to the Church to use (Kenyon, 1999:189). Believers today have the "power of attorney" to use it (Kenyon, 1998:65). When it is used, all its inherent power and "authority" is deployed in a situation (Kenyon, 2004:199, 205), and is even more potent than Christ was Himself during His Incarnation (Kenyon, 2004:202). One day all will kneel before this "Name" and "confess" that He is Lord. The basis for this power of the "Name" is the resurrection (Kenyon, 1999:188). It is vital to Kenyon therefore that the resurrection is legal, as that becomes the foundation for the legal use by each believer in the Church of "the Name of Jesus", with all the power its use deploys (Kenyon, 1999:188-189). The resurrection therefore infused power into "the Name" and set up a new chapter in Christ's ministry in the world.

Kenyon did not spend much time on the details of the resurrection – he was more interested in its application. However, in telling believers that they have the power of the Holy Spirit living inside them, he issued a technical statement – it was the Holy Spirit who raised Jesus., (Kenyon, 1998:33; 2004:139).

#### **2.5.8.2 The Presentation of His Blood in the Holy of Holies.**

The earthly Holy of Holies closed when the curtain in the Temple was torn (Kenyon, 1998:134). The Abrahamic Covenant, which Kenyon also calls the "Old Covenant", was "annulled" (Kenyon 1998:142). The Law was "fulfilled". The sacrificial system ended. The priesthood and high priesthood established by the "Old Covenant" were also terminated (Kenyon 1998:73).

After His resurrection Christ transported His own "Blood" to the heavenly Holy of Holies. His blood was applied to the mercy seat (Kenyon, 1998:74) and presented to the "Supreme Court of the Universe", that is, the Father, who accepted it (Kenyon, 1998:74, Kenyon, 2004:111). The Father agreed that "complete Redemption from Satan's authority and dominion had been wrought for the human race" (Kenyon 1999:221). Man could now be transferred legally to the Father's realm (Kenyon, 1999:202). When He presented His blood, redemption was "sealed"

(Kenyon, 2004:43). It became the “red seal upon the document of our Redemption” (Kenyon 2004:50). This “Document” proved that the blood and sacrifice were sufficient (Kenyon 1998:94). The redemption thus achieved was everlasting (Kenyon, 1998:73) and “once for all” time (Kenyon, 1998:79). At the time of the presentation and acceptance of the blood the new Covenant was set up and began to function (Kenyon, 1998:51, 74). With the “New Covenant” also came a “New Law” which was founded on the “Love” that Christ introduced (Kenyon 2004:158). The definition of that law was John 13:34-35 (Kenyon, 1998:134). A new priesthood, according to the Melchizedekian order had also come into effect, and its High Priest, Christ (Kenyon 1998:74), had just completed His first act as High Priest. He continues to serve in that capacity (Kenyon, 1998:79).

### **2.5.8.3 The Announcement in Paradise**

Paradise was the location that the Old Testament believers were sent after death to wait for the attainment by Christ of their redemption (Kenyon, 1998:60). On the cross, the one thief spoke with Jesus and gave a positive response. Jesus then promised him that he would see him in Paradise that same day (Luke 23:43). Kenyon objects to that understanding of the Luke passage. He rather believes that Jesus did not go to Paradise the day of His crucifixion. In his understanding, the thief would go to Paradise that same day, but Jesus would see him there only later in time. To arrive at to this understanding, he moved the comma from before, to after the word “today”. The sense would therefore be that Jesus was announcing “today”, at a future point when the two of them would be together in Paradise (Kenyon, 1998:60). This seemingly obscure interpretation is elucidated by Kenyon’s construct that Jesus went to Paradise only after His resurrection.

Therefore, He rose, presented His blood in heaven, and only then went to Paradise. It was there that the Old Testament saints, Fathers and the thief from the cross were anticipating His arrival (Kenyon, 1998:74). He announced to them the good news that redemption was complete (Kenyon, 1998:75). All those who had trusted in the blood of animals for all of the Old Testament times were collected and taken to heaven (Kenyon, 1998:117; cf. 2004:43).

### **2.5.8.4 The Work is Finished**

The exact timing of the visit to Paradise was not stated in the previous section. The earliest it could have been was after His resurrection and subsequent presentation of His blood in heaven (cf. Kenyon, 1998:74). It is now explained that it was later than that.

Christ collected the Old Testament saints from Paradise and subsequently made a final appearance to His disciples on “Mount Olivet” (Kenyon, 1998:9). During this appearance He was picked up and carried to heaven in a “Cloud”. Kenyon identifies the “Cloud” as the believers just collected from Paradise who then accompany Christ to heaven (Kenyon, 1998:75). This therefore provides the latest time for the trip to Paradise. After re-entering Heaven, Christ sat down on the honoured side of the “Majesty on High” (Kenyon, 1998:117). The reason He sat down was that the work of His Incarnation was complete (Kenyon, 1998:81; 2004:50, 157). The concluded work is identified as “Redemption” (Kenyon, 1998:187; 2004:50, 157). When He sat down, there was not only no taint of sin on Him, but not even a “smell” of it (Kenyon, 2004:73). The final step that acknowledged the completion of the work was for Him to “enter into His rest” (Kenyon, 2004:158).

#### **2.5.8.5 The Implications of the Resurrection**

This section would naturally fit immediately after Section 2.5.8.1, but has had to be held back until now in order to keep Kenyon’s expanded teachings on the resurrection and subsequent events together. For Kenyon, there are many significant accomplishments of the resurrection.

Firstly, Christ was “crowned ... Lord” by the Father – with all the authority that went with it (Kenyon, 1999:222). It was a consequence of His ending the “lordship” of the Devil over the world, that He became Lord (Kenyon, 2004:263). This same “dominion” was previously held by man – until he surrendered it to Satan. Christ now holds it so that we cannot “forfeit” it again (Kenyon, 1999:222, cf. 21). Secondly, on legal grounds (Kenyon, 1998:79), God was able to give eternal life to man (Kenyon, 1998:69). He was now able to convey to their spirits the very “Nature of God” (Kenyon, 1998:84).

Thirdly, Jesus became a “real Saviour”, something He had never been before (Kenyon, 1998:93). Fourthly, Satan was forever conquered (Kenyon, 2004:43, 69) and his former subjects (the ones who were born again) became masters over him (Kenyon, 1998:71, 89). This also meant that death, the nature of Satan, was defeated (Kenyon, 2004:133).

Fifthly, Jesus is the “head” of a “new creation” (Kenyon, 1998:69) “a new People” (Kenyon, 1998:134). They are “Jesus men” (Kenyon, 1998:70) who “reign as a king” (Kenyon, 1998:81). This new man is a “creative being” in the same “class” as God (Kenyon, 1998:69). This would tie in with him being given the nature of God. Sixthly, the diseases of believers would be remitted at the moment of belief because Jesus bore them on the cross (Kenyon, 1998:107-

108), since “disease and sin are one” and has a common origin in Satan (Kenyon, 1998:62; 1999:210-211). Therefore, when Christ was made sin, and later defeated it, disease was defeated along with sin and Satan (Kenyon, 1999:212, 214; 2004:41, 50, 262).

Seventhly, believers were given the right to use His Name (Kenyon, 1998:89). He “received the greatness” of the Name when He rose (Kenyon, 199:188). His Name is more powerful than Jesus was Himself during His earthly life (Kenyon, 2004:202). Believers who use the Name of Jesus deploy its inherent power in a situation so it can do “its mighty work” (Kenyon, 2004:32-33). Eighthly, His resurrection gives a guarantee to all who are recreated in His likeness that Jesus was just the first of many to come (Kenyon, 1999:177). Ninthly, all men will give account to Christ because after the resurrection “all authority” was granted to Him. At an unmentioned time, Kenyon adds that all beings will kneel before Him (Kenyon, 1999:188).

### **2.5.9 The Present Ministry of Christ**

The following ministries of Christ are all related to believers as distinct from non-believers. They appear in no special order.

Firstly, He is the “High Priest” (Kenyon, 1998:80, 134). His first action in that role was to present His blood (Kenyon, 1998:143). Secondly, He is the “Mediator” of the new covenant. Most of this concept relates to the past, but the aspect in the present, is Christ’s ongoing ministry of representing man to God. It is because of this ministry that man has been granted the privilege to address God through his “Mediator” (Kenyon, 1999:204).

Thirdly, Jesus is always interceding for believers. The believer knows that Jesus’ prayers are always answered. This ministry guarantees the believer’s success in the challenges of the Christian life (Kenyon, 2004:303). Fourthly, when a believer sins, his fellowship with God is interrupted. As soon as he confesses that sin, Christ represents him to the Father as an “Advocate” (Kenyon, 1999:206). Our Advocate is seated in the place of honour next to the Father (Kenyon, 2004:259).

Fifthly, as Head of the Church (Kenyon, 1998:100), He indwells both individual believers and the collective Body, the Church (Kenyon, 1998:55). He works through the Word to build Himself in the believer (Kenyon, 2004:11). Sixthly, He listens to the prayers of His children, and makes it His responsibility to take care of their needs expressed through this means (Kenyon, 2004:128). Seventhly, as Lord, He provides the needs of believers, watches over them and protects them (Kenyon, 1998:143).

### 2.5.10 The Future Ministry of Christ

Kenyon's teachings on Christ's future ministry are found in just two chapters (1999:273-288) in only one of the three volumes under consideration, apart from one reference (1999:188) in which he notes that at an unnamed time in the future all men will kneel before Christ (Philippians 2:9-10). The two chapters detail Kenyon's broad view of eschatology. His views could be classified as a variant form of a Dispensational framework (cf. Lie, 2008:2-17). However, he applies certain Bible references (Luke 17:30-35; Matthew 24:40) to the Rapture rather than the Second Coming of Christ, something a Dispensationalist (e.g., Ryrie) would not do. Ironically, he uses those references in the same manner as a Reformed theologian (e.g., Reymond) would, that is, one who views the Parousia as one event,. This point demonstrates, from an overall viewpoint, that his eschatology is eclectic, a trend in his theological system that was noted earlier in this chapter (cf. Lie, 2008:12).

Kenyon's teachings regarding the future ministry of Christ are now extracted from his eschatology. Kenyon (1999:273) teaches that Christ will be joined in "glory" by the church at the time of the Rapture. He Himself will return in two phases: first, the church will be taken up to meet Him in the "air"; and second, He will majestically return with "His Church" in a universally visible manner at the "Revelation of His coming" (Kenyon, 1999:274-275). Kenyon (1999:284) calls these events the two stages of the "second coming of Christ". Between those two events, and while tribulation is being experienced on earth, Christ will reward the church at the "Marriage Supper of the Lamb" (2 Corinthians 5:10; Romans 14:10; Revelation 19:7-9). The second phase of His return will also occasion His defeat of the enemies who are surrounding the Jews in Jerusalem, after which victory He will set foot on the Mount of Olives (Zechariah 14:2-4) (Kenyon, 1999:283). The Jews will then receive Him as their Messiah (Kenyon, 1999:284). Next, He will establish an earthly kingdom for a millennium (Kenyon, 1999:275, 284-285), and will be worshipped in Jerusalem (Kenyon, 1999:286). At the end of the thousand years, Satan will be released from captivity and will lead a revolt against Christ, which God will terminate with fire (Revelation 20:7-10). Eternity will then, begin (Kenyon, 1999:287).

The emphasis in Kenyon's eschatology is placed on the experience of the believer rather than the activity of God. Perhaps the best way to demonstrate this is in his own words: "Oh, the glorious truth of the wealth, the riches, the joy that belongs to God's family". He continues: "Through the ages of the ages we are going to know one another, talk with one another, enjoy heavenly bliss eternally" (Kenyon, 1999:287).

## 2.6 Problem Areas

Kenyon holds to a number of problematic doctrines in his overall system of belief. The following is a list of those which relate to his Christology:

- 1 His belief that redemption is from Satan.
- 2 The nature of Christ's humanity during the pre-cross phase of the Incarnation, in that it is not a complete identification with man.
- 3 The subsequent change in His Being on the cross whereby He became sin, changed in nature and partook of a satanic nature, Satan becoming His master, and God becoming subject to Satan.
- 4 The departure of His deity on the cross and its later return, so that He was not the God-man for the entire Incarnation, nor that he was a proper man in the other part.
- 5 The concept that sin could not be dealt with by a physical death.
- 6 The payment of Jesus for sin in Hell, and His subsequent rebirth in Hell.
- 7 The presentation of His blood in the heavenly sanctuary in that it makes the resurrection insufficient in the whole redemption process.
- 8 The details of the announcement in Paradise being based on supposition not the authority of Scripture

While many of these overlap with each other, and the arrangement could be refined, the point is made that there are sufficient grounds on which to question the orthodoxy of Kenyon's Christology.

### **3 CHAPTER 3: A REFORMED STATEMENT OF CHRISTOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

Stage two of this study is to answer the question, “How do Reformed theologians state their Christology?” The Reformed tradition has been well articulated over many centuries, and consequently any number of authors could have been chosen as representatives for the purpose of this study. However, an immediate problem arises in that the WFM is a more recent phenomenon. The older Reformed writers did not have to deal with many of the issues which the WFM have brought into theological debate. Therefore, more recent authors have been selected in order to increase the chance of finding direct statements regarding the unique issues involved.

Three authors were chosen. The first is the late James Montgomery Boice of Philadelphia, whose sermons this author has heard several times on the radio while living in the USA. He was the well-known pastor of Tenth Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia from 1968 until his death in 2000. He earned a D.Theol. at the University of Basel in Switzerland and a D.D. at The Theological Seminary of the Reformed Episcopal Church. He was also a frequently published author (Anon, n.d. e).

The second theologian to be selected is Robert L. Reymond. He is currently Professor of Systematic Theology at Knox Theological Seminary in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Prior to holding this position, he was a teacher at Covenant Theological Seminary, St Louis, for more than 20 years. He earned his Ph.D. at Bob Jones University, and carried out post-doctoral studies at a number of universities around the world. An ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church in America, he has served in a number of pastorates. He is also a frequently published author (Flyleaf of Reymond, 1998; cf. Anon, n.d. g).

Since the writer of this study comes from a dispensational perspective within Reformed Tradition, the final author also stems from that camp. Another reason for choosing a slightly divergent author is to indicate the breadth of agreement under the broader Reformed umbrella and therefore to more seriously question the soundness of E.W. Kenyon’s Christology. The third author is Charles C. Ryrie, under whom this author studied for one day in 1989. Ryrie is a leading author in the dispensational camp. For many years, he was Professor of Systematic Theology and Dean of Doctoral Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas. His

degrees include a Th.D. from Dallas Theological Seminary and a Ph.D. from the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. He is also a well published author (Anon, n.d. f).

In this chapter, essentially the same outline of Christology is followed as that in chapter two. Only those sections of Christology that match those of Kenyon are summarised so as to set the stage for chapter four. As noted before, Kenyon was not writing a systematic theology, whereas the three men employed in this chapter did do so. It does not serve the purposes of this study to summarise the sections of Christology that are neglected by Kenyon; hence they have been omitted, unless there is a very special reason to include them. However, in the next chapter, mention will be made of the sections that Kenyon omitted. Finally, certain issues in Kenyon's Christology are not directly answered in the three Reformed theologies; however, relevant statements that these writers do mention, will serve as a partial response, which will be stated so that they can be built upon in the next chapter in which this author will attempt to contribute a fuller response that is consistent with the Reformed tradition.

## **3.2 A Statement of Reformed Christology**

### **3.2.1 The Deity of Christ**

#### **3.2.1.1 His Pre-existence**

There is a variety of evidence that affirms this doctrine. Firstly, John the Baptist (John 1:15, 30) gives testimony that Jesus is both the Son of God and existed before He came as Messiah (Reymond, 1998:213-214; cf. Ryrie, 1999:274). Secondly, in the parable of the disobedient vinedressers (Mathew 21:33-39), there is a "strong suggestion" that the "Son" in the story existed with the "Father" before He came (Reymond, 1998:222).

Thirdly, in John 10 Jesus is asserting His deity to the Jewish leaders by claiming to be "Son of God". He indicates that He was "set apart" for the "messianic task" before He was "sent" and thereby makes a claim to pre-existence (Reymond, 1998:230). A fourth set of evidence is that John, in his Gospel, attributed pre-existence to Christ. Reymond cites John 17:1, 5, 24 in particular and also quotes eight other verses that substantiate this claim. He then adds the "I am" statement in John 8:58 and compares other "I am" references (of which more will be said in Section 3.2.1.2) which identify Him with Yahweh of the Old Testament, which constitute a clear claim to the pre-existence of Jesus before His Incarnation (Reymond, 1998:230-232; cf. Boice, 1986:275; Ryrie, 1999:275-276). Boice agrees that John 8:58 speaks of the prior existence of

Christ (Boice, 1986:261), and adds evidence from John 1:1-2 that Jesus was with God from eternity past (Boice, 1986:271-2). John 3:13 and 31 speak of His emanating from heaven (Ryrie, 1999: 274). While an Arian will believe in His preexistence, he will not agree that Christ is eternal, specifically in eternity past. The Bible teaches His eternality (John 1:1; 8:58) (Ryrie, 1999:274-275).

Fifthly, in Paul's writings, 1 Timothy 1:15 can only mean that Christ existed before the Incarnation (Reymond, 1998:265). In Philippians 2:5-11, Paul takes Christ from eternity past when in the form of and equal to God (cf. Ryrie, 1999:274), to His Incarnation, and back to His glorification in eternity future (Boice, 1986:268). Boice shows the same panoramic overview in 2 Corinthians 8:9, Galatians 4:4 and Hebrews 2, suggesting that these all assume Christ's preexistence (Boice, 1986:270-271). He was involved in the Creation and therefore had to exist before it (Ryrie, 1999:274). Sixthly, the early Church fathers agreed with the deity and preexistence of Christ, but did not make huge contributions to the statement of the doctrine because there were no heresies in this regard to fight in their time (Reymond, 1998:585). Finally, Ryrie adds the implications of the doctrine: if Christ came into being at His earthly birth, then there is "no eternal Trinity", Christ is not God, and He is a liar (Ryrie, 1999:273-274).

### **3.2.1.2 His Divinity**

There is a considerable amount of support for the teaching that Christ is God. The three approaches employed by the representative authors under consideration result in a formidable list of proofs. Since the purpose of this study is merely to summarise the Reformed position, the list is kept brief and is not to be considered the totality of evidence for this critical doctrine. For this reason, certain points have been truncated.

The first category of substantiation comes from the Old Testament. Although the "angel of the Lord" as "messenger" was distinct from God and was spoken to by God, yet due to "divine prerogatives and powers", this distinct person had "identity with God" (Genesis 31:11-13; cf. Psalms 2:7; 45:6-7; 110:1). This is only possible if they constitute two separate beings who are both members of the Godhead (Reymond, 1998:212). Psalm 2:7 inferred deity to God's one and only Son, the Messiah. Later, angels are told to worship Him (Hebrews 1:5-6) (Reymond, 1998:212). In Psalms 45:6-7, 102:25-27 and 110:1, different names of God, and in Isaiah 9:6, four divine titles, are applied to the Messiah (Reymond, 1998:213).

Secondly, in the claims that the “kingdom of God” is near, for example, Mark 1:15 and Luke 17:21, Jesus was saying that all the Old Testament prophecies “were about him and were fulfilled in him”. This was a clear claim to deity by the Messiah (Boice, 1986:273).

Thirdly, Jesus made statements about Himself that indicate He is deity. He called Himself the “Son of Man”, a term which indicated clear Messianic claims (cf. Daniel 7:13) (Reymond, 1998:214-215, 218). When He called Himself “Son of God” in the gospels, He was clearly claiming “essential divine oneness with God” (Reymond, 1998:218). This is confirmed by the term, “son of”, which indicates “of the order of” (Ryrie, 1999:285). The Jews of His day understood the appellation “Son of God” as a claim of deity as proved by their taking up stones to stone Him for blasphemy (John 5:25, 10:36) (Reymond, 1998:229-230). Involved among other things in the implications of this title, is the unique knowledge that both the Father and the Son has of the other because they are Father and Son (Reymond, 1998:219-221). The term “the Son” of “the Father” in the gospels clearly indicates that Jesus Christ is “deity incarnate” (Reymond, 1998:227). Boice adds that He spoke of God as “my Father” and claimed to be “one” with Him (John 10:30) – clear claims that He was deity (Boice, 1986:274; cf. Ryrie, 1999:286).

Fourthly, Jesus claimed to do things that only God can do. Reymond links this point with the previous one, but this author has separated them in order to more easily incorporate the other two authors into this list. He verbally pardoned people of their transgressions “against God” (Matthew 9:2; Mark 2:5; Luke 5:20; 7:48), and demonstrated that forgiveness by eating with “sinners” (Luke 15:1-2) (Reymond, 1998:232). Christ gave “eternal forgiveness” (Mark 2:1-12) (Ryrie, 1999:285). In John 14:13-14, He said that prayers should be addressed to Himself and that He would answer them – a response that would require being able to listen to all of them simultaneously (Reymond, 1998:232-233). He did not refuse the praise and adoration of children in Matthew 21:16 during the “triumphal entry” and then pointed critics to Psalm 8:2, which speaks of youngsters adoring God (Reymond, 1998:233). In words that would be blasphemous, that is, that he was deity, Jesus told the disciples to make Him the “object” of their “trust” (John 14:1) (Reymond, 1998:233-234). The reciprocal of this truth is that He can give eternal life to anyone He desires (John 5:21) (Ryrie, 1999:285). The many miracles that Jesus performed pointed to His Divinity (Reymond, 1998:557; cf. 553-554). The promise to send the Holy Spirit after He Himself had left, is a claim of deity (Boice, 1986:273-274). He will “raise the dead” (John 11:43) and be judge of all (John 5:22, 27) (Ryrie, 1999:285). These actions were understood by Reymond, Boice and Ryrie to make the claim that Christ is God.

A number of divine attributes were exhibited by Jesus during His Incarnation, which constitutes a fifth proof of His deity. He claimed omnipotence and an “absolute sovereignty” over all creation (Matthew 11:27; 24:30; 28:18; John 5:21, 22, 27-29; 10:18; 22, 27); omnipresence

(Matthew 18:20; 28:20); and omniscience (Matthew 11:27; John 1:48) (Reymond, 1998:234-235; cf. Boice, 1986:272; Ryrie, 1999:285). Ryrie adds eternity to this list (John 8:58; 17:5) (Ryrie, 1999:284).

Reymond (1998:237-311) gives an extended discourse on the opinion and evidence of the New Testament writers and shows that collectively they wrote in “support of the full and unabridged deity of the Son of God”. This extended piece of evidence forms a convincing sixth proof of His deity. Boice (1986:268-271) focuses on Paul, strongly indicating that according to Philippians 2, Christ is equal to God. He also mentions that Paul teaches the deity of Christ in all his epistles (Boice, 1986:270).

A seventh line of evidence is provided by New Testament writers who apply Old Testament Yahweh references to Christ (Reymond, 1998:311-312; Ryrie, 1999:286). A representative example of this would be Paul’s application to Christ in Romans 14:10 and Philippians 2:10 of Isaiah 45:23, which says that “every knee shall bow” and “every mouth shall swear” before Yahweh (Reymond, 1998:311-312; cf. Boice, 1986:269). Boice (1986:274-275) also mentions the John 8:57-58 claim by Jesus that He is “I AM” (Exodus 3:13-14).

The eighth point: Reymond (1998:312) cites nine occasions in the New Testament in which the writers speak of Christ as *Theos*. Perhaps the classic example of this is found in John 20:28 in which Thomas adores Jesus calling Him “my Lord and my God” (cf. Boice, 1986:275). Reymond concludes that “Jesus Christ is divine in the same sense that God the Father is divine”. Although coming from a slightly different angle, Boice (1986:271-272) supports this notion when he cites John 1:1-2, 14 as being a “categorical statement” of the deity of Christ. He also uses John 1:1 to demonstrate that Jesus Christ was a distinct Person in the Godhead.

Ninthly, Reymond (1998:211) cites the resurrection of Jesus as evidence of His deity. This will be covered later under a separate heading.

The tenth proof is the “I am” collection of sayings by Jesus, for example, John 14:6 and 8:57-58. These are clear claims of His divine nature (Boice, 1986:274).

Under Section 2.5.1.2, mention was made of Kenyon’s doctrine of the Trinity as it related to Christ’s deity. A representative statement of the doctrine of the Trinity from a Reformed perspective follows.

Reymond (1998:207-209) points out that although the Trinity was not mentioned in the Old Testament in nearly as much detail as it was in the New Testament, the believers of that time

did have clues to the “personal manifoldness in God”. In fact, he suggests that the writers of the New Testament saw no “incongruity” between their understanding and that of the Old Testament. After citing many biblical examples, he settles the argument by saying that the New Testament “assumed” the Trinity rather than proved it, because the doctrine was “already on the scene”. Later, he pointed out that during the Incarnation, Jesus’ teaching on the deity of Christ and the “personal subsistence” of the Spirit of God, along with what was already known about the Father, drew all the fragments together. Therefore the Trinity was “a given” by the time the first Christians began to “formulate their understanding” (Reymond, 1998:211). Ryrie (1999:59) suggests that the doctrine of the Trinity is in “seminal form” in the Old Testament and questions whether we could “know” it without the “flowering” that took place in the New Testament.

More direct quotations than normal are cited in the following section as the wording of this doctrine is so critical. Reymond gives the following succinct summary of the Trinity:

Three propositions (or doctrines) are essential to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity: (1) there is but one living and true God who is eternally and immutably indivisible (the doctrine of monotheism); (2) the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are each fully and equally God (the doctrine of the three Persons’ “sameness in divine essence”); and (3) the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are each distinct Persons (the doctrine of the three Persons’ “distinctness in subsistence).” These three concepts represent in capsule form the biblical doctrine of the Trinity (Reymond, 1998:205-206, excluding footnotes).

At the end of this quote, the footnote read: “To deny the first proposition is to fall into the error of tritheism; to repudiate the second is to embrace some form of essential subordinationism within the Godhead; to reject the third is to embrace some form of modalism” (Reymond, 1998:206). Modalism may include the teaching that the Father in a different “form (Son)” became “incarnate and suffered”. It sometimes includes the teaching that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit were “only different designations of the one personal God” who at different times revealed the one God as Father or Son or Spirit in different “modes of revelation” (Reymond, 1998:597).

Boice (1986:110-112) agrees that God is one. Subsequently, he answers a potential tritheism accusation against Christianity by explaining that the word in Deuteronomy 6:4 for “one”, “*echad*”, is used of a group of similar items meaning they are “one in unity”. He goes on to deny modalism, the concept that this one God has three different ways of manifesting Himself. He also refutes the idea that there are “three distinct beings with different natures within the Godhead”. Each person of the Godhead has His own “knowledge, feelings and ... will” yet they are “identical”.

In the third and fourth centuries there were a number of controversies, among them Sabellianism and Arianism. The resulting debate led to the “First Ecumenical Council” and the

Nicene Creed of 325 A.D. While this statement “affirmed” the Trinitarian beliefs of the early church, it also added both clarity and definition to the Trinitarian doctrine (Reymond, 1998:317-318). Later in his treatment of the Trinity, Reymond (1998:321-323) explains input from the Nicene and Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creeds. While there is a repetition of some of the points already made, the following explanation is added: the three distinct Persons have been in the Godhead “eternally”; each Person is “fully God”, not one third of God; the three together do not constitute “a greater divine being” than one “viewed singly”, nor one alone less than the three together. Furthermore, “because the three Persons are as real and eternal as the one divine being which each possesses is real and eternal”, we must also understand each as being “distinct (*not* separate) ‘egos’, with each possessing his own distinguishing incommunicable property which differentiates him from the other two”, yet at the same time not seeing them with respect to each other “existing independently”. Reymond (1998:319) explains that in the fourth and fifth centuries the concept of “ego” designated “roles”. He added that it was only later that theologians came to understand it as meaning the “center of self-consciousness”.

There is much more that can be said regarding the Trinity, but this is sufficient to represent the Reformed position. In the next chapter, it will be compared with the concept set forth by Kenyon in the previous chapter.

### **3.2.2 The Humanity of Christ**

In the Incarnation, the eternal Son “took on Himself humanity”, something He had not done previously (John 1:14). His “humanity was sinless” (Romans 8:3) (Ryrie, 1999:277; cf. Reymond, 1998:546). This section deals with the reason for the Incarnation and how it took place.

#### **3.2.2.1 The Reasons for the Incarnation**

While Reymond does not devote a specific section to this subject, his comments do include two key thoughts. Firstly, the Incarnation occurred because in God’s plan, it was the “appointed time” for it. He goes on to specify the world situation and how the scene had been set for this intervention by God. Secondly, Jesus came for “our salvation” (Reymond, 1998:545-546; cf. Boice, 1986:556).

Boice (1986:286-287) gives one major rationale for the Incarnation of Jesus: “the atonement”. He came to die for the men who “were to believe in him”. Boice also suggested two lesser

reasons for Jesus taking on humanity and coming to earth: it was to show the human race that God had not “abandoned” us but still chose to love us, and to reveal that He is able to “understand” our plight and “sympathize” with us. Having given the minor reasons, he again stressed “the atonement” as the key reason (Boice, 1986:288). The Heidelberg Catechism (Anon, 1563: Lord's Day 5-6), a major historic statement of Reformed Theology, agrees with the points made in the summary of Boice, mentioned in the following two paragraphs.

For Boice (1986:289-290), the atonement and the Incarnation must be evaluated jointly so as not to deform either doctrine. Salvation had to be achieved by a God-man since no one else could meet all the demands of God. God both began and completed the plan, because of His love, and to satisfy His “justice”. In this plan, God satisfies his righteous anger against sin so that His love can effectively save sinful man. This raises the final non-negotiable truth in the whole matter: the substitute for man had to be human as he needed to be the “representative” for the race. These requirements give the reason for the Incarnation — it was the only way to save man.

God did not love man because he was lovely, but despite who we were, Calvary reveals the love of God in its purest form (Boice, 1986: 331-332). The cross event, which could only be accomplished through an Incarnation, did not change God's outlook toward sin or us, but rather, provided the way for God's love to remove sin eternally, in Christ (Boice, 1986:332-333). The Incarnation therefore satisfied God's justice, demonstrated His love, and enabled the salvation of man.

Ryrie (1999:281-282) gives seven reasons for the Incarnation. Firstly, it was to manifest God to man. While nature revealed Him to a limited extent, the Incarnation increased the revelation by demonstrating the “essence of God, though veiled” (John 1:18; 14:7-11) in the Son. Secondly, it gave us a “pattern” or “example” by which to live (1 Peter 2:21; 1 John 2:6). The third reason is the same as that for Reymond and Boice above, that is, to provide a Saviour — someone who could pay for sin forever. Fourthly, the Incarnation provided someone to eternally sit on the throne of David (Luke 1:31-33). Fifthly, Satan had to be beaten in his sphere of influence, the world. Therefore, Christ came to earth in order to “destroy Satan's works”. Hebrews 4:14-16 provides the sixth reason: a “sympathetic”, that is, “tested as we are”, High Priest was needed for man. Finally, a “qualified” Judge was needed. This Judge could silence man's excuses because He is human, and could judge in truth and justice because He is God (John 5:22, 27).

### 3.2.2.2 The Virgin Birth

Much Scriptural evidence points to the virgin birth of Christ: Isaiah 7:14; Matthew 1:16, 18, 20, 22-23, 25; Luke 1:27, 34, 35; 3:23. Mark 6:3; John 8:41; 9:29 suggest there was something abnormal about the event. He had either a “virginal” or an “illegitimate conception”. The Bible clearly points to the virgin birth (Reymond, 1998:547-548). Reymond (1998:548-549) also indicates that the church fathers, and the creeds and confessions of the church over “twenty centuries” all uphold the virgin birth. However, Reymond (1998:550-552) warns that it is not yet a definite fact that the sin nature is passed on only through the male of the species, as the female is also a sinner and both are the parents of a normal human child. Since woman contributes to the nature of the child as much as man, he questions whether the virginal conception of Jesus with its “elimination” of the “male factor”, prevented Him from receiving our fallen nature (Psalm 51:5). He believes that it was a unique work of God over and above the virginal conception that prevented Jesus from possessing a fallen nature. If it was in fact a purpose of the virginal conception, he suggests that it was not the primary reason. With that warning in mind, he makes the point that the virginal conception did not in any way compromise the “full and true humanity” of Jesus. It was the means by which “God became man”, the means by which the “eternal Son and Word of God, took into union with his divine nature in the one divine Person of the Son our *human nature* (not a *human person*)” [*emphasis in original*].

Boice (1986:556) calls the virgin birth “a supernatural or miraculous event”. To deny it is to diminish the God-man Jesus to a solely human status.

Ryrie (1999:277-278) shows that “*almah*”, “virgin” in Isaiah 7:14, is only used to refer to a “young” female who is a “virgin” and that Matthew (1:23) sees Christ as the “fulfillment” of the Isaiah “prophecy”. He therefore concludes that Isaiah “foretold” the “means” of the Incarnation, that is, the virgin birth of Christ. The later statement by the angel to Mary focused on the fact of “divine generation” rather than the “method” of the same (Luke 1:35) (Ryrie, 1999:279). He adds that the virgin birth was not necessarily the way Christ was kept free from sin, but it certainly pointed to the fact that the baby was one of a kind (Ryrie, 1999:279; cf. Reymond above).

### 3.2.2.3 The Nature of His Humanity

The humanity that Jesus adopted was demonstrated in numerous events during his life: He exhibited tiredness (Mark 4:37-38), thirst (John 4), saliva (Mark 9:6), and sorrow (John 11:35), amongst many other human characteristics (Reymond, 1998:546-547; cf., Boice, 1986:281-284; Ryrie, 1999:286-287). He was crucified, and while on the cross, blood and water came from his

pierced side (John 19:34). He had “a full complex of human attributes”, and was “fully and truly man” (Reymond, 1998:546). For Reymond (1998:552), the body that Jesus had was human just as any other human’s body was human. He “shared” our “humanity” (Hebrews 2:14) and was “‘like’ us in every way” (2:17). Boice (1986:284-285) adds that He is similar to us in that He experienced “temptation” (Hebrews 4:15; Matthew 4:1-11) and “suffering” (Luke 22:39-46). Yet, as has already been stated, Christ was without sin in His humanity (Ryrie, 1999:277; Reymond, 1998:546). While it cannot be demonstrated with a specific quotation or reference, it must be said that none of the authors under consideration mention a change occurring in Christ’s sinless state during the entire time of His Incarnation, even when He was made sin for us.

### **3.2.3 The Union of Deity and Humanity of Christ**

Neither Reymond nor Boice deals with this subject *per se*; however, Reymond makes some relevant interesting comments in his explanation of the Transfiguration of Christ. The man Jesus Christ transfigured Himself and three of His disciples saw Him in His “‘unearthly’ radiance”. They briefly saw His “sovereign power and glory” (Reymond, 1998:561). He specifies the brightness of His face and garments and links it with “His glory” and “majesty” (2 Peter 1:16) (Reymond, 1998:563-564). He adds the word of the Father from the cloud that says that Jesus is the Son of God (Reymond, 1998:564). The implication of all this for our purposes is that while Jesus was a man standing before the disciples, His divine glory briefly shone, thereby revealing that He was both God and man at the same time. Later, in dealing with some errant thinking, Reymond (1998:615-622) clearly states that he agrees with the statement of the Council of Chalcedon whose definition he summarizes and which is worthy of full inclusion:

The Definition is quite positive in what it asserts about Christ, declaring that he is (1) one person who is (2) both truly divine by virtue of his Godness and truly human by virtue of the virginal conception, who is also (3) both consubstantial with the Father according to his deity and consubstantial with us according to his humanity, (4) with the distinction of his two natures being by no means taken away by their union in the unity of his person, but (5) the properties of each nature being preserved and (6) concurring in one person, that is, in one subsistence (Reymond, 1998:620).

Ryrie (1999:286-289) dedicates a section to the “hypostatic or one-person union” of the human and divine natures of Christ. In describing Christ’s human nature, he says that His humanity was “complete” — “including both material and immaterial aspects” (Matthew 26:38; Luke 23:46). Therefore, it was not the case that his human nature provided His “body” and the divine nature His “soul and spirit”. The word “nature” is defined as a composite of characteristics. Therefore, He “retained” in one person the complete composite of divine characteristics and all

the composite of human attributes that would be typical of a perfect human. The divine and human natures did not make Him into two persons. He added that there was no “mixture” of the two natures, no change in either composite, and no “separation” of them so as to make two persons. “Jesus has two natures comprising one person or hypostasis forever.” Nor, he adds, could characteristics be “transferred” from one nature to the other as this would change the mix of the composite and thereby the nature. However, at times he performed actions “predicated” on the “whole person”, for example, “redemption”; at other times, on the divine nature, for example, “pre-existence”; and yet others, on the human nature, for example, hunger. Thus, in each action, He demonstrated a characteristic of a particular nature that was involved in the action. “Of course, Deity does not die or thirst, but the person, Jesus Christ, the God-man, did both.” Finally, it is said that Christ had two wills, one divine will and one human will, and each decision made came from either will or a “blending” of the two (Ryrie, 1999:286-289).

Later, it will be seen how important this union of the two natures in one person is with regard to the unique doctrinal distinctives of E.W. Kenyon (cf. Section 2.5.3, and the sections following).

### **3.2.4 The Kenosis of Christ**

The “Kenotic” theory suggests that Christ “emptied” Himself (Philippians 2:7) of some of His divine characteristics, for example, omnipresence and omniscience, during His Incarnation (Reymond, 1998:616). In dealing with this concept, Reymond (1998:616) argues strongly that for Christ to “divest” Himself of any feature of His deity, He would no longer be divine, as the “attributes” cannot be separated from the “divine essence”. Instead, the “essence” is demonstrated in the complete package of “attributes”, rather than an almost complete set. He reminds that the Incarnation involved “addition” not “subtraction” — He did not stop being God when He took on a human nature. He is fully God and fully man in one person. Reymond cites numerous examples from Scripture that support this statement, one of the most dramatic being Hebrews 1:3 which speaks of Christ on the cross dealing with our sin, while at the same time maintaining all things running “by the word of his power” (Reymond, 1998: 616-617). For Reymond, (1998:620) problems in this matter of doctrine are caused by allowing one’s thinking to become biased against one respective set of biblical support for either the humanity or the deity of Christ. He further suggests that it is the latter error which is most prevalent today, specifically that Christ’s deity is considered to be a legend of the early church. Finally, Reymond (1998:615) indicates in a footnote that it is “faulty exegesis” of Philippians 2:7 that results in the erroneous “Kenotic” thinking above. For him, the passage refers not to “emptying” but rather to Christ “‘pouring himself out’ in death as our high priest”.

By approaching the explanation from a different angle and expressing certain factors in a different manner, Ryrie (1999:299-302) agrees with Reymond above: Christ was deity eternally; if being in the “form of God” meant that He was less than “fully” God, then likewise being in the “form” of a servant meant that He was less than a servant (Philippians 2:6-7); He added humanity (albeit sinless) so that He could die (Isaiah 53:12), yet without “subtraction of Deity” or any of its characteristics; and, the “emptying” was voluntary. The fact that Ryrie and Reymond approach this subject from different angles and yet agree so completely, adds considerable weight to the Reformed position that they both hold.

### **3.2.5 The Impeccability of Christ**

Perhaps the most succinct summary of the Reformed position under evaluation is to say that Christ “lived a sinless life” (Reymond, 1998:88). For our purposes, there are two major implications in that simple statement: firstly He was “sinless”, and secondly, He was “sinless” for “life”. When Jesus added human nature to what He had eternally been (divinity) (Reymond, 1998:546), not a human “person” (Reymond 1998:552), that additional nature was “sinless” (Reymond, 1998:550). His discussion on the “virginal conception” of Jesus the man, concludes that this means of taking on humanity resulted in Him being fully human, yet “sinless” (Reymond, 1998:550-552; cf. 616). Christ gave Himself for our sins on the cross (Reymond, 1998:617). The sins of our race were “charged” to Christ, who paid the penalty for us. Since he was obedient to the Father, He therefore did this without sinning (Reymond, 1998:633; cf. Ryrie, 1999:303).

Subsequently, Reymond (1998:633-634) reminds one of the sacrificial side of Christ’s offering of Himself on the cross. The Old Testament sacrifice had to be perfect, it could not be flawed (Exodus 12:5; 1 Peter 1:19). So, for Christ to go to the cross as a sacrifice, He had to be perfect, that is, “sinless”, in order for our sin to be imputed to Him in a way that was “acceptable” to God.

Finally, Reymond (1998:618) states that Christ was a “true man” before and after he rose from the dead, and that He will continue to be such for all eternity. Tying all that Reymond has said together, this means that from the moment Christ took on humanity, from that point forward into eternity, His humanity was and will always be, sinless. Ryrie (1999:303) agrees, as he avers that, “at every stage of His life, infancy, boyhood, adolescence, manhood, He was holy and sinless”. Ryrie (1999:303) adds that it was agreed that Christ was “innocent” a total of eleven times during His trials and Crucifixion. 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Peter 1:19; 2:22; Hebrews 4:15; and, 1 John 3:5 are given as evidence of His sinlessness (Ryrie 1999:303-304). He also notes

that the physical limitations, for example, being tired, parched or famished, were not acts of sin (Ryrie, 1999:303).

There is one final matter to mention under this heading, that is, the temptation of Christ (Matthew 4:1-11). For Ryrie (1999:304-305), the temptation of Christ, while representative of the temptation that is common to all mankind, was specifically targeted at a God-man. The temptations to “turn stones into bread” or to launch Himself into the sky, or to be offered earthly “kingdoms”, were not for normal men, but were designed to test His Messiahship, and thus they constituted “real” temptations. Since they were true temptations, He was later qualified to be a “truly sympathetic High Priest” (cf. Boice, 1986:284-285). Due to His constitution as the God-man, He could be tempted (His human nature was temptable), but the total person (God-man) could not sin as He did not possess a sin nature, that is, He was impeccable.

### **3.2.6 The Earthly Life of Christ**

#### **3.2.6.1 The Events of His Life**

The events of Christ’s life are relevant in a study of Christology for a number of reasons. For the sake of space, as these points emerge under other headings, three reasons will be posited and affirmed with examples, rather than exhaustive referencing, found in each of the three authors under consideration. Firstly, He demonstrated His worthiness to be the Saviour (e.g., Boice, 1986:288-291; Reymond, 1998:623-625; Ryrie, 1999:281). Secondly, His life provided an example for us to follow (e.g., Boice, 1986:309-310; Reymond, 1998:232-234; Ryrie, 1999:281). Thirdly, He gave His teachings during His lifetime (e.g., Boice, 1986:273-275; Reymond, 1998:624; Ryrie, 1999:286).

#### **3.2.6.2 The Offices He Occupied**

During His work, Christ held three offices: prophet, priest and king (Boice, 1986:295-296; Reymond, 1998:623-624; Ryrie, 1999:292). He fulfilled the office of prophet by representing God as He proclaimed God’s “message” for the present and the future, and is presently fulfilling it through His Spirit working with that message today (Deuteronomy 18:15; Luke 4:18–21; 13:33; Acts 3:22) (Reymond, 1998:623-624; cf., Boice, 1986:297-301; Ryrie, 1999:292-296). Ryrie (1999:308) adds that He was proved to be God’s true Prophet by the resurrection, as He had previously predicted that He would rise (Matthew 20:19).

The priestly office involved His offering of Himself as a substitutionary sacrifice on the cross and his present time “intercession” for His children (Psalm 110:4; Hebrews 3:1; 4:14–15; 5:5–6; 6:20; 7:26; 8:1) (Reymond, 1998: 623-624; cf., Boice, 1986:301; Ryrie, 1999:296-297). Boice (1986:301-304) adds a number of facts that will become important in the next chapter. Unlike the Old Testament priests, Jesus was “perfect” and therefore did not need “atonement” to be made for Himself (Hebrews 7:26-27). His sacrifice was also “perfect”, consequently, it could both pay for sin and “remove” it — “Christ’s death was the actual atonement on the basis of which alone God declares the sinner righteous” (Hebrews 9:11-14). Lastly, the sacrifice of Jesus was “complete and eternal”, which is why He is presently “seated” on the “right hand” of the Father (Hebrews 10:12-14). He reiterates: Jesus is “the only, perfect, all-sufficient sacrifice for sin on the basis of which God counts the sinner justified”. Finally, Ryrie (1999:297-298) details Christ’s priesthood as it conforms to the order of the Melchizedekian priesthood (Genesis 14:18-20; Hebrews 7:1-3) (cf., Reymond, 1998:631-632): it is a “royal” order, unconnected to parentage (Hebrews 7:3), without recorded beginning or end and superior to the Aaronic priesthood — Abraham from whom Levi came, acknowledged this in Genesis 14:20.

For Reymond (1998: 623-624; cf. Boice, 1986:301-304) (Isaiah 9:6–7; Psalms 2:6; 45:6; 110:1–2; Luke 1:33; John 18:36–37; Hebrews 1:8; 2 Peter 1:11; Revelation 19:16) Christ exercises the office of King by calling to Himself, governing, preserving, and protecting His children. He also orders all things to achieve His glory and takes vengeance on those who refuse to obey Him. He (1998:994) further sees the rule of Christ as being both present (in “grace”) and future (cf. Boice, 1986:309) (in “judgment”, “power” and “glory”). For Ryrie (1999:298), Christ as King is summarised by five words: “promised, predicted, proffered, rejected, and realized”. Similar to Reymond, He also sees broadly both a present and future aspect of Christ’s Kingship.

### **3.2.7 The Crucifixion**

In chapter two, an outline was followed which specifically served the theological system of E.W. Kenyon. From this point forward in this chapter, a broader outline will be followed, which means that certain sub-points from chapter two will not feature here. Some of the issues that Kenyon afforded a more lengthy treatment are covered in a different manner by the Reformed authors. Therefore, a broader outline serves both the purpose of presenting the Reformed position and the subsequent purpose of evaluation in chapter four.

For Reymond (1998:624-625), the “cross work” of Jesus Christ is “central” to Christianity. This is because the second person of the Trinity, who “became flesh”, “died” and accomplished

salvation there. He emphasises the obedience of Christ to the Father in various aspects of this “cross work” (Reymond, 1998:628-663).

God’s “inviolable holiness and righteousness” require that anyone who hopes to be “accepted” by Him must be as perfect (Reymond, 1998:666). Therefore, Christ needed to go to the cross because man in Adam rebelled against God in the Garden of Eden (Boice, 1986:312-313) and fell short of the required standard. This sin earned the “wrath” of God which demanded that a “judicial punishment” (Reymond, 1998:639) or price be paid, that is, death – either of the sinner or of Christ (Boice, 1986:312-313). The required penalty was also expressed in terms of “the curse of the law” or “just condemnation” (Reymond, 1998:657). Unless a qualified substitute could be found, the only result for sinful man was “eternal perdition” (John 3:16) (Reymond, 1998:666).

The Old Testament offers a clear insight into the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross: the sacrifice had to be “without blemish” (Exodus 12:5); the sin of the sinner was reckoned to the sacrifice; the sacrifice stood in place of the sinner as a substitute; the sin of the sinner was cancelled or “expiated” by the blood, even death, of the sacrifice. In a similar manner, Christ was a sinless perfect sacrifice, had the sin of sinners imputed to Him stood as a substitute for sinners, subsequently cancelling their sins (Reymond, 1998:634-635). This is known as a “vicarious atonement” (Reymond, 1998:644). Boice (1986:316) adds that Christ was “one with mankind”, that is, He had a human nature, and so qualified to stand for the human race. As our representative, He “fully paid the penalty for our sin and thus fully discharged the debt which our sin had accrued before God” (Reymond, 1998:640).

The motivation for Calvary is love. In love, the Father chose to save, and the Son chose freely and willingly to obey, within the Father’s will. This means that in love Christ chose to withstand “vicariously” the wrath of God against sin (Reymond 1998:643). The high cost paid on the cross is an indication of God’s “infinite love for sinners” (John 3:16; Romans 5:8; 1 John 3:1; 4:10) (Reymond, 1998:666; cf., Boice, 1986:318). In harmony with these thoughts, the Bible teaches that Christ was both “offered up” (Hebrews 9:28) and “offered himself up” (Hebrews 7:27) in our stead (Reymond, 1998:631).

Another accomplishment of Christ’s death on the cross is “propitiation”. As already seen, God’s wrath had to be poured out against sin. This is where Christ, the God-man, stepped in and the wrath of God was poured out on Him. He therefore died. At this point, God’s wrath is said to have been “propitiated” — “quenched”, “abolished”, “pacified” — by Christ’s death. God is now in a position to love sinners and to save them (Boice, 1986:312-315). “Propitiation” therefore has a “Godward reference”, as it is God’s holiness that was “offended” and it is He who must be

“satisfied”, not man (Reymond, 1998:639-640). God’s holy “alienation” from and “enmity” toward man was “removed” by the death of Christ in our place (Reymond, 1998:644). Our sins were also said to be “expiated”, cancelled, by the death of Christ (Reymond, 1998:634, 636-639). A result of all this is that God was reconciled to man by the cross work of Christ (1 Corinthians 5:17-21) (Reymond, 1998:647-648). Therefore, by the time Christ physically died on the cross, the Father was “propitiated” — no further punishment or payment was needed.

A further achievement of Christ’s death was “redemption”. Whereas “propitiation” averted God’s wrath against sin, “redemption” speaks of buying back a person from bondage (Boice, 1986:311). A ransom price is involved in the concept of “redemption”. In this case the price required was the shed blood, that is, sacrificial death, of the representative. Jesus gave Himself to be the ransom price on behalf of sinners (Reymond, 1998:653-654; cf. Boice, 1986:326). This price having been paid meant that forgiveness was possible (Luke 22:37; cf. Isaiah 53; 1 Peter 1:18-19); an eternal “redemption” (Reymond, 1998:653-654). He is also said to have redeemed us from the “curse of the law” so that there is no “condemnation” awaiting those in Christ Jesus (Romans 8:1) (Reymond, 1998:657).

To whom was the ransom paid? In the early church era and until the middle ages, some suggested that the ransom for man was paid to the devil (Boice, 1986:311; Reymond, 1998:656). Boice (1986:311) called this idea “bizarre”, while Reymond (1998:657) pointed out that it slowly vanished as a doctrine because it was not found in the Bible. He adds that there is no question but that the ransom was paid to God as His “holiness and justice had been offended by man’s transgression of His law”.

Satan exercises sway in the world albeit within parameters designated by God (Reymond, 1998:659-660). In accord with Genesis 3:15, and contrary to a dualistic view, the Bible teaches that Satan will be “crushed” by Christ and has already been knocked back by the cross work of Christ: his forces have been “fragmented” (1 John 3:8c); he has been shown to be inferior to Christ in “one-on-one conflict”, and his forces know they serve a beaten leader (Matthew 12:29; Luke 11:21-22); he has lost his power, the fear of death, over believers (1 Corinthians 15:24-26); he has been judged (John 16:11); his accusations against sinners have been “disarmed” (Colossians 2:13c-15); and, he will be destroyed (Hebrews 2:14-15) (Reymond, 1998:661-663). While some of these speak of actions that are yet future, the cross was the event that decided their outcome. Without denying the devil’s present impact, it is a fact that the cross has already limited his influence. Further, it was the cross event that secured Christ’s victory over Satan.

As already established, Jesus became a man so that He could die for the human race. In answering the question whether Christ was a coward when He prayed in the garden of

Gethsemane and asked the Father to take the “cup” from Him, Boice (1986:319) responded that it was more than merely a physical death with which the Lord was faced. The matter which concerned Him most that night was the spiritual death that was about to become His. He was to be “separated” from God because He was “bearing” our sin, and so was about to experience the wrath of God. Therefore Boice links the spiritual and physical death of Christ (cf. Reymond, 1986:602). Reymond (1986:667) speaks of the “cry of dereliction” by Christ on the cross just before His death when He became our sin-bearer, when He was “rejected” by God. Therefore, this cry was just moments before He gave up His life in physical death (Matthew 27:45-50). Similarly (Boice, 1986:201, cf., 157), when Adam sinned his spirit died immediately, with the result that his “communication” and “fellowship” with God were instantaneously terminated. Ryrie (1999, 253) clarifies this: death is “separation”. Spiritual death is therefore a “penalty related to inherited sin” and indicates that “separation” has taken place from “the life of God”. This would mean that when Christ was made sin, Ryrie believes that He was separated from God and therefore was spiritually dead.

Neither Boice nor Reymond mention any changes in the nature of Christ at the time of His death on the cross. Boice (1986:327) confirms this when he explains that only God can save us, implying that the man who died on the cross had to be God (cf., Boice, 1986:202). For Boice, this means that deity did not leave Christ on the cross. Reymond (1988:614-614), in his concluding remarks on his explanation of the contribution to Christology of the Definition of Chalcedon, leaves no ambiguity that he stands in agreement with its statement. With regard to the two natures of Christ, the Definition of Chalcedon does not allow for “confusion”, “change”, “division”, or “separation” (cf. 609). It would therefore stand to reason that Reymond does not countenance any change in the nature (both divine and human) of Christ on the cross.

The work of Jesus the Christ on the cross has paid the price for the sin of the human race, and enabled God to be reconciled to man. God is satisfied. This is because the death alone was sufficient to pay for the sin of mankind.

### **3.2.7.1 Events between the Cross and the Resurrection**

As just articulated, the Reformed writers have established the case that the full payment for sin was made on the cross when Jesus shed his blood and died both spiritually and physically as a substitutionary atonement. This has spawned two results that affect this section: they have not needed to develop a post-cross doctrine of payment, and in accordance with the silence in Scripture, they have written very little on this period between the cross and the resurrection.

However, there are some brief statements in their writings from which a response can be constructed.

There is one mention in Reymond (1998:668-669) which alludes to Christ going to hell. Unfortunately it is a quote of 5 words<sup>6</sup> from another author (Calvin, 1997:II.xvi.19) in the midst of an extended quote that makes a totally different major point — the sufficiency of Christ. Further, Reymond gives no explanation of the 5 words, nor even second mention of them. Therefore one cannot conclude whether he agrees or disagrees with the 5 words or the concept of Christ going to hell.

It was mentioned in the previous section that Boice (1986:311) disagrees with the idea of a payment for sin being made to Satan. He further states that God was propitiated, not man (Boice, 1986:312). The propitiation for sin was accomplished by Christ (Boice, 1986:313). Reymond (1998:657) adds that the ransom was paid to God as He was the “offended” party. While these points do not speak to the matter of Christ going to hell after His death on the cross, they do make it very clear that the payment was to satisfy God's wrath against sin. This therefore precludes the need for Christ to make any payment to Satan, let alone to have to go to hell to make this alleged payment.

Ryrie (1999:605-607) deals with the matter of the immediate destiny of the Old Testament saint upon death. Included in the treatment is the question of whether between His “death and resurrection” Christ went to collect the souls of these saints from the “saved compartment” of Hades. He refutes the idea of Christ doing this by explaining two passages: Ephesians 4:9 is not saying that Christ went to Hades but that He left heaven and came to the “lower parts” of the cosmos, that is, “the earth” (an appositional usage of “the earth”); 1 Peter 3:18 is not speaking of a supposed announcement in Hades by the Lord, but rather a reference to His preaching through Noah to those of that time who are now imprisoned because they rejected His message.

There being no hard evidence and one denial, it would seem prudent to conclude that the three authors under consideration do not agree with the conception that Christ descended to Hades or Hell and suffered or even announced anything to the residents thereof. When combined with the previous section, that full payment was made on the cross, this would appear to be a more than reasonable conclusion. A corroboration of this conclusion stems from the Heidelberg Catechism (Anon, 1563: Lord's Day 16, Question 44) which responds from an established Reformed perspective regarding Christ's descent into hell. Its interpretation is that it refers to His

---

<sup>6</sup> “in His descent into hell”.

“inexpressible anguish, pains, terrors, and hellish agonies” during His entire time of suffering, “but especially on the cross” (Psalm 18:5, 6; 116:3; Isaiah 53:5, 10; Matthew 26:38; 27:46; Hebrews 5:7). Therefore, even this landmark of Reformed dogma does not consider this a literal descent into hell by the Saviour.

One final matter that fits into Kenyon's theology between the cross and the resurrection must be addressed: that is the re-birth of Christ in hell. The case has been made in both this section and the previous one that Christ did not need to go to hell and did not go there. Further, there is no mention in the Scripture of Christ being born-again, let alone of this taking place in Hell or Hades. Therefore the Reformed writers do not speak to this matter, and it is concluded that if they had, they would have opposed it on the basis of lack of scriptural evidence.

### **3.2.8 From the Resurrection to the Ascension**

#### **3.2.8.1 The Resurrection**

This doctrine is critical in the thinking of the three Reformed writers. They are unanimous in their affirmation that this is a non-negotiable doctrine. For example, Boice (1986:341) asserts that “The resurrection is the historical base upon which all other Christian doctrines are built and before which all honest doubt must falter”. In this section, their collective evidence for the resurrection is summarised. The theological implications of this watershed event is considered in a later Section (3.2.8.4).

Reymond (1998:565) sets the stage by explaining the expectation of the general populace of Jerusalem with regard to resurrection. Resurrection was not what Jews of that day were anticipating, not because they did not believe in the concept (cf. Daniel 12:2), but because they only expected it at the end of the time. Further, in Jerusalem, the very “politico-religious centre” of Judaism, when the disciples started claiming that Jesus had risen from the dead, their teaching offended the minds of the nation.<sup>7</sup> Reymond therefore illustrates that the surprise factor of the resurrection contributes to its authenticity.

Genuineness of testimony is also noted by Boice (1986:349) who cites the gospel records as the first evidence of the resurrection in that they set out what transpired. The four different accounts agree on the details of this event in an unusual manner, yet they are not exactly the

---

<sup>7</sup> In supporting this expectation, Reymond notes that although many Jews of the era did believe in the resurrection of the dead (cf. Acts 23:6-8), the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection was obnoxious to them because of how he had died i.e., under God's curse ((Deuteronomy 21:23).

same, as they would be if there had been a conspiracy of deception, but essentially the same, while containing unique detail that suggests 4 different eye-witness accounts (Boice, 1986:349-350, 352; cf. Reymond, 1998:570-571). This authenticity is important to Boice (1986:349, 352).

The testimony of the empty tomb is preceded by an interesting collaboration of the surprise factor: that at least five women on their way to the tomb to finish the preparation of the body, with their major concern to remove the stone (Boice, 1986:350-351). When they arrived and saw that the stone had been moved, they sent Mary Magdalene back to tell Peter and John. Shortly after this, they entered the tomb and discovered that the body was gone, yet the grave clothes remained (John 20:3–9) (Boice, 1986:351). The disappearance of the body of Jesus from the grave on the third day is reported in all the Gospels (Matthew 28:6; Mark 16:5–6; Luke 24:3, 6, 22–24; John 20:5–8) (Reymond, 1998:566).

Various explanations attempt to explain away the resurrection as the cause of the empty tomb. Ryrie (1999:309) mentions the bribe that the guards were given by the chief priests not to broadcast it (Matthew 28:11-15). Instead, they were to say that the disciples had stolen it, which if true, would have resulted in the punishment, even capital punishment of the guards for failure to perform their duty (cf. Reymond, 1998:566-567). Despite this inconsistency, the story developed that the disciples had stolen the body. After revealing the errors in this same suggestion that the disciples had removed the body, Reymond (1998:566-567) also refutes two other robbery theories. The Jewish leaders did not steal the body because when the response to the Christian message became more popular, they would have had to merely produce the body to silence it, which they could not do. Finally, professional grave robbers would not have stolen the body in that they would have had to take away a naked corpse as the grave clothes had remained in the tomb.

Another attempt to explain away the resurrection is the theory that Jesus had just passed out on the cross, appeared to have died, later revived in the grave and then rolled the stone away — the so called swoon theory (Boice, 1986:352-353; Reymond, 1998:567-568) as proposed by H.E.G. Paulus (1761–1851) (Osborne, 1998:323). This defies credulity as it means that the Roman executioners had erroneously pronounced His death, a badly wounded and exhausted Jesus moved the stone silently, evaded the guard, and then fooled the disciples that he had risen (Boice, 1986:352-353; Reymond, 1998:567-568).

The evidence left in the “not quite empty tomb” also points to resurrection. Boice (1986:353-354) explains the eastern burial customs and cross references them with the funeral procession in Nain and the death of Lazarus (John 11:44). The customs were the same, and involved the insertion of spices in the folds of the burial cloth which covered the body up to the shoulders. A

separate cloth covered the head and neck. The wording in John 20:5-7 specifies that the burial cloths were “undisturbed” and that the head cloth was in a separate place as if still around the face (Boice, 1986:355). For Boice (1986:356), this is evidence that the body had not been moved or taken, but that it had “passed through” the cloths. This would be consistent with the abilities of the “resurrection body” (Ryrie, 1999:310). Ryrie also points out that all previous “resurrections” were “restorations” of a person to their existing human body. Jesus had a “new kind of resurrection body”. Therefore even the evidence left in the grave refutes the other theories and points rather to resurrection as the explanation for the disappearance of His body.

After Jesus had risen bodily from the dead, He was seen by a significant group of witnesses. The sheer number and variety of these events is compelling proof that He had indeed risen (Ryrie, 1999:309). He continues that when Peter preached the resurrection of Christ on the Day of Pentecost, he was in Jerusalem where there were still witnesses there who could corroborate the claim (Acts 2:32). Ryrie (1999:309) and Reymond (1998:569-570) mention an order of the appearances. Reymond (1998:570) explains that the appearances were to “individuals”, small groups, males, females, in “public”, in “private”, at various hours of the day, and in both Jerusalem and Galilee. The widespread nature of the appearances constitutes strong proof of the resurrection.

The disciples witnessed the death of their Teacher and were distraught. Boice (1986:340) explains that their faith was “profoundly shaken” with the result that they began to “scatter” to their former homes. Three days later, an incredible transformation began to take place. Reymond (1998:565) says that despite “threats, bodily persecution, and martyrdom” they did not cease proclaiming the resurrection. Peter and James are among those examples listed by Boice (1986:358) as having exhibited such a change in both attitude and behaviour. Only the sight of the resurrected Jesus could have accounted for such a dramatic change (Boice, 1986:358-359) and is therefore further evidence of the resurrection.

Jews were commanded to rest on the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath. After the resurrection of Christ, Christians, who were initially all former Jews, started to worship on the first day of the week, Sunday, despite the fact that it was a normal working day (Acts 20:7) (Boice, 1986:310, 359). Boice (1986:359) maintains that the only way to explain this change is that it occurred on account of the reality of the resurrection (cf. Reymond, 1998:571).

The evidence for the resurrection of Jesus has been summarised. The significant effort that the three writers made to defend this doctrine perhaps presents a clue to its importance to them: they defend it as if their eternities depend on it.

### **3.2.8.2 The Presentation of His Blood in the Holy of Holies.**

Having already established that full payment for sin was made on the cross, it should be no surprise that the Reformed writers do not major on this issue. In fact, it is only Reymond who makes any comment at all.

The Old Testament tabernacle in its time resembled that which was yet to come. The basis for its organisation was a plan that God revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai (Exodus 25:9, 40; 26:30; Acts 7:44), which also constituted a “copy and shadow” of the heavenly sanctuary (Hebrews 8:2, 5) (Reymond, 1998:532). While discussing the redemption price, Reymond asserts that Christ entered the Holy of Holies “once for all” by means of His own blood with the result that everlasting redemption was procured (Hebrews 9:12) (Reymond, 1998:654). The sanctuary thus entered was the heavenly one, which He entered as the High Priest of saved man (Hebrews 8:2, 5) (Reymond, 1998:532). The Holy of Holies was the cross (Reymond, 1998:1043). This entry occurred when He took up the function of High Priest and “Mediator of the new covenant” (Reymond, 1998:1043), that is, at his ascension (Reymond, 1998:1041). His purpose for entry, among others, was to purify the heavenly sanctuary, not with animal blood, but with His own (Hebrews 9:12, 24) (Reymond, 1998:1041).

While the payment was made on the cross, and redemption fully secured, the blood of the Son of God had to be presented in the heavenly Holy of Holies. This process was accomplished on the cross and completed when the risen Christ re-entered heaven.

### **3.2.8.3 The Announcement in Paradise**

In Section 3.2.7.1, doubt was cast on the concept that Christ went to Hades after His death on the cross. The current question is whether He went to Paradise to make an announcement of the redemption.

With regards to the destiny of the dead soul before the final resurrection, Ryrie (1999:605-607) discusses the conception that there were two compartments in Sheol, the lower for the unbeliever and the upper for the believer. He concludes that there is only one level in Sheol (Ryrie, 1999:606-607); that Sheol is the place where the unbelieving dead go to wait for the Great White Throne judgment (Rev 20:13) (Ryrie, 1999:605); that Paradise is the “presence of the Lord” (2 Corinthians 12:4); and, that the Old Testament believer went straight to the “presence of the Lord” (Ryrie, 1999:606-607). It is in this discussion that he mentions Luke

23:43 in which Jesus tells the thief on the cross that not only will he go to Paradise that same day, but that He will see him there at the same time (Ryrie, 1999:607).

Therefore, there is no need for Christ to go to Paradise to collect the souls of the dead saints, nor is there any reason to make an announcement to them about the redemption as they are already in the “presence of the Lord”. There is one additional point, derived from Ryrie above: Jesus expected to be in the “presence of the Lord” that same day, even while His body lay in the grave.

#### **3.2.8.4 The Implications of the Resurrection**

At this point a change in the order employed in chapter 2 takes place. When presenting a Reformed statement of dogma, this seems the most natural place to deal with this topic, hence the change in order.

In his presentation, Reymond explains the “cross work” of Christ as a whole unit of accomplishment (e.g., Reymond, 1998:663-669). A consequence of this approach is that while defending the historicity of the resurrection (Reymond, 1998:565-575), he does not single out its implications. Silence from him in this section should therefore not be interpreted as his disagreeing with the Reformed position.

The first implication of the resurrection is found in the lives of Christ's disciples. While their faith had been devastated by the crucifixion, they were totally changed when they saw that Jesus had risen bodily from the dead. Therefore the truth of Jesus' resurrection has the power to transform lives (Boice, 1986:340, 358-359). The second implication is that it not only proves that God exists but also that He is the God revealed in the Bible. Nothing and no one else can explain the supernatural raising of Jesus from the dead (Boice, 1986:341-342).

During His lifetime, Jesus made some amazing claims (cf. Section 3.2.1.2). He claimed that he was equal with God (Boice, 1986:342), and He predicted His own resurrection (Boice, 1986:342; Ryrie, 1999:308). He was either “deranged” (Boice, 1986:342), a “liar” (Ryrie, 1999:308) or speaking the truth. Therefore the third implication of the resurrection is that it affirmed His deity (Boice, 1986:342). Ryrie (1999:308) adds that it proved that He was a “true Prophet”. It also indicated that He was both “Lord and Messiah” (Acts 2:36) (Ryrie, 1999:311). Finally, the resurrection proves that Jesus was also the “Son of God” (Romans 1:4) (Boice, 1986:342-343; Ryrie, 1999:311). Boice (1986:342) adds one last point, that since God the Father was involved in raising Jesus from the dead, it was therefore “God's seal on Christ's

claim to divinity”.

Fourthly, the resurrection body made its first appearance. Prior to His resurrection, all resurrections were merely “restorations” to a previously existing body. At His resurrection, Jesus rose with a human body but it was also an “eternal body” as it would never perish. Jesus was the first to reveal this “prototype” body. During His post-resurrection appearances, He was recognised in the new body by others (John 20:20). This body also demonstrated a number of evidences that it was still physical in nature: the wounds from the cross remained (John 20:25-29; Revelation 5:6), he could eat (Luke 24:30-33, 41-43), and it comprised “flesh and bones” (Luke 24:39-40). Yet it was also different: it could go through walls (Luke 24:36; John 20:19), “appear and disappear at will” (Luke 24:15; John 20:19) and seemed not to need nourishment or “sleep”. After death, believers will also possess resurrection bodies. Similarly to Christ's, they will resemble their earthly bodies (1 Corinthians 15:35-41; 1 John 3:2) (Ryrie, 1999:310-311; cf. Boice, 1986:363). The resurrection was key to this new body.

Fifthly His resurrection was essential to His post-resurrection, present and future ministries. If He did not rise from the dead, then none of these would be possible for He would have been dead, and His ministry would have ceased (Ryrie, 1999:308, 311). The sixth implication is simple yet profound: without the resurrection there would be no gospel. The gospel is predicated on two critical factors: the Saviour's death and resurrection. Without both, it is not the gospel (Ryrie, 1999:311).

The seventh implication is in the same vein of thought as the sixth: the resurrection is the visible proof that God accepted the atoning sacrifice of His Son for our sin, and therefore proof that believers in Christ, have in fact been “justified” (Romans 4:24-25). The fact that God raised His Son from the dead, said that Jesus was still without blemish and therefore did not sin on the cross. Therefore, the resurrection ended the speculation: it truly demonstrated that God had indeed accepted the work of Christ on our behalf. We can therefore have confidence in our salvation (Boice, 1986:344).

Eighth: the resurrection is the substantiation that believers in Christ can live a life that is victorious over sin and “pleasing” to God. When measured by God, no “good” is found in the natural man. However, all who are joined to the risen Christ are able to live a righteous life, because He enables us (Romans 6:4; Ephesians 1:19-20) (Boice, 1986:344-345).

The resurrection of Jesus shows that death is not the conclusion of this life. The ninth implication is therefore that we can be certain that life continues after physical death for those who are joined to Christ (Boice, 1986:345-346). If Christ had not risen there would be no hope

for believers, and our message would be unfounded (1 Corinthians 15:13-19) (Ryrie, 1999:308). The conclusion of this point is that for all who are joined to Christ by faith, death has been defeated by His resurrection (Boice, 1986:345; Reymond, 1998:662).

The tenth and final implication of the resurrection is the “pledge of a final judgment” which will fall on all those who are outside Christ. The future judge rose from the dead as a sign that He was God's appointed judge (Acts 17:31). This means that physical death is not the end of all things for the lost; the judgement comes and then eternal punishment. His opponents thought they had defeated Him when He was crucified, but the resurrection proved that death was not the end for Christ. The resurrection shows He is alive to judge and will indeed judge at the end (Hebrews 9:26-27) (Boice, 1986:347-348).

The resurrection, therefore, constituted the proof of the claims of Christ and provides the certainty for all those who are joined to Christ. Until the resurrection, it could be said He was little different from all the other false Messiahs, but the resurrection was the acid test. The implications of this event are eternally profound.

### **3.2.8.5 The Ascension**

Many Scriptures refer to the return of the Lord Jesus Christ to heaven. All three Reformed authors refer to the following passages: Luke 24:51; John 6:62; 20:17; Acts 1:9; Colossians 3:1; 1 Timothy 3:16. There are a total of 58 other unique verses cited by at least one and sometimes two of these authors, which refer directly or indirectly to the Ascension (Boice, 1986:361-362; Reymond, 1998:575-576; Ryrie, 1999:311). There is therefore strong attestation to the Ascension in the Bible.

The Ascension itself took place on the Mount of Olives (Acts 1:12). Jesus lifted up from the Mount “as if supported by the cloud” (v. 9) on His way into the sky. The Scriptures imply the disciples were able to follow Him as He moved, until He was lost from their sight. At that time, two angels told them that he would come again just as He had departed (v. 11) (Ryrie, 1999:311-312).

Reymond (1998:576-578) outlines the objections of some critical scholars who do not countenance the entrance of any “supernatural” manifestation in the affairs of life, and who therefore object to a literal understanding of the Ascension. He also responds to those objections and concludes that these scholars simply do not trust the Scriptures.

There are certain implications of the Ascension of Jesus Christ. Firstly, a “physical” separation between Christ and His disciples began, but no such break in spiritual fellowship would ever take place (Reymond, 1998:578). Secondly, the Messiah returned to heaven. Boice (1986:362-363) observes that heaven is a “real place”. In addition to the witness of the Scriptures, he makes this deduction based on the reality of Christ in His Incarnation, the reality of His resurrection body and the consequence that He must have gone to a “real place”. He also notes that Christ went to prepare an abode for the disciples (John 14:2-3). He concludes therefore that Jesus is there and that it is a real place.

Thirdly, He is now seated to the right of the Father in heaven (Hebrews 1:3). This is the place of honor, and favor. It also speaks of His “authority” (cf. Mathew 28:18-20) over the church and the world (Boice, 1986:363-364; cf. Reymond, 1998:579). The fact of His being seated in heaven, would also presuppose that He had been allowed back into heaven. Fourthly, after returning to heaven, Christ could begin new ministries on behalf of His children and the cosmos (Ryrie, 1999:312). Boice (1986:363) specifies the continual “sending” of the Holy Spirit and Christ’s interceding as two of the new ministries post-Ascension.

A fifth implication is that Christ will return from heaven as Judge at some point in the future. There has to be a time when the “great and holy God” judges sin, a time of “ultimate justice” (Boice, 1986:366; cf. Acts 1:11).

A final conclusion that can be derived is with regard to the “cloud” of Acts 1:9. It has already been established that the Reformed writers under consideration disagree with the concept of Christ collecting the souls of dead saints from an upper section of Sheol, called Paradise, and leading them to heaven. The “cloud” could not therefore be a symbolic term for this group of saints being led to heaven by Christ, as they are already in God’s presence. Consistent with this, when speaking of the upward journey of Christ, Ryrie (1999:312) did not give any meaning to the cloud other than its function of receiving Christ and apparently carrying Him on His way.

There is strong evidence to support the Ascension. It definitely is the capstone on the work of the Incarnation as it speaks of the successful completion of the task by Christ, in that He was allowed back into heaven – an entrance that could only be possible if He was free of all taint of sin. The Ascension is therefore the Father’s rubber stamp on the earthly ministry of Christ.

### **3.2.9 The Present Ministry of Christ**

The first action in what is called the present ministry of Christ, was for Him to keep the promise

He made during His Incarnation to send the Holy Spirit (John 14:16–18, 26; 15:26; 16:7). While this happened on the day of Pentecost and is technically a “past ministry” of Christ (Ryrie, 1999:313), Boice points out that there is also a “continuous sending” during this age, that is, Jesus keeps sending Him to perform His will (John 16:7) (Boice, 1986:363). The Heidelberg Catechism adds that this involves the abundant giving by the Spirit of “heavenly graces” to His children (Acts 2:33; Ephesians 4:8), and His guarding and keeping them in the face of every foe (Psalm 2:9; 110:1, 2; John 10:28; Ephesians 4:8) (Anon, 1563: Lord's Day 19, Question 51). Therefore, the localised Incarnational ministry of Christ in the past is extended worldwide by the Spirit of God in the present.

His second ministry, presently in progress, is as “Head of His Body”, the church (Ephesians 1:20-23). He inaugurated the body on the Day of Pentecost when He sent the Holy Spirit to unite them into the body (Acts 1:5; 2:33; 1 Corinthians 12:13) of God (Ryrie, 1999:313). As “Head”, He cares for His body by sanctifying it on a continual basis (Ephesians 5:26), by giving gifts (Ephesians 4:7-13; 1 Corinthians 12:5), and by enduing it with power (John 14:17; 15:1-10) (Ryrie, 1999:314). The Heidelberg Catechism (Anon, 1563: Lord's Day 19) adds that the Father “governs all things” through Christ, in His capacity as “head” of the “church” (Matthew 28:18; John 5:22).

His third ministry at present is that of “heavenly” High Priest, interceding for us (Boice, 1986:363; Ryrie, 1999:314-315). This involves asking for needs unknown to us, protecting us, and “cleansing” us from sin (1 John 2:1-2) (Ryrie, 1999:314-315). There are two other priestly functions mentioned: He “sympathizes, succors, and gives grace” to believers (Hebrews 2:18; 4:14-16); and He serves as “Forerunner”, a ministry whereby He affirms our future entrance into heaven (Hebrews 6:19-20) (Ryrie, 1999:314-315).

The final ministry that Jesus performs now is one of preparing a place for His people in heaven (John 14:2-3) (Boice, 1986:363). Reymond (1998:1017-1018) begins with the aspect of His accommodation for those who die before the “resurrection”. He speaks of a lower form of “glory” when compared with “final glory”, but all the same, a place in His presence. Ryrie (1999:315) focuses on the eternal nature of the dwellings being prepared. He also introduces the future ministry of Christ when he says that the rooms will be ready when He comes again to collect His saints.

### **3.2.10 The Future Ministry of Christ**

All the Reformed writers agree that Christ will return to this earth (Boice, 1986:305, 704-707;

Reymond, 1998:1022-1023; Ryrie, 1999:315-316). However, they do not all agree on some of the details (cf. Boice, 1986:704). Since this is a Christological study, only the greater, overarching matters of Christ's future ministry will be presented, and the more debatable areas will be left for a potential future study in the field of Eschatology. It will also be remembered that in the previous chapter Kenyon did not place much emphasis on the future ministry of Christ, therefore, a mere summary of the Reformed statement will suffice for the purposes of this work.

It is agreed that a time will come when the dead will be raised by Christ. For Reymond and Boice the timing is that of Christ's second coming, whereas for Ryrie there are a number of resurrections separated in time (Boice, 1986:711-712; Ryrie, 1999:315; cf. Reymond, 1999:796).

There will also be a time of accountability for both believers and unbelievers. Unbelievers will be judged by Christ and then dispatched to Hell forever (Boice, 1986:711-713; Reymond, 1998:1019; Ryrie, 1999:316). Believers, on the other hand, will be subject to judgment unto reward; their eternal destiny is in heaven with God (Boice, 1986:716; Reymond, 1998:1019-1020; Ryrie, 1999:316).

The conclusion of the future ministry of Christ is His future reign. Ryrie (1999:316) speaks of the kingdom of Christ on earth before eternity future begins, the implication being that this rule will continue into eternity. Boice (1986:705) and Reymond (1998:1022-1023) speak of his reign in heaven in eternity future. All would therefore agree that this life will be summed up and concluded by Christ, and that the sense of future accountability should affect daily living in this life.

### **3.3 Conclusion**

While this has not constituted an exhaustive statement of Reformed Christology, it will still set the stage for the next phase of the work. In the next chapter, Kenyon's Christology will be evaluated from the Reformed point of view which has just been established.

## **4 CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION**

### **4.1 Introduction**

A comparison between the respective doctrinal statements of E.W. Kenyon and the Reformed tradition reveals that there are radical differences as far as Christology is concerned. The problematic elements of Kenyon's Christology were however the direct result of misconceptions in his theological presuppositions. In order to show this link, and in order to logically set forth the Christological errors, this chapter is divided into two components. First, the imperfect foundations of Kenyon's dogma are evaluated, which are: the nature of sin, the nature of man, imputation, substitution, propitiation, and Satan. The evaluation of each of these doctrinal areas will be limited to their non-Christological features in Section 4.2.1, thereby reserving the evaluation of their Christological aspects for Section 4.2.2 . The second section covers the Christological problems to be evaluated: Christ's representation of man, the deity of Christ (immutability), the substitution, the place and timing of Christ's payment for sin, the blood of Jesus, the salvation of Christ, the authority of Satan, and the return of Christ. It is this author's perception that his foundational errors forced Kenyon to have to redefine his Christ in order to accommodate the faulty presuppositions which he was either not willing to relinquish or was too proud to admit that they were erroneous. The unfortunate fact that will be established in this chapter is that his Christology is flawed to the point of being heretical. His Christ could not be the Saviour of mankind.

### **4.2 Kenyon versus Reformed Theology: an Evaluation**

#### **4.2.1 The Faulty Foundations of Kenyon's Dogma**

In this author's opinion, the six foundational level errors in Kenyon's theology are:

##### **4.2.1.1 The Nature of Sin**

In Section 2.4, it was established that when Adam sinned the first time, he became a possessor of the nature of Satan and was in fact "born-again of Satanic Nature". In Kenyon's mind the sin was that Adam handed his God-given authority over creation to Satan. As a possessor of

Satan's nature, he was controlled by his new master, the devil. In Section 2.5.2.2, Kenyon's concept of sin was clarified further, as it was equated with "spiritual death" and Satan's dominion. In Section 2.5.5, the final element of Kenyon's teaching on sin emerged, that is, sickness or disease.

Due to the focus of this study on Christology, a representative Reformed explanation of sin was not given in chapter three, although certain aspects of its Hamartiology were evidenced. Therefore, a succinct statement of the Reformed position on the effects of sin which is relevant to this study is needed.

Reymond (1998:446-449) lists seven consequences of the original sin. First, "legal/moral innocence" and "original righteousness" were forfeited and replaced by "real guilt" and "moral corruption". The latter meant a change had taken place in the "nature" of the original couple; they were now "sinners" who acted in agreement with their new "condition". Second, the "image of God" in man was "fractured and distorted" and an enmity toward both God and other humans resulted. Third, communion between the Godhead and humanity was damaged and "alienation" resulted. This included ejection from both the garden and God's immediate presence. Fourth, creation was "cursed" with the consequence that both nature's and man's "productivity" were reduced. Fifth, Adam and Eve were "judicially condemned" and penalised with both physical and spiritual death. Physical death related to the "body" and spiritual death to the "soul". Sixth, since Adam represented the whole race, his "transgression" was credited to all of his descendants by "forensic imputation", so all were plunged into sin. Seventh, the race needed "divine grace" to overcome the effects of their rebellion against God. Therefore God instituted the "covenant of grace".

Death is "separation". Spiritual "separation" occurred at the precise moment as original sin. The "decaying process" which would culminate in physical death, began at the same instant (Ryrie, 1999:234). Spiritual death also means a "separation" from the "life of God" during one's lifetime (Ephesians 2:1-3), as well as "eternal death", if that status is not remedied before physical death (Ryrie, 1999:253). Boice (1986:201) adds that when Adam's spirit died, his communion and "communication" with God were "broken". His spirit was no longer able to receive "signals" from God, as it had stopped listening to Him (Boice, 1986:203).

The major differences to emerge from the preceding are the widely divergent statements of the effect of sin, specifically the change in nature within human beings. Kenyon's concept that he is born-again to Satan, is very different from the Reformed teaching that man is morally corrupted and is a sinner by nature. For the Reformed, sickness and disease are a result of the fall and are not even mentioned in the sources above, whereas for Kenyon, they are the essence of sin

as part of the nature of Satan. Kenyon has therefore misunderstood the Biblical teaching on sin, and in his attempt to explain the separation between God and man has gone way beyond the Scriptural explanation. The sin nature is not the nature of Satan, but a nature that is predisposed to disobedience against God, and which does not listen to God. It is separated from fellowship with God, and is physically decaying until the ultimate decay occurs, which is physical death. Therefore Kenyon has exaggerated the already devastating effect of the fall by appending an additional effect to the Biblical assessment of our predicament: his erroneous addition is his teaching that man is also born-again to Satan (cf. Section 2.5.7.1). This is an enormous obstacle to overcome, and the consequent effects of this basic error will result in more distortions of Biblical teaching as will be revealed in the sections to come.

A serious student of theology may wonder how a Biblical teacher could make such an elementary error in his formulations. It is the author's opinion that it resulted from two reasons in Kenyon's background. Firstly, in Section 2.3, it was noted that he did not have the benefit of a good education. As simple as this may seem, it means he was not taught to think an issue through to view its consequences in a cause and effect manner. This is evidenced by his misconception that man is born-again to Satan. Later he would discover that he had created such a massive problem that he could apparently only solve by distorting other areas of doctrine as well. These allegations will be demonstrated later in this chapter. The second contributing weakness is found in the same section of chapter two. Kenyon studied the Bible in a non-systematic manner. He lacked the well-rounded grounding that comes from a systematic study of the Word of God and even a basic systematic theology, which has been thought through by students of the Bible. It became an even bigger dilemma when he experienced novel ideas that appealed to his curiosity or imagination. He did not have the grounding to test these against an established doctrinal system and reject them if required, as being outside the realm of Scripture. Since he liked the ideas, they found their way into the theological construct he was building in his own mind. As this process continued he was cornered into some theological abominations. Although he was able to find a way out of those corners, it unfortunately came at the expense of Biblical truth.

#### **4.2.1.2 The Nature of Man**

It was established in the previous section and in Section 2.4, that when Adam sinned he experienced a change of nature. He became a possessor of the nature of Satan, who was also his new master. It is further noted from Section 2.4, that if at a later point in his life Adam had been born-again, he would have experienced another change in nature. This time he would have received the nature of his new Master, God, and this would have happened at the moment

he was born- again. It must also be remembered that Kenyon believed the part of a man that experiences this rebirth is his spirit, not his body.

In Section 2.5.2.3, there emerges in Adam's life another period characterised by a second dominant nature. This was alluded to when describing the similarity between Christ and Adam. Before Adam's first sin he was not subject to "spiritual death". Since Christ had the nature of God in the comparative phase of His Incarnation, by implication, Adam also had the nature of God before the fall. Kenyon does not present any other possibility but the possession of the nature of God or of Satan. The similar changes in Christ will be left to later sections in this evaluation chapter.

From the same section of chapter two it becomes obvious, since Kenyon is trying to solve the problem of a race being subject to "spiritual death", that each human being is born into a condition in which he is born-again to Satan. The solution to this problem, as presented by Kenyon, is for a person to be re-born by Christ, at which time their nature will change from that of Satan to that of God, their new master. It means there are two possible phases in a life, one in which the nature of the person is Satan's and a second in which it is God's. These phases could more accurately be called *nature-master periods*. The implication of this moniker is to emphasise the truth according to Kenyon that each human being is merely a receptacle of the nature of his or her master during a particular phase in life. Therefore, the writer concludes that man does not possess his own nature as his spirit is actually the nature or spirit of his master. That leaves only the body as the part which can genuinely be called human, and so at best in Kenyon, a human being is a receptacle for the spirit of his master. When it is also remembered that Kenyon avers that only the spirit is re-born, not the body, his whole concept of humanity appears to be rather unusual. In the later Section 4.2.2.1, the consequence of this error will become obvious.

There is a parallel to the nature-master periods in Adam in Section 2.5.2.3. Jesus's blood, pre-cross, was not human, but rather came from His Father, God. He was said to have "the life of God". For Him to have had the blood of Adam, would have meant Him being subject to spiritual death. Kenyon taught that at rebirth, each human receives "a change of blood" and that "new life enters ... through his blood stream". He also taught the "union of blood and spirit".

When these ideas are joined, it is realised that not only did the spirit change at the fall and at rebirth, but so did the blood. This blood-spirit link ties in perfectly with the nature-master periods seen above. Kenyon's blood teaching also brings questions to bear on how he defines a human being.

The representative Reformed writers do not find themselves in this same trap – as was seen previously in Section 4.2.1.1. In their view when man fell, he was morally corrupted and became a sinner by nature. However, he was still a man, albeit a damaged one. The nature change they envisaged was not on the same scale as that in Kenyon. Neither did they mention any blood transfusions.

One additional truth on which the Reformed writers all agree is that man is personally responsible for his sin (e.g. Boice, 1986:154-155; Reymond, 1998:372-376; Ryrie, 1999:239, 243). When the implications of Kenyon's theological construct, specifically that man is merely a receptacle for an occupying nature-master, are followed to their logical conclusion, it is realised that God is the one culpable for man's fall into sin. The reason is that Adam's first sin occurred while he was the receptacle for the God-nature, which means that there was a weakness in the nature-master for that period of his life, which failed to prevent him from sinning. Kenyon (1999:45) himself effectively notes as much: "God had created a man in the face of the fact that He knew he would fall. The responsibility of such a creation rested on the Father-God". The net effect of Kenyon's formulation of the nature of man will be seen in Section 4.2.2.1.

#### **4.2.1.3 Imputation**

The previous two sections have revealed Kenyon's erroneous understanding regarding the doctrines of sin and the nature of fallen man. There is another closely related Biblical teaching which Kenyon has misunderstood: the doctrine of imputation. This error duplicates in that Kenyon could neither perceive the imputation of righteousness to man at the moment of salvation, nor the imputation of sin to the race in Adam. If Kenyon had understood this means of changing the state of a person, it is doubtful he would have arrived at the two preceding erroneous viewpoints.

Kenyon's understandings of both the fall and salvation were seen in Sections 2.4, and 2.5.2.3. The exchange of nature and blood, as seen in the previous section, which takes place at salvation in Kenyon's conception, results in his new man being able to stand in the presence of God. The presence of the nature of God or Satan and the related blood-source are the critical factors in Kenyon's mind as he differentiates between a believer and a non-believer, between spiritual life and spiritual death. Finally, in Section 2.5.5, it was stated that sin was not "reckoned" to Kenyon's Christ but rather "He was made to be sin". While this refers to Christ, it shows that imputation (reckoning by judicial declaration) was not part of Kenyon's thinking, and that a nature exchange was his means of solving this problem.

The Reformed writers explain that sin is charged and righteousness is credited to the individual's account by means of a doctrine called Imputation. Boice (1986:205-206) makes an insightful remark when he questions whether there is anything more difficult for a "natural" mind to agree with than the concept of "guilt by imputation". He said it was "offensive" to the world's sense of "justice and fair play" that God judged the whole race because of Adam's sin. For Boice, however, this judgement is true because Adam was the "representative of the race". When he fell, all fell.

Ryrie (1999:256-257) lists three acts of imputation: firstly, of Adam's transgression to all Humanity (Romans 5:12-21); secondly, of the sin of the race to the Saviour (2 Corinthians 5:19; 1 Peter 2:24); and thirdly, of the righteousness of the Saviour to the saints (2 Corinthians 5:21). The first of these was already seen in Section 4.2.1.1, where Reymond's comments were reported, that by means of "forensic imputation" sin was credited to all Adam's descendants because he was their head. The second and third examples are also mentioned in Reymond's (1998:742) explanation of the doctrine of "justification". "Justification" is God's "forensic judgment" concerning the sinner by which he "declares" him to be "righteous" on the basis of both his sin being imputed to Christ, that is, he is "pardoned", and Christ's "perfect obedience" being imputed to him, that is, he is "constituted righteous" (Acts 10:43; Romans 4:5, 6-7; 5:1, 19; 2 Corinthians 5:21).

Therefore, instead of changing the nature of man, the receptacle of the master-nature, at the fall or at the moment of salvation as Kenyon taught, sin was rather attributed to the race in Adam. Later our sin was imputed to Christ's account, when He paid for it with His death, and finally His righteousness was imputed to the believer's account so that God could declare him righteous before Himself. The means of changing the standing of man in Kenyon is therefore incorrect. This is the third foundational error in his dogma.

#### **4.2.1.4 Substitution**

The nature exchange concept employed by Kenyon as the means of making man a sinner, has another consequence in that he has no alternative but to distort the doctrine of substitution. In Section 2.4, it was seen that the part of man which is born-again is his spirit, not his body. This is important to Kenyon because in Section 2.5.5, (cf. Section 2.5.7.1) he taught that sin is spiritual, that the sin problem cannot be solved physically, and that sin and disease which are part of "spiritual death", are also solved at a spiritual level. The implication of this for Kenyon is that when sin and disease have been dealt with spiritually, they have also been addressed at a physical level. As if to corroborate all the above, in Section 2.5.7.2, Kenyon notes that if sin was

a physical thing, then every man could “die for himself” and take care of his sin. Then he reiterates that it had to be dealt with in “the spirit realm”. The “spiritual penalty” had to be paid before substitution could be successful. One final element from Section 2.5.2.3 is required in order to understand the concept of substitution in Kenyon's mind: if the one being substituted for was spiritually dead, then the substitute also had to be an exact likeness, that is, subject to spiritual death. The remainder of Kenyon's understanding of substitution will be evaluated when considering it as applied to the substitution by Christ in Section 4.2.2.3.

In contradistinction, the Reformed writers give an explanation of the general concept of substitution noting several points. In Section 3.2.7, Reymond's (1998:639) viewpoint was reflected which states that sin earned the “wrath” of God. Boice (1986:312-313) specified that the price for sin was death. Reymond (1998:666) added that a man could therefore pay for sin himself, but would necessarily experience the consequences thereof, that is, “eternal perdition” (John 3:16). If however there was a qualified substitute, the payment could be made by the substitute. He also stated that in the Old Testament the sin of the sinner was reckoned to the animal sacrifice, which had to be “without blemish” (Exodus 12:5). He continued the explanation by applying the Old Testament symbolism to Christ, saying the sin was then “expiated” by the blood, even death of the sacrifice. In Section 3.2.6.2, Boice's (1986:301-304) position indicated that Jesus did not need to have “atonement” made for Himself since he was “perfect”. Because of this, Christ was able to both “remove” sin and pay for it. The basis for that payment was His death. The implication of this is that a death could both pay for and remove sin. Ryrie (1999:330) adds that the “innocent” substitute suffers for the sinner (1 Peter 3:18), and that “guilt” can be apportioned to him despite the fact that he never personally sinned.

As was mentioned in Section 4.1, the evaluation of Kenyon's teachings on each of these foundational doctrines will not extend to their Christological facets in Section 4.2.1 and its sub-sections. The evaluation of the Christological aspects will be held back until Section 4.2.2 and its sub-sections. For example the foundational teachings regarding substitution will be evaluated immediately hereafter, but the Christological features will only be evaluated in Section 4.2.2.3.

In Kenyon the substitute had to be of exact likeness as regards nature, whereas the Reformed writers point out that the substitute must be “without blemish”. This means that when sin is imputed to the sacrifice, “spiritual death” as a nature has not come upon the sacrifice, as that would render it blemished so it would fail to live up to the Old Testament precedent and typology. This is a basic error in Kenyon's thinking and invalidates his sacrifice. More will be said regarding that in a later Section, 4.2.2.1.

Although the Reformed writers were speaking of Christ's sacrifice, there was clearly no question in their minds that physical death was both the penalty for sin and the acceptable payment for it. When they spoke of the Old Testament sacrificial system, they did not indicate any need for suffering by animals other than was involved in their physical death. Later when applied to Christ, physical death was again sufficient payment – without any additional suffering. (The fact that an animal sacrifice did not make full and final payment for sin, but only covered it until that final payment was made by Christ, was not mentioned in chapter three. The point the Reformed writers were recorded as making by this author, was that nothing other than physical death was needed to make the payment. In so doing, they have adequately refuted Kenyon's basic misconception as regards substitution. In a later Section 4.2.2.3, that point will be made with relevance to Christ's death).

Finally, Kenyon seems to have had in his mind a certain amount of suffering and punishment that was required subsequent to the substitutionary death with all its inherent suffering. That is why in his mind the post-death spiritual penalty had to be paid before substitution could be completed. In Section 2.5.8.2 it was pointed out that for Kenyon the full acceptance of the substitution only occurred when the blood was presented in the Holy of Holies. The most important aspect for now is that Kenyon has confused the payment for sin (death) with the consequences of death (hell). The Reformed writers agree that physical death with all its inherent suffering, torment and pouring out of God's wrath is the appropriate payment (cf. Section 3.2.7; Boice, 1986:312-313; Reymond, 1998:634, 636-639, 644), whereas Kenyon requires some suffering after death before he is satisfied with the substitution, because he believes post-death torment in hell is part of the payment process.

All three of these errors will be dealt with in greater depth at a later stage (Section 4.2.2.3). For the present, the purpose is merely to show that Kenyon has flawed understandings of what is involved in substitution: the amplification and consequences of his basic errors will later become abundantly evident.

#### **4.2.1.5 Propitiation**

Closely associated with Kenyon's confusion regarding the substitution are his conclusions on the propitiation. It builds from his view on the blood, adds in several other sub-points, and then arrives at his distinctive point of view. In Section 2.5.2.3, it was demonstrated that Kenyon believes a child receives his blood from his father and with it the sin nature, because sin is in the blood. The second factor in his opinion, found in Sections 2.5.5, and 2.5.7.1, is that the sin problem cannot be solved physically. The third factor is the importance he places on the

presentation of the blood (Section 2.5.8.2) as the final act in the whole process of securing salvation. This matter will be considered in Section 4.2.2.5. Fourth, is the point made in the last Section (4.2.1.4), that Kenyon confuses the payment for sin (death) with the consequences of death (hell). Finally, in Sections 2.4, 2.5.2.1 and 2.5.7.2, it was established that Kenyon believes redemption was obtained from the devil. .

At least nine inter-related beliefs of Kenyon support this final position. The first and second are found in Section 2.4: Adam had a God-given dominion which he turned over to Satan; and, his sin caused him to be “born again of Satanic nature”, a possessor of Satan's nature. Third: Satan has power over death (Section 2.5.2.1). Fourth: any person who is Satan's child is in a state of spiritual death, that is spiritually dead (Section 2.5.2.3). Fifth and sixth: sin is spiritual death, and, sin is the nature of Satan (Section 2.5.5). Seventh: sin is a spiritual matter and cannot be paid for physically (Section 2.5.7.1). Eighth: sin therefore could not be paid for on the cross with a physical death, but had to be dealt with spiritually, in Satan's domain, hell (Section 2.5.7.2). A sub-thought there is that Satan would do the punishing, not God. Ninth: the “claims of Justice” had to be met (Section 2.5.7.2). However, it was shown that in Kenyon's mind, the demands of “Justice” were actually the demands of Satan.

While the role of Satan will be considered briefly in the next section and also later in Section 4.2.2.7, the previous paragraph will not only set the background for that, but it also substantiates the importance of Kenyon's dogmatic construct. When critiquing another author, it is easy to elevate a few of his comments that do not contribute to his central argument beyond proportion. To be fair, the greater argument must be considered and the obscure contradictions noted but not highlighted as key issues, if they are not. The author wants it to be crystal clear that Kenyon has not made a few throw-away comments regarding the payment being made to Satan, but rather has built his system solidly around this point of dogma. That focus on Satan is therefore part of his doctrine of propitiation.

The representative Reformed doctrine of propitiation differs from that of Kenyon. In Section 3.2.7 it was pointed out that sin earned the “wrath” of God. His “wrath” demanded that a “judicial punishment” or price be paid. The price was the death of the sinner. In other words, the required ransom price for the sin of man was the shed blood, that is, sacrificial death of the sinner or his representative. The wrath of God was poured out onto Christ on the cross, and when He died as the substitute for man, God's wrath was fully satisfied. Once this price was paid, forgiveness was possible.

Further, as reported in the same section, Boice and Reymond opine that the ransom was not paid to the devil. Reymond avers it is not only a concept which does not appear in the Bible,

but the ransom was rather paid to God since it was His “holiness and justice” that were “offended by man's transgression of His law”.

It is therefore evident that Kenyon had confused the role of the blood in the payment for sin, because he had made a fixed rule in his system stating that physical death was not enough to pay for sin. Furthermore, he is making the payment to the wrong party. It was God, not Satan who was offended by the sin of man and therefore it was God who had to be satisfied. He was also the one who specified the nature of the payment; physical death of the sinner or his representative. The Reformed writers are very clear on the fact that physical payment with its spiritual implications was enough and further, that after this payment, complete forgiveness was immediately possible.

Kenyon's doctrine of the blood is interesting in that he seemed to believe it was very important in the whole process, but he totally misunderstood how. When he linked the sinful nature to the blood, he precluded any possibility of its use in the payment, as he would then have sin paying for sin. Kenyon's focus on the blood in the Holy of Holies will be examined later, in Section 4.2.2.5, but for now it can be concluded that he is building his concept with regard to the role of the blood from flawed foundations .

The point was made in the previous Section (4.2.1.4) that Kenyon had confused the payment with the consequences. It is restated in this section. For Kenyon, the anguish and torments of hell had to somehow be included in the payment for sin in a way that went beyond death on the cross. While this might seem logical in some ways, it is clearly not Biblical. The Reformed writers reflect the Bible when they undoubtedly state that the full payment for sin and the satisfaction of the wrath of God, were ended by the death of Christ on the cross. The penalty was paid completely by the physical death. It is therefore concluded that Kenyon also confused the nature of the wrath of God. Consequently, his doctrine of propitiation is not scriptural.

#### **4.2.1.6 Satan**

In the previous section, there was extensive restatement and collation of Kenyon's beliefs regarding Satan. There is therefore no need to reiterate them here. A separate heading is employed for Kenyon's conception of Satan since the latter is not normally part of the propitiation and since angelic beings are considered in their own sub-section of a written systematic theology.

The matter of the Reformed response to the redemption being from Satan was dealt with in the last section. In Section 3.2.7, it was shown that Reymond (1998:659-663) believes that while the devil has sway in the world, it is within parameters designated by God. He also listed the ways in which Satan has already been set back by the cross work of Christ in accordance with the prediction of Genesis 3:15.

This subject of the role and authority of Satan will be revisited in the second half of this chapter, in Section 4.2.2.7. Since this first section is designating underlying errors in Kenyon's system, one observation made here will be foundational for the later Section 4.2.2.7, that is, Kenyon's doctrinal system depends heavily on the role of Satan as he has given him a high degree of authority. In fact, in Kenyon's works when Adam handed over the universe-wide dominion to the devil, it became obvious that God was now on the outside of the system. This is corroborated by the payment for sin being made to Satan, and the suffering as part-payment required in hell at the hand of Satan, who was also called Justice. There is a marked contrast in the Reformed doctrine i.e. Satan is only allowed to operate within parameters set by God. The conclusion of this section is that Kenyon not only gives a higher degree of authority to Satan than the Scriptures do, but in the universe, Kenyon's Satan also outranks God. This is a very serious departure from the Scriptures. It means the Incarnation problem being solved in Kenyon is more than just a sin problem; it is fundamentally a legal way of placing God back in His own creation and removing power from Satan. How this distorts Kenyon's Christology will be defined in the next section.

## **4.2.2 Christological Problems**

The foundational defects in Kenyon's theology, outlined above, necessarily lead to errors in his Christology. These problems will be delineated in this section.

### **4.2.2.1 Christ's Representation of Man**

The question to be considered in this section is this: According to the Scriptures, was Kenyon's Christ a valid representative for man? Did He qualify to be our substitute?

When He was incarnated, Christ added humanity to His eternal deity. For Kenyon, as pointed out in Sections 2.5.2.3 and 2.5.5, Christ began this period with a body that was the same as Adam's before the Fall. It was not subject to "spiritual death" or "disease". The nature inside Christ at the time was God's and His blood was from His Father. His Master was God. The

second phase of His Incarnation began on the cross when He became subject to “Spiritual death”, and died spiritually. In this process He became mortal, His blood must have changed, He acquired the nature of Satan, sin “impregnated” Him and “penetrate[d] the heart of God, Himself”, and he became subject to His new master, Satan. In a long quotation Kenyon argued that Christ in the first phase of His Incarnation “was not a complete identification with man”, as he did not have “the nature of man”; He only completely identified with man during His time on the cross. Finally, in Section 4.2.1.2 it was concluded that Kenyon's man was at best a body which is a host for the spirit of his master.

The Reformed writers present a different picture of the humanity of Christ and therefore His representation of the race. In Section 3.2.2.1, Boice shows that the Saviour had to be human in order to represent man. In the same section, Ryrie added that a “sympathetic”, that is, “tested as we are”, High Priest was needed for man and also a “qualified” Judge who could silence man's excuses because He is human too. In Section 3.2.2.2 Reymond argued that Christ added to His “divine nature”, by means of the virgin birth, man's “*human nature*” [emphasis in original]. In Section 3.2.2.3, Reymond stated Christ had “a full complex of human attributes”, was “fully and truly man” and had a body that was human just like any other human being's. He “shared” our “humanity” (Hebrews 2:14) and was “like’ us in every way” (Hebrews 2:17). Both Reymond and Ryrie reminded that Christ was without sin in His humanity. None of the Reformed authors mentioned a change in Christ's sinless state during the entire time of His Incarnation, even when He was made sin for us. In Section 3.2.3, Reymond cited the Council of Chalcedon, in particular that Christ is “consubstantial with us according to his humanity,” and that there is no compromise in His “two natures” as a result of their “union in the unity of his person.” Ryrie rejected the idea of His human nature providing His “body” and the divine nature His “soul and spirit”. He said Christ “retained” in one person the complete composite of divine characteristics and all the composites of human attributes that would be typical of a perfect human. The possession of two natures did not make Him into two persons, nor did the two natures become a “mixture”.

Kenyon's concept of human nature is therefore at odds with the Reformed articulation. Simply stated, Kenyon's pre-cross Christ did not have a human nature. He therefore could not have been a representative of the human race. While it could be said the essential representation took place on the cross, a point Kenyon teaches, there is still a problem with the pre-cross phase. It was during this phase he was tested by the devil in particular and as regards the daily grind of living as a human. If He was not human in this phase He could not later qualify to be a “sympathetic” High Priest or Judge. Therefore, even this aspect of Kenyon's non-human-Christ is problematic in the pre-cross phase of the Incarnation.

In the second phase of Kenyon's Incarnation of Christ, when He took on human nature, an even greater predicament arises. This Christ becomes not only tainted by sin, but He also becomes a sinner. The Reformed writers did not allow for this defilement of the Christ. Kenyon's Christ has again disqualified Himself from representing the race. He had to be human but He did not need a sin nature in order to represent man; that is a disqualifying over-representation. This is in agreement with the points made in Section 4.2.1.4, that the substitute had to be "without blemish", and Section 3.2.6.2, that Jesus did not need to have "atonement" made for Himself since he was "perfect".

Therefore, it is concluded that Kenyon's Christ was not able to be the representative of the human race at any time in His Incarnation. Since He was a different kind of "human", He was at best representing a different kind of humanity than ours. This is also another implication of Kenyon's misunderstanding of the doctrine of Imputation (cf. Section 4.2.1.3).

#### **4.2.2.2 The Deity of Christ (Immutability)**

It was established in Sections 2.5.2.3, 2.5.5, and also in the previous section, that according to Kenyon, Christ began His Incarnation in a body like Adam's before the Fall, which had the nature of God. On the cross, He died spiritually when He was made sin, and His nature changed to a human nature, that is, a fallen nature, and Satan became His master. In this way He had finally made complete identification with man. In Section 2.5.7.1, it was pointed out that Christ's deity left Him when He was made sin and it returned when He was recreated in hell.

In Section 2.5.7.2 it was shown that the second nature change of His Incarnation took place. After Jesus had suffered enough in hell, He was "recreated". At that point, His nature changed from the nature of man (Satan) to the "Nature of God", and His deity returned to Him.

Therefore to sum up Kenyon, during His Incarnation there were two nature changes in Christ. In the middle phase He ceased to be God and was rather a man both subject to Satan and a possessor of Satan's nature.

Some of the Reformed doctrines which were summarised in the previous section are again relevant to this section. In Section 3.2.2.2 Reymond spoke of Christ as being both God and man during the Incarnation. In Section 3.2.2.3 it was indicated that Christ was fully human, yet without sin, even when He was made sin for us. Also no changes in His nature were mentioned by the three authors. Earlier in Section 3.2.1.2 it was established that Christ was and is deity. In

Section 3.2.3 evidence was led that during His Incarnation Christ was both God and man, at the same time, in one person.

In Section 3.2.4 it was stated that if Christ was to “divest” Himself of any part of His deity during the Incarnation, He would cease to be divine, as the “attributes” and “essence” of deity are inseparable. The Incarnation involved “addition” not “subtraction”, therefore Christ did not cease to be God when He added human nature to His being. The authors disagreed with the possibility that there was any “emptying” of Christ’s attributes during the Incarnation. He was fully God and fully man for the entire Incarnation.

In Section 3.2.1.2 certain divine attributes were listed as evidence of His deity. Ryrie (1999:285) adds to this list “immutability” (Hebrews 13:8), also noting it was not asserted by Christ Himself, but by “others” with reverence for Him. The propositions of Reformed Christology mentioned in the previous paragraph agree with the doctrine of the immutability of God. The three Reformed writers have much to say about the unchanging nature of God (cf. Boice, 1986:141-146; Reymond, 1998:168-203; Ryrie, 1999:43), and all apply this attribute to Christ as a member of the Tri-unity . Finally, in Section 3.2.7 it was shown that the Definition of Chalcedon did not allow for “change” with regard to the two natures of Christ during His Incarnation.

The foundational theological errors in Kenyon's system (cf. Section 4.2.1) are magnified when they enter the field of Christology. His failure to understand the concept of imputation, resulted in a system of nature change in his man and his Christ. The consequences of that are brought under the spotlight in this section. Kenyon's changing Christ does not conform to the Reformed statement of God, even Christ's, immutability. Kenyon's Christ is host to either God's nature or man's nature, whereas for the Reformed, He is both God and man without change throughout the Incarnation. The refutability of the Kenosis theory by the Reformed writers becomes an authoritative response to Kenyon's nature changes. If any change in Christ means He ceases to be God, then He neither changed His nature on the cross, nor in Hell, as it was the same all the way through. In agreement with the Scriptures, the Reformed uphold the second position, that is, that He did not change, a position that agrees with the immutability of God. Kenyon's doctrine of the traveling deity, if followed to its logical conclusion, would actually result in the destruction of the universe as we know it, as it would implode. Reymond (1998: 616-617) was shown to have made just this point in Section 3.2.4 when he cited Christ on the cross dealing with our sin, while at the same time keeping all things running “by the word of his power” (Hebrews 1:3).

There is one other change that deserves specific comment. In Kenyon, when Christ was made sin he became subject to his new master, Satan. This is an incredible situation, to have God subject to Satan. However, for Kenyon, if one follows the logic of his thought, God is not subject

to Satan at this time as Christ is no longer God: his fallen Christ is not God, he is only a man. The problem with this explanation is that the Second Person of the Tri-unity has ceased to be divine, an impossible situation for one who is immutable. Therefore, the problems just keep mounting when a theologian allows any change to occur in the Godhead, in any of its Persons.

Jesus cannot change during His Incarnation as Kenyon proposes and He cannot cease to be God for even one millisecond. Kenyon's concept in this section is therefore extremely problematic, and very unscriptural.

#### **4.2.2.3 The Substitution**

The first part of Kenyon's thinking on substitution was summarised in Section 4.2.1.4, so only those factors which are relevant to Christ's substitution are added hereunder. The last partial thought in Section 4.2.1.4 is completed in Section 2.5.7.1. This is a key concept for Kenyon: for Christ to be man's substitute He had to become "absolutely human" and be made exactly like man. This Christ was fallen, subject to "Spiritual Death" and his master, Satan. Also in this section, Kenyon taught that the cross work of Christ was not enough to complete the substitution. Ironically, in Section 2.5.2.1 according to Kenyon, the substitute would have to be sinless to provide a legal substitution,. In Section 2.5.7.2 while referring to the spiritual nature of the penalty for sin, Kenyon stated that the satisfaction required was for Christ to both suffer and be punished by "Eternal Justice" in Hell. This ties back to the point made earlier that sin could not be paid for physically.

Just as in Kenyon above, the Reformed doctrine of substitution was largely summarised in Section 4.2.1.4. In Section 4.2.2.2, it was restated that Christ remained God, even when He took sin on Himself. In Section 3.2.7 it was also stated that Christ was a sinless perfect sacrifice who had the sin of sinners imputed to Him, stood as their substitute, and then cancelled their sins. He was said to be "one with mankind" because He had a human nature which qualified Him to stand for the race. He "fully paid the penalty for our sin". The wrath of God was poured out on Christ on the cross and His death satisfied the Father. In Section 3.2.8.5 it is seen that Christ is now seated to the right of the Father in heaven. This is a place of "honor". This presupposes that He was allowed back into heaven and that he was free from all taint of sin.

This section is another in which Kenyon's misunderstanding of the concept of imputation is demonstrated. This is tied up with his error regarding representation (cf. Section 4.2.2.1). For Kenyon the representative had to be exactly like the one he was representing, even down to possessing the same fallen nature. In Section 4.2.1.4 it was stated that for the Reformed, the

substitute animal had to be “without blemish”. When this concept is applied to a human representative, the substitute must be without sin. Christ had a human nature, yet free from sin. When sin is imputed to the substitute, He does not become sinful, but He bears their sin. This is a huge mistake in Kenyon’s works: his substitute was a sinner, and therefore disqualified from representing the race.

A second error in Kenyon, as already mentioned in Section 4.2.1.4 was that physical death was not enough to pay for sin. The Reformed writers argued that the Father was satisfied by the death of man's substitute, Christ, as payment for the penalty of the sin of mankind. Full and complete payment was therefore attained by Christ’s death on the cross.

This leads to the third error, also mentioned earlier in Section 4.2.1.4. In Kenyon, the payment and suffering had to take place in hell, after the physical death on the cross. This conclusion shows a misunderstanding of the wrath of God. In Reformed dogma, the wrath of God was poured out on His Son on the cross and was satisfied when He physically died on that same cross. Another consequence of Kenyon's error will be demonstrated in Section 4.2.2.7.

There is a final ironic point to be made. When Kenyon's Christ became sin on the cross and his nature changed and he became a fallen man, subject to Satan, he was meant to resist his new master and pull off the most incredible rescue act in the history of the race. Since His deity had left him in this phase of the Incarnation, he was equipped for this battle with nothing but himself, a fallen man with the very nature of the enemy he was fighting. If Kenyon had any thought, and it has not been demonstrated that he did, that this Christ would remain sinless and so remain qualified to be a substitute in some improbable way since He had a sin nature and was “impregnated” with sin, then He is asking the impossible. It has already been shown that this version of Christ could not represent the race, but even being gracious to Kenyon and giving him the benefit of the doubt he does not even solicit, his Christ is having to overcome impossible odds for a mere fallen man. The Scriptures teach that is exactly the reason a God-man had to be a substitute, to do for them that which they could not do for themselves. It should also be noted in the Reformed doctrine, that Christ was fully God and fully man throughout the Incarnation. This implies that even if on the cross he was unable, as a man with the sin of the race imputed to Him, to do anything about it, His divine nature would have enabled Him to overcome. Kenyon's Christ did not have this ability. We are asked by Kenyon to believe a most incredible story.

When this section is combined with the earlier one, Section 4.2.1.4, there can be no doubt that Kenyon's conception of substitution is flawed. He has a sinner paying for the sin of the race, an incorrect understanding of the penalty to be paid, and His Christ would never have been

accepted back into heaven, let alone to a place of honour at the Father's right hand, as He would be tainted by sin. Therefore Kenyon's conception of the substitution is not only impossible, it is also not scriptural.

#### **4.2.2.4 The Place and Timing of Christ's Payment for Sin**

Kenyon's concept of sin has been reviewed in many of the previous sections of this chapter, for example, Section 4.2.1.1. The payment for sin was referenced in the previous Section, 4.2.2.3. In Section 2.5.7.2 Kenyon believed that payment for sin must be made to Satan, and therefore the terms "Justice" and "Eternal Justice" also apply to Satan. Kenyon is therefore consistent when he describes hell as the place of suffering. Therefore, after his death on the cross Jesus went to hell to pay the penalty for sin, because hell is the place of man's punishment for sin. In hell, Jesus experiences "agonies", "sufferings and torments" at the hand of Satan and his demonic forces. Another important matter for Kenyon is the duration of this visit to hell: it was 72 hours. When complete payment was rendered to "justice", the suffering ended immediately.

In Section 2.5.8.3 Kenyon argued that Jesus did not see the thief on the cross in Paradise that same day, but rather later in time, which was established as after Christ's resurrection from the dead and before His Ascension. The reason that Kenyon could not place Christ in Paradise at the time between His death on the cross and the resurrection, was that He was in hell during that time. Therefore the issue he makes of the timing of the journey to Paradise stands or falls with the veracity of his concept of the place and timing of Christ's payment for sin. Another reason Kenyon provides for Christ's journey to Paradise was to collect the Old Testament saints and to announce that redemption was complete.

In Section 4.2.1.5 (cf., Section 4.2.2.3), it was shown that death is the required penalty for sin. The Reformed theologians demonstrated that the wrath of God was poured out on Christ while He was on the cross, so when He died, the Father was completely satisfied. Forgiveness of sin was then possible, proving that full payment had been made. In the same section, it was also pointed out that the ransom was not paid to the devil: it was God's "holiness and justice" which was "offended", not Satan's. In Section 3.2.7.1 a case was built stating that payment for sin was made to God on the cross, and He was the one propitiated. Therefore, the Reformed doctrine precludes the need for Christ to go to hell, let alone pay the penalty to Satan while there. Finally in Section 3.2.8.3, Ryrie, representing the Reformed viewpoint, disputed the fact that the Old Testament saints were in a supposed upper stratum of Sheol. Instead he said, Sheol was reserved exclusively for the unbelieving dead. He built a case for Paradise already being in the

“presence of the Lord” so that there was no need to convey saints anywhere as they were already where they needed to be; with the Lord.

In Section 4.2.1.1 it was established that Kenyon has a mistaken concept of sin. The consequences of this foundational error impact the life and ministry of his Christ. The Reformed stance that the one offended and therefore the one to whom the payment for sin must be made is God, not Satan, implies that Christ's mission was to satisfy God. Since God demanded death as the satisfaction for His (not Satan's) wrath against sin, and since Christ made that payment on behalf of the race, God is satisfied with Christ's work on the cross. No payment had to be exacted after the death on the cross. No punishment or torture was needed either as God was already satisfied. Above all, the devil did not have to be paid or satisfied, nor was he authorised to meet out the punishment. More will be said about Satan's role in Kenyon's theology in Section 4.2.2.7.

Kenyon's error on the concept of sin, the identity of the offended party and the means of payment for sin meant he had to place his Christ in hell. It has already been established that he confused the payment for sin and the consequence of dying in sin. The result was that he had Satan administering the punishment in hell after the death on the cross. A man who dies in his sin is destined to eternal death, that is, an eternity in hell. When conceiving his theological system, Kenyon decided that full payment for sin could be made for the sin of the entire race in hell in an accelerated period of time, if it was done by a substitute. Therefore he was so insistent on a 72-hour time period in hell, rather than the normal three-day interpretation, as it offers him an extra 30 hours or more for his Christ to suffer. In his mind he was able to justify 72 hours more than an approximate 39 hours. Nowhere does he refer to Scripture for his reasoning. This is just another example of the strange distortions of theology which were revealed when he attempted to cover over his original mistakes. Effectively Kenyon, not God, decided the time frame for the payment of sin, that is, death and 72 hours of torment.

Therefore it is concluded that Kenyon is mistaken on both the timing and the place of the payment for sin. He has clearly misunderstood the doctrine of propitiation and the role of Satan, among other misconceptions. His whole theory of Christ's journey as well as his conception of Paradise also fails to gain credence since it is established on non-existent foundations.

#### **4.2.2.5 The Blood of Jesus**

In Section 2.5.2.2 Kenyon avers that the blood of man comes from the male sperm, and that the Holy Spirit conception of Jesus would prevent Him from obtaining Joseph's sinful blood. In

Section 2.5.2.3 it is noted that a child's blood comes from his father not his mother. Sin and blood are linked so sin is in the blood that is, the sinful nature is transmitted in the blood. When a man is re-created, his blood changes and with it comes "the life of God", or the nature of God. So fallen man begins life with his human father's blood, and the satanic nature that goes with it, and at salvation, has a "change of blood" and with it, a new God-like nature. Similarly, Christ did not have human blood for the first phase of His Incarnation as He did not have a sin nature during that time. Instead he received blood from His Father and with it "the life of God". He then acquired human blood on the cross, and it was deduced even though Kenyon did not say it, that He again changed his blood when he was born-again in hell.

In Section 2.5.8.2 Christ transported His own "Blood" to the heavenly Holy of Holies, applied it to the mercy seat and presented it to the Father who accepted it. This was the moment when redemption was acknowledged to be complete and was "sealed". The new Covenant was also set up and commenced, as did the new priesthood.

In Section 2.5.7.2 Kenyon stated that redemption would be complete only when Jesus was resurrected from the grave and had taken His own blood to the heavenly temple and it had been received. It is this latter concept that is the issue in this section.

In Sections 3.2.7 and 4.2.1.4, the Reformed explanation of the penalty for sin, it was pointed out that the sin of the sinner was cancelled or "expiated" by the blood, even death, of the sacrifice. The same applied to Christ when He was the substitute: His blood shed as He died "fully paid the penalty for our sin". God was "propitiated" by Christ's death. Later in that section it was said that the price required was the shed blood, that is, sacrificial death, of the representative. When this price was paid, eternal redemption was achieved.

In Section 3.2.2.2 the Reformed writers agreed that the Virgin Birth did not necessarily prevent the transmission of the sin nature from Jesus' physical parents to Himself, as His human mother was a possessor of the sin nature. Rather they believe a supernatural work of God prevented the sin nature's transmission.

Finally, in Section 3.2.8.2 the Reformed emphasis is that full payment was made by Christ's blood shed on the cross. It was noted that Reymond (1998:654) spoke of Christ entering the Holy of Holies "once for all" by means of His own blood (Hebrews 9:12). He said the timing of the entry was at His ascension. The purpose of the entry, amongst others, was to purify the heavenly sanctuary, not with animal blood, but His own (Hebrews 9:12, 24) (Reymond, 1998:1041). Bigalke Jr., (2002:43) agrees when he states that it is not due to His blood being

“preserved in heaven” or “offered upon the heavenly mercy seat” that Christ entered heaven, but rather “His shed blood on Calvary's cross”.

Not all the Reformed beliefs on the matter of the blood are presented in this study. The key element to them is the payment for sin. The Reformed writers are consistent in their understanding that sin was paid for in full on the cross, and Christ's shed blood was indispensable in that payment. If Kenyon is saying that the redemption was only complete when Christ entered the heavenly Holy of Holies, then sin was only fully paid for at that time. He earlier indicated that the substitution was complete in hell, but the redemption would only be completed when the blood was presented and accepted. This is perhaps evidence of some confusion in Kenyon's mind. He knew the blood was important in the Bible but does not seem to fully understand its role.

On further analysis it would seem that there is an even bigger confusion. If as Kenyon says, a physical death cannot pay for sin, and the person who represents a sinner must be a sinner Himself, and the blood was presented after the resurrection, which was after Jesus had been born-again and re-acquired the nature of His new master, God, then which type of blood did He present in the Holy of Holies? It certainly was not the blood of sinful fallen man as Jesus was no longer a sinner when He presented it. Was it the blood of a human body with the God-nature inside it? The question that must be asked is, with Kenyon's de-emphasis of the physical, is that the proper blood to present? Was not the blood Jesus used to cleanse the temple, as Raymond (1998:1041) described it (Hebrews 9:12, 24), the blood of the God-man, Jesus Christ? With all the nature changes and blood changes in Kenyon's Christ, it appears the wrong blood was presented in the heavenly Holy of Holies.

This confusion represented above, is the net effect of an eclectic theological system (cf. Lie, 2008:12) which is based on assumptions and foundations that are either incomplete or false. Bigalke Jr., (2009:52) takes the latter position, since he attributes Kenyon's erroneous stance on the blood to the results of an attempt to “equate” the Biblical teachings with “pagan rituals”. If Kenyon's Christ had the wrong blood that had sin in it, He would not be permitted to enter heaven. The only alternative is a blood that is not human, but the blood of His Father. So Kenyon's payment for sin is lacking the correct blood payment, which means man is still in his sin. Clearly when he conceived this aspect of his religious system, Kenyon did not think through to the end regarding all the implications of his novelties that he had initially employed

#### 4.2.2.6 The Salvation of Christ

In Section 2.5.5 and many other places in this study, it was shown that according to Kenyon, on the cross when Jesus was made sin, He partook of the sin nature, even the nature of Satan, and became mortal. This occurred when he finally made “complete identification” with man. Kenyon taught that after Christ's spiritual death, He was no longer sinless. Lest there be any confusion, in Section 2.5.7.1 Kenyon was quoted as saying that Jesus became “born-again” to Satan. In Section 2.5.7.2, Kenyon explained the salvation of Christ in hell, when He was “recreated”, or “made alive in spirit” and received the “Life of God”.

In Section 2.5.1.2, evidence of Kenyon's modalistic concept of God was furnished. He saw the Godhead as “Three modes of Beings which God is”. In Section 2.5.3 it was shown Kenyon's Christ could move with ease from the sphere of His human ability to the sphere of His deity. It was suggested that his modalistic concept of God enabled Christ to make these changes, which were later shown to be nature changes, during the Incarnation.

In Sections 4.2.1.4 and 4.2.2.3 it was re-stated that for the substitutionary sacrifice to be acceptable to God, it had to be “without blemish” or sinless. It was also demonstrated that, due to the doctrine of imputation, Christ was sinless even when He took sin upon Himself, and did not need to have “atonement” made for Himself since He was “perfect”. In Section 4.2.2.2, it was also shown that He was both God and man for the entire Incarnation. In Section 3.2.1.2, the concept of modalism was shown to be a misunderstanding of the “distinctness” of each of the Persons of the Tri-unity.

The teaching that Jesus had to be born-again is the end result of a long line of errors. Kenyon has built a system in which His Christ is not qualified to represent the race and he needs to be born-again. The Scriptures teach that Jesus Christ went to the cross and took our sin on Himself, without becoming a sinner in the process, and without ceasing to be God or man at any time in the Incarnation. This fulfilled all the Old Testament types and precedents. He paid the debt in full and then rose again from the dead, without ever sinning. The sin of the race was imputed to His account, but that did not make him a sinner. He did not need to be saved from His sin. Rather He went to the cross to save us from our sin as our qualified substitute. The whole concept that Christ had to be born-again is built on a substitute who is sinful and therefore invalid. How can the price for the sin of a sinful race be paid successfully by a man who is Himself sinful, and who is not even a valid substitute? Ironically, Kenyon (1999:46) knows his substitute is meant to be without sin, for he himself says that “therefore, one man without sin shall be able, on legal grounds, to pay that penalty, so the human race shall be declared free from guilt and unrighteousness”. This is an example of Kenyon

representing an orthodox theological position in one place in his writings, which is out of step with the rest of his system. This kind of error is either a result of deceitfulness or a failure to analyse and cross-check his own system for inconsistencies. This author believes it is the latter.

Further, Christ did not need to change natures during the Incarnation as suggested by Kenyon. This is premised on a wrong conception of the nature of man, of imputation and of the Godhead.

The correct answer to Kenyon with regard to the salvation of Christ, is that His Christ was not qualified to be a substitute as He had to be saved from His sin as did the whole human race. The Scriptures teach that Jesus the Christ had no need of salvation, so therefore Kenyon's concept is incorrect.

#### **4.2.2.7 The Authority of Satan**

The high rank Kenyon accords to Satan was discussed in Sections 4.2.1.5 and 4.2.1.6. Essential points stipulated are: Adam's hand over of the God-given dominion to Satan, man becoming born-again to Satan, Satan's power over death, the spiritual nature of sin that means it has to be paid for in Satan's domain, the punishment for sin being administered by Satan, having to meet the demands of "Justice" who is Satan, and the ransom for sin having to be paid to Satan. This enters the field of Christology because Christ's Incarnation entered a world under the dominion of Satan and because on the cross Christ became born-again to Satan, and was even subject to Satan (cf. Section 4.2.2.6). The demands of "Justice", the payment to Satan and his torment of Christ in hell were restated in Section 4.2.2.4.

The authority of Satan in Kenyon is divided into three distinct phases. There is very little written about the pre-fall phase, as noted; however, this is not developed any further. The second phase began when Adam handed over the "Universe-wide" dominion to Satan. It ended and the third phase began when Christ was born-again in hell, "triumphed over" Satan, defeated all his forces, captured the "keys of death and hell" and "stripped" Satan of all his "authority" and "dominion", (see Section 2.5.7.2). At this point even Satan's former subjects who were now born-again became masters over him (see Section 2.5.8.5). An interesting confirmation of this authority is relevant to Section 2.5.7.2 when it was noted that "Justice" was satisfied with the payment for sin. At that moment, God said, "Enough" and the suffering ended immediately. The implication of this is that in Kenyon, God did not have authority over Satan from the time of the fall until full payment had been made to the devil in hell. Christ subsequently gained authority

over Satan with His victory. This is why in Section 2.5.8.1 the legality of the redemption was so important to Kenyon. He wanted to be able to legally place God back in the system. Christ could only rise from the dead if the redemption was legal, paid in full to the right person, so he had no claims over man from then on.

In several previous sections, for example, Section 4.2.2.4, the errors regarding the price of sin, to whom it was payable, and who specified the amount were covered and answered. Suffice to say that God had to be satisfied, not Satan. Also, in Section 3.2.7 it was reported that Raymond (1998:659-663) stated that the devil has sway in the world, but within parameters designated by God (Job 1:12; 2:6; Matthew 12:29; Revelation 20:2-3). It was also established that he listed ways in which Satan has already been set back by the cross work of Christ (Matthew 12:29; Luke 11:21-22; John 16:11; 1 Corinthians 15:24-26; Colossians 2:13c-15; 1 John 3:8c).

Since the doctrine of Satan rightfully falls under Angelology, not all the matters pertaining to Kenyon's teaching on the subject will be evaluated or responded to in this section. However, as mentioned above, there is an overlap with Christology, so certain aspects do require a response.

Kenyon's system has a series of inter-related errors that have already been answered: the result of the fall was depravity, not a born-again-to-Satan status for the race; God, not Satan, was offended by Adam's sin; God made the decision regarding the penalty for sin, not Satan; God's wrath against sin, not Satan's, was poured out on Christ on the cross; the payment for sin was accomplished in full by Christ on the cross, rather than later in hell; God was satisfied with the payment, Satan did not have any say in the matter; and, Jesus was never born-again to Satan. The common denominator in all the answers from the Reformed statement is that God is in final control of all these matters. That means that God is the authority over Satan. A serious student of the Bible will also note Satan's request for permission to torment Job in the book of the same name and the restrictions God places on him on each occasion.

It is erroneous to ever give Satan more authority than God does. Kenyon has made this error in his theology, certainly in the phase between the fall and the so-called re-creation of Christ in hell. Raymond's comments on the limitations imposed on Satan, and those seen in the book of Job, relate to the time period in which in Kenyon, Satan is the authority. Kenyon has made yet another mistake in his theology, to give too much esteem to the enemy. This is why he is so insistent on the legality of the redemption: he is more worried about the enemy than the satisfaction of the justice of God Almighty.

#### **4.2.2.8 The Return of Christ.**

It was noted in Section 2.5.10 that Kenyon explained his eschatological views in one brief mention and two chapters in one of the three books under consideration. It was further observed that Kenyon places emphasis on the experience of the believer, rather than the activity of God in his outline of the future. He mentioned all men kneeling before the Lord and also Christ giving rewards to His church. He also mentioned Christ's rule during a future earthly kingdom. His major emphasis was the joy awaiting the believer in heaven.

A brief Reformed statement was given in Section 3.2.10 in which it was shown that the three authors agreed that this life will be summed up and concluded by Christ. While there are some differences in the details of their statements, there is a strong sense of both future reward and the accountability of Christians for how they lived their lives.

In this chapter, this section is very brief, but still important. Kenyon was not writing a systematic theology, but rather focusing on the current responsibilities and privileges of the believer. The dilemma with this limited focus is that his readers only have a limited motivation to obey the commandments of God. They are motivated to obey based on the promise of future rewards. However, missing is the more foreboding truth that they will one day give account to Him. When a Christian knows that even when no one else is watching, God knows all his actions, and will one day require an accounting of them, it has a sobering effect on a believer. The simple point emphasised in this section is this: Kenyon has an unbalanced theology with a weak stress on the future, specifically on accountability which causes a greater responsibility in this life.

### **4.3 Conclusion**

After comparing E.W. Kenyon's formulation with the long established Reformed tradition, there can be no doubt that there are significant differences. That these are not mere differences of opinion has also been established. The Christ of Kenyon is defective. Kenyon developed a set of doctrines and taught it, but never thought it through regarding logical inconsistencies. Further, he did not compare them adequately with the Scriptures, or when he did, he saw what he wanted to see in the Scriptures and twisted them to fit his own conception. A whole movement, the WFM, has developed on these inadequate foundations and in as far as they believe in the Christ of Kenyon, they are following the wrong saviour, while remaining in their sin. This Christ does not represent our race, is mutable, is not "without blemish", paid for sin at the wrong time and place, did not cleanse humans with his blood, needed salvation himself because of his own sin, is subservient to God's great enemy even to the point of possessing his nature, and finally

does not provide an all-encompassing reason for obedience from man as he leaves open to debate any sense of final accountability to himself or God.

It is therefore concluded that the Christology of the Word of Faith Movement's E.W. Kenyon is scripturally unsound according to a Reformed understanding of Scripture.

## 5 CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In various sections of this study, it has been concluded that Kenyon taught an incorrect doctrine (cf. Gittens, 1990 in Section 1.1.2). The magnitude of his errors only increases when one considers its dissemination. In Section 1.1.1, it was first alluded that the influence of the WFM is not only widespread, but is also growing. Since the doctrine of the WFM is based on the teachings of E.W. Kenyon, (Section 1.1.2), and inasmuch as they still constitute part of the present day WFM message, his influence is therefore also widespread and growing. The ongoing reprinting and sale of Kenyon's books, (Section 1.1.2), confirm this. An interesting illustration of this continuing influence is the fact that the writer bought his copies of Kenyon's volumes from the bookstore of a WFM church less than 10km from his home, and saw many more on the shelf. This study, its findings and conclusions, are therefore relevant to clarify just one of the contemporary false teachings which sidetrack the lost from the true gospel, and church saints from obedience to God.

In Section 1.1.2, it was noted that the proponents of the WFM tend to dismiss older evaluations of their writings. It would therefore be wise to anticipate some opposition to the conclusions contained herein, hence an explanation of the process of this study is in order. Since, as noted in Section 1.1.2, the WFM, and Kenyon in particular, have not written a systematic theology, this work aimed to write one section of it for them. This was accomplished in chapter two. Kenyon's volumes were read several times in order to obtain a general understanding. Subsequently, any statement which related to Christ was gathered, with its extended context, and tagged with an appropriate subject title. Those tagged sections were then sorted into their respective groups. Each group was studied and organised until Kenyon's Christological beliefs in each particular sub-section became obvious. Cross-referencing Kenyon with his own statements clearly revealed the doctrine behind his volumes. His Christology was then recorded. At this point, Kenyon's books were re-read, and the author's written Christology was checked to see whether it is truly Kenyon's. The conclusions of this study are based on the level of understanding of Kenyon gained from this process. While engaged in this process, the author discovered that his factual understanding of Kenyon increased exponentially in the writing of the Christology. He certainly would not have been in a position to arrive at any of the conclusions in this study, if he had not completed an in-depth study of the works of Kenyon. This study was most enlightening.

It is interesting to note in Section 1.1.2, that MacGregor (2007b:55-56) said of the WFM, that because they publicly teach the benefits of their system, it takes time to uncover their doctrine. He also explained that he had listened to broadcasts of certain WFM teachers for about a

month in order to learn their theological “structure”. When the code is broken, a totally different picture emerges than was perceived when initially listening to their preachers (MacGregor, 2007b:55-56). The point is that any followers who have not yet carried out a study to discover the WFM doctrines, or the teachings of Kenyon in as much as they continue to form part of the WFM doctrinal statement, are not in a position to even evaluate this expression of their own system of belief. Christians who do not belong to the WFM will be equally astounded at the outcomes of this study if they have not investigated the WFM teachings.

## 5.1 Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are as follows:

1. (Section 4.2.1.1). Kenyon's position that sin is death that is, the nature of Satan, and that natural man is born-again to Satan, is erroneous in that it is an overstatement of the Biblical teachings. Man is rather morally corrupted and a sinner by nature. He is predisposed to disobedience against God, and does not listen to God. Death is the result of sin, not the definition of sin itself. Kenyon's poor education and lack of systematic understanding of the Bible and theology, contributed to his distorted theological construct.
2. (Section 4.2.1.2). The *nature-master periods* evidenced in Kenyon reveal that man's humanity is just a receptacle of the nature (and blood) of his master, either Satan or God, at a given time in his life and that his spirit is actually the nature or spirit of his master. Therefore ultimate responsibility for sin is necessarily transferred to God. The Reformed stance is that man is a person with a fallen (not satanic) nature, and all responsibility for sin rests on him.
3. (Section 4.2.1.3). Imputation, a “forensic” reckoning of either sin to the race in Adam or of righteousness from Christ to the account of a believer, was not part of Kenyon's thinking. Instead, he explained that when Adam fell, or when anyone believed in Christ, his nature and blood were changed to that of the new master.
4. (Section 4.2.1.4). Since sin could not be compensated for physically and the substitute had to be spiritually dead, Kenyon's substitute was a defective representative for sinful man and therefore invalid. He also taught erroneously that suffering post-death was required as part of the substitution. The Old Testament sacrificial system instructed that the sin of the sinner could be reckoned to the sacrificial representative, as long as it was “without blemish”. Then payment (or covering until the cross) for sin was accomplished by the physical death of an animal, apart from any additional suffering.
5. (Section 4.2.1.5). For Kenyon, redemption was obtained from the devil as the offended party, and fittingly was completed in hell. He therefore was wrong as regards the wrath of God, and confused the payment for and the consequences of sin. The Reformed writers agreed that it was God's “holiness and justice” that was offended, and His wrath was poured out on the

sacrifice. The required ransom price was the shed blood, that is, sacrificial death, of the sinner or his representative. Forgiveness was possible after death.

6 (Section 4.2.1.6). Kenyon's doctrinal system is very dependent on Satan and accords him a high degree of authority. In fact, Kenyon's Satan outranks God. For Kenyon, the Incarnation solved more than just a sin problem, it found a legal way to get God back in His own creation and to remove power from Satan.

7 (Section 4.2.2.1). Kenyon's pre-cross Christ did not have a human nature, neither did his testing as a non-human qualify him to later become either a "sympathetic" High Priest or Judge. On the cross, when Christ was made sin and became a sinner, he was immediately disqualified from becoming a substitutionary sacrifice as he was no longer "without blemish". Therefore, Kenyon's Christ was never able to represent the human race.

8 (Section 4.2.2.2). Christ added humanity to His divinity without ever ceasing to be God or changing either of His two natures from that time onwards to eternity. However, Kenyon's Christ emptied himself of his deity on the cross and became subject to Satan, before experiencing a second nature change in hell. Since God is immutable, and since Christ is God, the two changes in the nature of Kenyon's Christ, mean he ceased to be God. This is an impossible situation for one who is immutable. Therefore Kenyon's Christ is not only problematic, he (deliberate lower-case) is unscriptural.

9 (Section 4.2.2.3). Kenyon's conception of substitution is flawed: he has a sinner paying for the sin of the race, a misunderstanding of the wrath of God, the wrong conception of the penalty to be paid, and a tainted and therefore disqualified Christ attempting to make the substitution. Further he would be unable to do what Kenyon claimed he did, and would not be accepted back into heaven after his Incarnation.

10 (Section 4.2.2.4). Since Kenyon did not understand the doctrine of propitiation, and he added to the Biblical concept suffering in hell for 72 hours, his Christ made the payment for sin in the wrong place, and at the wrong time. His conception of Christ's journey to Paradise also fails because these two misconceptions totally undermine it.

11 (Section 4.2.2.5). This is linked to the nature changes in Christ which have already been refuted. Kenyon does not understand the Biblical concept of blood. He has a misconception of when sin was paid for and of the involvement of blood in the payment. He also misunderstands the purpose of the presentation of Christ's blood in the heavenly temple. The blood of his Christ is not correctly used nor applied, with the result that man is still in sin.

12 (Section 4.2.2.6). The Scriptures teach that Christ went to the cross and bore the sin of the race, without sinning Himself. He did not need salvation; instead as our qualified representative, He provided it. The whole concept in Kenyon's works which argues that Christ needed to be born-again is built on a long line of errors and a sinful substitute who is not qualified to represent the human race. Kenyon's conception of the salvation of Christ is therefore also incorrect.

13 (Section 4.2.2.7). Kenyon attributes too much authority to Satan, from the fall of man to the rebirth of Christ in hell, in that he requires the payment for sin, and he is also the one who administers the punishment for sin. The Bible teaches that the devil had sway in the world in parameters designated by God, and that God has the final authority over Satan at all times. Kenyon is more concerned with Satan than he is with satisfying the justice of God Almighty.

14 (Section 4.2.2.8). Sixteen pages in the three volumes refer to Christ's return and the sequence of subsequent events. It is not a major emphasis in Kenyon's theory, as seen in the three volumes under consideration. Within that brief treatment he focuses more on the reward and especially rewards awaiting believers, and totally omits the future accountability that will encourage them to live a more responsible life now. His brevity on eschatology therefore means his overall system of theology is unbalanced.

15 (Section 4.3). Kenyon's Christ is defective. He is not able to save the followers of Kenyon from their sin. Therefore, in terms of the central theoretical argument of this work, the Christology of the Word of Faith Movement's E.W. Kenyon is scripturally unsound according to a Reformed understanding of the Scripture.

This study has revisited the roots of the WFM, that is, the teachings of E.W. Kenyon. Therefore, this study has articulated the foundational Christological beliefs of the movement. Furthermore, it has revealed major deviances between those foundations and the Reformed articulation of the Scriptures. Therefore, with those erroneous foundations in mind, it is now incumbent on any modern day proponent of the WFM to demonstrate in the subsequent development of their doctrinal system, that they have moved away from and corrected their heretical foundations, so as to move back into the mainstream of orthodoxy. Should they fail to do so, the conclusion that they have a false Christ will continue to be associated with their movement. The warning of MacGregor (2007b:55-56) in Section 1.1.2, that those who continue on this road are going "into a new religion devoid of salvific power", is now even more urgent – eternity is at stake.

This author is very concerned about the deceptive nature of the WFM. Many follow their teachings and are in total denial regarding its non-Christian theology. There can be no greater deception by the enemy of our souls than to convince people through false teachings to believe that they are Christians, when the doctrine they believe makes it impossible. The words of the prophet Jeremiah speak to both the false message of the false messenger, and the follower's false hope and false obedience:

<sup>15</sup> Then the prophet Jeremiah said to Hananiah the prophet, "Hear now, Hananiah, the LORD has not sent you, but you make this people *trust in a lie*. <sup>16</sup> Therefore thus says the LORD: 'Behold, I will cast you from the face of the earth. This year you shall die, because *you have taught rebellion against the LORD.*'" <sup>17</sup> So Hananiah the prophet died the same year in the seventh month. (Bible, 1982: Jeremiah 28:15-17, *emphasis added*).

## 5.2 Recommendations for Future Study

In the course of this study certain issues have come to light that would be worth further detailed examination or study. The following matters are worth investigating in order to expand academic research into the teachings of EW Kenyon of the WFM:

1 Kenyon's emphasis on Paul, the Psalms, and Isaiah. In Kenyon's writings he makes the point from time to time that it was only through the Pauline revelation that the redemption and substitution were revealed (e.g. Kenyon, 2004:109-123; 221-227). However, he then supports some of his key doctrines with references from the Psalms and Isaiah (e.g. Kenyon, 1998:59-67; 2004:231). Isaiah 53 and Psalm 22 are key passages to him in his doctrine of suffering, which he uses to distinguish physical suffering from spiritual suffering (e.g. Kenyon, 1999:274; 1998:43-47, 61; 2004:50, 71, 160, 261). A study of this interesting contrast of emphases could well reveal more of the thinking on which Kenyon's dogma is based.

2 Wesleyan Perfectionism in Kenyon. It was established in Section 2.3 that Kenyon spent some time in his early life in the Methodist church (Anon, n.d. c). Two references in other sources alerted this author to the possible link between Kenyon and Wesleyan Perfectionism. In an announcement and review, at that time, of a recently published book, Congdon (1975:527) stated that Kenyon believed in "sinless perfection (eradication of sin nature)" and related the teaching to AB Simpson. The second reference of interest was in the treatment by Warfield (as quoted by Geisler, 2004:580-584) of Wesleyan Perfectionism in which AB Simpson was again mentioned. Of note was the concept of man controlling God in Wesleyan dogma, which is similar to some of the notions in Kenyon.

3 Arminian influences in Kenyon. In Section 2.3, it was noted that Kenyon was ordained by the Free Will Baptists (Anon, n.d. d), who Enns (1989:489) linked to an Arminian doctrinal stance. Possible Arminian tendencies were seen in Kenyon's concept of the old man and his Satanology. The Arminian influences in Kenyon and the effect on his doctrine, could be an area worthy of further detailed study by a dogmatologist.

4 Confusion of the Covenants by Kenyon. While this author was reading Kenyon's three volumes, he noted that Kenyon appeared to confuse the nature and content of the the Abrahamic covenant and the Mosaic covenant. If this is true it would be another contributing factor to his later construct.

5 Kenyon's view of the Blood. In Section 4.2.2.5, it was noted that Kenyon knew that the blood was important in his Christology but was rather confused as to any further detail. There is

reason to believe that further detailed research could be attempted on this subject as a means of revealing that flawed basis in Kenyon's theory in greater detail than was achieved in this work.

6 Modalism, Gnosticism and Docetism in Kenyon. In Section 2.3, it was noted that Kenyon encountered New Thought while he attended the Emerson School of Oratory in Boston. McConnell (1998:34-51) explains more about the Emerson and New Thought influence on Kenyon. Boice (1986:279-281) spoke of Docetism and Gnosticism and the idea that the Spirit of God came upon Jesus at His baptism and left just before the crucifixion. When linked with the Modalistic tendencies noted in chapter two of this work (cf. Section 2.5.1.2), it could be worth investigating the link back to these old heresies which were spoken against in the early church councils. It is possible that the WFM is a recycled version, albeit with some additional components, of a very old heresy or heresies that have already been responded to centuries ago.

7 Other problematic areas of Kenyon's systematic theology. Since a systematic theology has a number of interconnected components, the fact that problems exist in Kenyon's Christology means that there are most likely problems in a number of other areas of Kenyon's total doctrinal construct. In this study, reference has been made to faults in his Theology Proper, Anthropology, Angelology, Hamartiology, and Soteriology. Just as this study constructed a section of Kenyon's theology, each of the areas just listed could be investigated and exposed to greater scrutiny.

8 Developments of Kenyon's Dogma in his successors. In Section 1.1.2 it was indicated by McConnell (1995:4-11) that the two immediate successors to Kenyon, the so-called fathers of the WFM, Kenneth E. Hagin and Kenneth Copeland, both plagiarised Kenyon's work. He also noted that the theology of the WFM stemmed from Kenyon. It would be worth investigating how the Christology developed as it was passed from generation to generation of WFM teachers and how they have kept or adjusted the original teachings of Kenyon. More than that, a study such as this could expose whether the WFM has ever corrected the errors in Kenyon, and whether it falls within the realm of Orthodoxy or not.

It can be concluded that Kenyon and the WFM afford many opportunities for future academic investigation.

### 5.3 Bibliography

ANON. (2007). [http://www.theopedia.com/Word\\_of\\_faith\\_movement](http://www.theopedia.com/Word_of_faith_movement) Date of access: 30<sup>th</sup> May 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) a. [http://en.allexperts.com/e/e/e/e.\\_w.\\_kenyon.htm](http://en.allexperts.com/e/e/e/e._w._kenyon.htm) Date of access: 19<sup>th</sup> Mar. 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) b. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adoniram\\_Judson\\_Gordon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adoniram_Judson_Gordon) Date of access: 19<sup>th</sup> Mar. 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) c. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E.\\_W.\\_Kenyon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E._W._Kenyon) Date of access: 19<sup>th</sup> Mar. 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) d. <http://www.atcross.com.sg/author.html> Date of access: 19<sup>th</sup> Mar. 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) e. <http://www.tenth.org/index.php?id=152> Date of access: 22<sup>nd</sup> Jul. 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) f. [http://www.theopedia.com/Charles\\_C.\\_Ryrie](http://www.theopedia.com/Charles_C._Ryrie) Date of access: 22<sup>nd</sup> Jul. 2010.

ANON. (n.d.) g. [http://www.theopedia.com/Robert\\_Reymond](http://www.theopedia.com/Robert_Reymond) Date of access: 22<sup>nd</sup> Jul. 2010.

ANON. 2001. Faith Movement. (*In Nelson's New Christian Dictionary: the Authoritative Resource on the Christian World*). Available: Logos Bible Software.

ANON. 1563. The Heidelberg Catechism. (*In Brannan, R. ed. Historic Creeds and Confessions*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.) Available: Libronix Digital Library System.

ATKINSON, W.P. 2007. The Nature of the Crucified Christ in Word-Faith Teaching. *Evangelical Review of Theology*, 31(2):169-184, April. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.

BARRON, B. 1990. *Faith Movement (Word Movement)*. (*In Dictionary of Christianity in America*). Available: Logos Bible Software.

BIBLE. 1982. *The New King James Version*. Thomas Nelson: Nashville.

BIGALKE Jr., R.J. 2002. Christ as the "Mercy Seat": Understanding the Shed Blood of Christ. *Chafer Theological Seminary Journal*, 8(43): 42-55, April. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.

- BIGALKE Jr., R.J. 2009. The Error of Divine and Mystical Attributions with Regard to the Blood of Christ. *Journal of Dispensational Theology*, 13(39): 36-58, August. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- BOA, K., & KRUIDENIER, W. 2000. Vol. 6: Romans. *Holman New Testament Commentary; Holman Reference*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers. 480p.
- BOICE, J.M. 1986. *Foundations of the Christian Faith: a Comprehensive and Readable Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press. 740 p.
- BOWMAN Jr., R.M. 2001. *The Word-Faith Controversy: Understanding the Health and Wealth Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books. 254 p.
- BOYD, J.H. 2003. A Biblical Theology of Chronic Illness. *Trinity Journal*, 24(2):189-206, Fall. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- CALVIN, J. 1997. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Logos Research Systems, Inc.: Bellingham, WA.
- CHRISTIAN FAMILY CHURCH. (n.d). <http://www.christianfamilychurch.co.za/> Date of access: 27<sup>th</sup> Sept. 2008.
- CONGDON, R.D. 1975. Book Notice: The Bible in the Light of Our Redemption. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 132(527):282, July.
- EASTON, R.D. 1999. Jonathan Edwards on Revival: an Analysis of his Thought as Used by Proponents and Critics of the Toronto blessing. *Reformation and Revival*, 8(2):23-39, Spring. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- EDERSHEIM, A. 1896. 2 vols. *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. New York: Longman, Green, and Co.
- ENNS, P. 1989. *The Moody Handbook of Theology*. Chicago: The Moody Bible Institute. 688 p.
- FARRAR, F. W. 1874. 2 vols. *The Life of Christ*. New York: Cassell, Petter & Galpin.
- GEISLER, N. L. 2004. *Systematic Theology, Volume Three: Sin, Salvation*. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers. 624p.
- GITTENS, C.L. 1990. The theology of EW Kenyon, the unrecognised father of the faith-teaching Movement. Pretoria: UNISA. (Dissertation – M.Th.) 266 p.
- GORDON, A.J. (1894). *The Ministry of the Spirit*. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 217 p. Free Web access [www.gutenberg.org](http://www.gutenberg.org) Retrieved: 19<sup>th</sup> Mar. 2010.
- GUTHRIE, D. 1982. *A Shorter Life of Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House. 186p.
- HANEGRAAFF, H. 1993. *Christianity in Crisis*. Eugene, OR: Harvest House. 448 p.
- HOLLINGER, D. 1988. Enjoying God Forever: an Historical/Sociological Profile of the Health and Wealth Gospel. *Trinity Journal*, 9(2):131-149, Fall. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.

- JONES, D.W. 1998. The Bankruptcy of the Prosperity Gospel: an Exercise in Biblical and Theological Ethics. *Faith and Mission*, 16(1):79-85, Fall. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- JONES, D.W., & WOODBRIDGE, R.S. 2011. *Health, Wealth & Happiness: Has the Prosperity Gospel Overshadowed the Gospel of Christ?* Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications. 208 p.
- KAISER, W.C. 1988. The Old Testament Promise of Material Blessings and the Contemporary Believer. *Trinity Journal*, 9(2):151-170, Fall. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- KENYON, E.W. 1998. *What Happened from the Cross to the Throne*. Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society. 203 p.
- KENYON, E.W. 1999. *The Bible in the Light of our Redemption: Basic Bible Course*. Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society. 303 p.
- KENYON, E.W. 2004. *Advanced Bible Course: Studies in the Deeper Life*. Lynnwood, WA: Kenyon's Gospel Publishing Society. 316 p.
- LIE, G. 2000. The Theology of E. W. Kenyon: Plain Heresy or Within the Boundaries of Pentecostal-Charismatic "Orthodoxy"? *Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, 22(1): 85-114, Spring.
- LIE, G. 2003. *E.W. Kenyon: Cult Founder or Evangelical Minister?* Oslo, Norway: Refleks Publishing. 192 p.
- LIE, G. 2008. E.W. Kenyon and Dispensationalism. *Cyberjournal for Pentecostal-Charismatic Research*, 17, January. <http://www.pctii.org.cyberj/index.html> Date of access: 19<sup>th</sup> Mar. 2010.
- LIOY, D. 2007. The Heart of the Prosperity Gospel: Self or the Savior? *Conspectus: The Journal of the South African Theological Seminary*, 4 (1): 41–64, March. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- MacGREGOR, K.R. 2007a. The Word-Faith Movement: a Theological Conflation of the Nation of Islam and Mormonism? *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 75(1): 87-102, March.
- MacGREGOR, K.R. 2007b. Recognizing and Successfully Averting the Word–Faith Threat to Evangelicalism. *Christian Apologetics Journal*, 6(1): 53-71, Spring. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- MARTIN, W. 1997. *The Kingdom of the Cults: 1965*. Minneapolis: Bethany House. 703 p.
- McCONNELL, D. 1995. *A Different Gospel: Updated Edition: 1988*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers. 225 p.
- MOO, D. 1988. Divine Healing in the Health and Wealth Gospel. *Trinity Journal*, 9(2): 191-209, Fall. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- OSBORNE, G.R. 1998. Biblical Criticism, New Testament. (*In Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*, 322-327.)
- PARK, M.S. 2003. David Yonggi Cho and International Pentecostal/Charismatic Movements. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 12(1): 107-128, October. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.

- PERRIMAN, A., ed. 2003. *Faith, Health & Prosperity*. Carlisle: Paternoster. 316 p.
- REYMOND, R. L. 1998. *A New Systematic Theology of the Christian Faith*. Thomas Nelson: Nashville. 1210 p.
- RYRIE, C. C. 1999. *Basic Theology : a Popular Systemic Guide to Understanding Biblical Truth*. Chicago: Moody Press. 272 p. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- SIMMONS, D.H. 1997. Postbellum Pursuit of Peace, Power, and Plenty. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997. 349 p.
- SPENCER, J.M. 1999. An Examination and Evaluation of the Brownsville Revival. *Christian Apologetics Journal*, 2(1): 1-14, Spring. Available: Libronix Digital Library System.
- VREELAND, D.E. 2001. Paper presented by Derek E. Vreeland of Cornerstone Church, Americus GA, at the 30<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Society for Pentecostal Studies in 2001. <http://www.victoryword.100megspop2.com/reconstruction.html> Date of access: 1<sup>st</sup> Feb. 2008.
- WARFIELD, B.B. 1931. *Perfectionism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1931. 399p.