

THE SUBJECTION OF THE SON
A Critical Investigation Of
I Corinthians 15:28

By
JAMES LEE CUSTER

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in
Grace Theological Seminary
March, 1963

LIBRARY

PREFACE

The doctrine of the Subjection of the Son to the Father is rarely voiced today. That this passage seems to clearly teach such a subjection has challenged my thinking for many years. I approached the preparation of this paper with a biased feeling of resentment against any teaching that would suggest the slightest "de-exaltation" of our precious Lord. Then, as the truth presented in these verses broke upon my mind, the flood of realities that swept across my heart lifted my spirit into the realms of eternal blessedness! That He will "subject himself" is certain; but oh, the precious promises that His subjection guarantees to His believers. "Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge . . . BUT God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit."

I have long anticipated the opportunity to thoroughly study a passage of Scripture, assimilating the rich heritage of my Bible-centered training in a Christian home, the varied experiences of learning during my six years on a Christian campus, and the fruits of the diligent application of skills acquired here at Grace; then, after blending them all together, present an accurate, practical exegesis of the truth of that passage. This paper has afforded just such an opportunity.

Many people have influenced my growth into, and preparation for, the Christian ministry. Out of them, and in direct connection with the presenting of this paper, I wish to express my thanks to my parents, whose early teaching laid the foundation for the broad scope of Christian truth herein explored; to my instructors, who have helped me to know something of the wonderful universe in which we live, and to deeply appreciate the vast realms of the Wisdom of God out of which our universe came; and to my wife, whose skillful completion of the great task of correcting and typing this manuscript is a monument to her devotion and diligence. I wish to express my appreciation especially to my beloved advisor, Dr. James Boyer, under whose guidance I was first introduced to the priceless study of the Greek language. His patient thoughtfulness has been a great encouragement to myself as to others who have been privileged to study in his classes, to grow beneath his faithful ministry of the Word, or to behold his daily manifestation of quiet meekness. I humbly pay to him this tribute to the glory of his God:

"While his hands patiently minister to the needs of those around him, his heart sits in quiet communication at the feet of his Lord."

"The bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
ENGLISH VERSIONS	6
GREEK TEXT	9
VARIATIONS	11
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS	13
INTERPRETATIONS	15
Incorrect Views	16
Inadequate Views	27
Proposed Personal View	39
DEFENDING ARGUMENTS	43
The Argument from Context	44
The Argument from Linguistics	47
The Argument from Theology	57
The Argument from Results	69
ENGLISH PARAPHRASE	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85

INTRODUCTION

The selection of this passage of scripture as the text for a critical monograph was not the result of long consultation. When the writer discovered that the text which he desired to pursue had been chosen already, he then gave more attention to this intriguing passage as a possible selection. At that time, the writer was aware of the deep problems and the perplexities which have attached themselves to a proper understanding of this verse.

After much study, the writer has become convinced that a dogmatic interpretation of this passage is not possible. The infinite secrets of the Eternal God have not all been revealed to man. This verse telescopes the reader into that realm of eternity where the infinite counsels of God's wisdom have chosen to obscure the answers to our anxious questions. However, such a conclusion does not bring dismay to the writer's heart. Rather, he is bound by a determination to know more fully those things which have been revealed to us through the Word and to leave the idle speculations of men to work their own confusion in the lives of their authors. But -- one can never stand tip-toe on the mountain peaks and gaze enraptured at the glorious realms of blinding light without reflecting a bit of that light from his face and in his heart as he walks again in the shadows of deeper valleys.

The background of this pearl of revelation would devolve a church which was perplexed by problems and rent into several opposing groups. Peace had flown. Unrest and confusion prevailed. Hatred and jealousy tore what tiny vestages of superficial unity which still remained. To this church the apostle Paul addressed a letter of instruction. In the whole of that letter, Paul deals with several questions which have concerned the members and have precipitated their disunity. However, the central concern of Paul is that they cease their fighting and return to a spirit of unity.

After dealing with the various causes for the division, Paul pens a capstone appeal to their unity by showing the universal reality and results of the resurrection. Since all believers will share in this event, Paul bids them to take their eyes off each other and gaze upon this blessed hope. Then the Apostle skillfully weaves the pattern of the resurrection into a picture of the Resurrected One - Jesus Christ. Using His victory as a pattern, Paul explains the nature of the new body, the validity of such an experience for each believer, and the importance of this experience in the great program of the Godhead. Our passage forms the crown jewel of Paul's brilliant display of this glorious Resurrected One.

Chronologically, the verse before us projects us further into the realms of "eternity-future" than any other passage of Scripture. It begins when all the other events

of God's revealed program for man have been consummated. In other words, when the last promise of the Book of God has been fulfilled, when the last decree of the Risen Lord has been carried to its full consummation, when Time fades into Eternity, then the event described in the words of our text occur. It might be further noted that these verses state no consummation within themselves. They merely depict what actions will then take place and describe the conditions which will continue into the ageless eons of God's being.

The absence of absolute revelation concerning this event in the chronology of God's program has left commentators to their own speculations. Consequently, there is a mass of material written on the subject and little of it is based on a solid, exegetical research of the passage itself.

Thus, due to the lack of information in the Word concerning that period of time when the events of this verse will transpire, and due to the depths of the subject therein propounded, namely, the inter-relationship of the Triune God-head in the coming eternal ages, the writer refuses to dogmatically assert that all the conclusions within the pages of this study are accurate and absolute. These are merely suggested answers to the complicated problems of this short passage.

To facilitate your understanding of the following pages, it will be helpful to know that all the quotations have been taken from the American Standard Version of 1901 (unless marked otherwise in the context), and that the arguments are not conclusive within themselves. They form a chain of support for the writer's view, none of them being independently strong, but each contributing to the weight of the whole. In the Contextual Argument, the immediate context of the passage is examined; in the Linguistic Argument, the important words of the actual verse have been examined. The Argument from Theology presents (in defence of the writer's interpretation) a sketch of the inter-relationships between the First and Second Persons of the Triune Godhead during the various periods of revealed history. The Argument from Results is an analysis of the Minor Problem with an attempt to show how this resulting condition supports the proposed view of the writer.

In submitting these to your thought and further study, the writer sincerely desires that you will share the delights that flooded his heart and the great joy that filled his soul as he gazed upon these "all-but-veiled" scenes of heavenly glory.

ENGLISH VERSIONS

King James Version, 1611

And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

The Twentieth Century New Testament, 1900

Then when everything has been placed under him, the Son will place himself under God who placed everything under him, so that God may be all and in all.

The American Standard Version, 1901

And when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all.

The Basic English New Testament, 1941

And when all things have been put under him, then will the Son himself be under him who put all things under him, so that God may be all in all.

Moffatt's New Testament, 1950

And when everything is put under him, then the Son himself will be put under Him who put everything under him, so that God may be everything to everyone.

The Revised Standard Version, 1952

When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to everyone.

The Amplified New Testament, 1958

However, when everything is subjected to Him, then the Son Himself will also subject Himself to [the Father] who put all things under Him, so that God may be all in all - that is, be everything to everyone, supreme, the indwelling and controlling factor of life.

Phillips New Testament, 1958

Nevertheless, when everything created has been made obedient to God the Father, who gave the Son power over all things, thus, in the end, shall God be wholly and absolutely God.

Wuest's New Testament, 1958

But whenever all things are put under subjection to Him, then also the Son himself shall be in subjection to Him who subjected all things under Him in order that God the Father may be all in all.

The Berkeley Version, 1959

However, once everything is subjected to Him, then the Son, too, shall subject Himself to the One whom all obey, so that God may be all in all.

The New English Bible, 1961

And when all things are thus subject to him, then the Son himself will also be made subordinate to God who made all things subject to him, and thus God will be all in all.

ORIGINAL TEXT

(Nestle Text)

"τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται τῷ
ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, ἵνα ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς
πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν."

VARIANTES

VARIATIONS

The only textual variation is the omission of Τα from the second Παύτα. The weight of textual evidence supports Nestle's omission of the article. This variation is discussed in the Argument from Results on pages 74 and 75.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEMS

MAJOR PROBLEM

The Main Problem of this paper is to determine exactly what is meant by the subjection of the Son as expressed by these words:

"then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him . . . "

MINOR PROBLEM

The Minor Problem of this paper is to determine what is meant by the phrase:

"that God may be all in all."

In this paper, the Minor Problem will be presented as "The Argument from Results."

The Arians, in their controversy with Athanasius over the Deity of Jesus Christ "appealed to this verse . . . to represent His subjection as in some way derogatory to Christ."¹

Gill explains that the Arians used this verse to refer to His "divine nature as if He was in that inferior to the Father." He then states the impossibility of such an interpretation because, "He (Jesus) is equal with Him (the Father), has all the perfections He has, and the whole fullness of the Godhead dwelling in Him."²

This brief explanation, combined with the records of ecclesiastical history, gives ample refutation to this heretical view.

¹Thomas Charles Edwards, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886), p. 420.

²John Gill, An Exposition of the New Testament (London: William Hill Collingridge, 1853), II, 264.

THE ABSORPTION VIEW

Those who support this view believe that the Son will be subject to the Father to the degree that He will cease to exist as a separate personality. There are two main groups who support this view; the Eutychians and the Sabellians.

The Eutychians hold that the human nature of the Son will be changed "into the divine, in which, they fancy it will be swallowed up."³ The Son, being thus absorbed into the Father, will cease to be a distinct Personality. This view is closely associated with the De-Incarnation view, but differs in that the De-Incarnationists do not argue that the Son disappears totally as a distinct and separate Personality, but that He merely ceases to be Man. However, the arguments given against the De-Incarnation view will also prove the inaccuracy of the Eutychians.

The Sabellians speak of the "refunding of the characters of the Son (and so of the Father) unto God: when they suppose these characters, which they imagine to be merely nominal, bare names, will be no more . . . "⁴ They teach that "Christ was an emanation from the Father,

³Gill, loc. cit.

⁴Gill, loc. cit.

and would be finally re-absorbed into the Father's personality."⁵

The ancient church fathers refuted the error of the Sabellians. The words "whose kingdom shall have no end" were inserted in the Nicene Creed at the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, to correct this error.⁶

Exell, refuting this view states:

The Sabellianism of Baur, who says that in the Apostle's Christology Christ is Son of God in reference only to the work of redemption, has no foundation in this verse, which, in fact, implies the opposite. The cessation of His human mode of existence or its absorption in Deity would not be called a subjection of Him to God.⁸

Godet warns:

Beware of understanding this subjection in the sense of an absorption of Christ in the Deity so that His personality thence forth disappears. The expression "to be subjected" denotes quite the opposite of this idea. (See Romans 8:29; Revelation 3:21)⁹

A fuller argument against this view will be given in the presentation of the Minor Problem. We rest the error of this view with the words of Doddridge:

The union of the divine and human natures in the person of the great Emmanuel, the incomparable virtues of his

⁵J. J. Lias, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, ed. J. S. Perowne (Cambridge: University Press, 1907) p. 148-49.

⁶Lias, loc. cit.

⁷Joseph S. Exell, "First Corinthians," The Biblical Illustrator (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.), II, 463.

⁸Edwards, op. cit., p. 417.

⁹F. Godet, Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957), II, 372.

character, the glory of his actions, and the relation he bears to his people, with all the tests which assert the perpetuity of his government, prohibit our imagining that he shall ever cease to be illustriously distinguished from all others, whether men or angels, through eternal ages."10

10 Joseph Benson, The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, with Critical, Explanatory, and Practical Notes (New York: T. Carlton & J. Porter, n.d.), II, 203.

acquired by His incarnation, the Son "subjected" Himself to the Father. They agree that the "subjecting" of the Son refers to His only as God, in this respect. He was always subject to His Father, ever since He was incarnate, and this seems to support something possible at this time.

Small writes:

The Apostle was only thinking of the eternal Sonship and giving us to see the eternally imperial date of its continuance. Trinity will remain, but the eternal Sonship, the Son, will disappear and be no more visible.

Commenting on Small's statement, another has more fully explained:

He is speaking plainly of the Son as incarnate, or externalized in the flesh, visible outwardly and in the man-form, and known as the Son of Mary. . . . Christ will remain because the eternal Son is in Him, but the Son, the human part, will be made subject or subordinate. . . . It is as if the Christ we loved were visible to all, His own humanity, though Trinity alone is God.

Small, p. 113.

Small, p. 113.

Small, p. 113. Trinity VII - 2 Corinthians IX, 10. Small's Bible I, 1900, p. 371.

The exponents of this view teach that the subjection of the Son is totally in the realm of His fleshly form and human nature. In His divesting Himself of those properties acquired by His incarnation, the Son "subjects" Himself to the Father. They assert that the "subjection" of the Son refers to Him only as man, in this sense: He was always subject to His Father, ever since He was incarnate, whereas this seems to respect something peculiar at this time.¹¹

Exell writes:

The Apostle was only thinking of the mortal Sonship and giving us to see the essentially temporal date of its continuance. Trinity will remain, but the mortal Sonship, the man, will disappear and be no more visible.¹²

Commenting on Exell's statement, another has more fully explained:

He is speaking plainly of the Son as incarnate, or externalized in the flesh, visible outwardly and in the man-form, and known as the Son of Mary . . . Christ will remain because the Eternal Son is in Him, but the Jesus, the human part, will be made subject or taken away . . . It is as if the Christ we loved were visible in all His dear humanities, though Trinity alone is left.¹³

¹¹Edwards, loc. cit.

¹²Exell, loc. cit.

¹³The Sermon Bible, "Acts VII - I Corinthians XVI," (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1900), p. 371.

Matthew Henry avoids this confusing confliction of terms by bluntly stating that "the glorified humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . was no more than a glorious creature. This will appear when the kingdom is given up."¹⁴ This implies that the Creator will divest Himself of all about Him that is "creature."

Clarke demonstrates the logic behind this view as he writes:

Divine nature shall not be made subject to the human nature. Christ, as Messiah, and Mediator between God and man, must ever be considered inferior to the Father and his human nature, however dignified in consequence of its union with the Divine nature, must ever be inferior to God.¹⁵

Exell, however, does not shrink from driving his view to its logical conclusions:

It may be we have promised ourselves a felicity in the future world, made up almost wholly of the fact that we shall be with Christ in His humanly personal form, and have used this hope to feed our longings, quite apart from all higher relations to His Eternal Sonship . . . our relations to Christ, then, in the future life are to be relations to God in Christ, and never to Jesus in Christ.¹⁶

Barth writes:

Christ will resign his universal dominion to the Father from whom he has (as man) received it. Here only the humanity of Christ is spoken of, for it was in that capacity (to fulfill the prophecy of Psalm 15) that

¹⁴Matthew Henry, A Commentary on the Whole Bible (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.), VI, 590.

¹⁵Adam Clarke, The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ - with A Commentary and Critical Notes (New York: Carlton & Phillips, 1853), II, 284.

¹⁶Excell, loc. cit.

dominion was conferred upon Him.¹⁷

In refutation, Lange answers:

That the Logos will cast off the nature which He had assumed, and become as before the incarnation, can hardly be supposed . . . the intimations of Scripture in regard to the perpetuity of Christ's Headship hardly allow of such a supposition.¹⁸

We agree with him that "the expression, 'the Son also himself,' is sufficient to restrain us"¹⁹ from accepting this view.

Godet strikes at the heart of this erroneous interpretation:

They distinguish between the Divine and human nature of Christ and ascribe what is here said to only the latter. They attempt to divide the Lord's person into two natures, one of them subject while the other remains free and self-sufficient."²⁰

In full agreement with these refutations, we affirm that Christ's humanity (as during the forty days of the post-resurrection period) will be associated forever with his Sonship.²¹

¹⁷C. G. Barth, An Expository and Practical Commentary on the Books of Scripture (London: Nisbet & Company, 1873), p. 827.

¹⁸John Peter Lange, "Corinthians," Commentary on the Holy Scriptures (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 323.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 320.

²⁰Godet, op. cit., p. 368.

²¹Sermon Bible, op. cit., p. 517.

Chrysostom, followed by Oecumenius, Theophyl, and Estus, reduces the interpretation of this verse to a mere "full agreement" of the Son with the Father. He argues:

What can be more absurd and unworthy of God than to inflict on His Son at some future time a subjection greater than that of taking the form of a servant: he reduces the notion to a mere concord between the Father and the Son. (ὅταν ὁμονοίῃ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀκριβείας)²²

This view is completely refuted by Lange:

We (are not) warranted in interpreting the self-subjection into the perfect oneness of thought (πολλῇ ὁμόνοια) between the Son and the Father.²³

Lange bases his assertion on the fact that this view does not give proper credence to the words of the text. Applying this same argument, we must reject the view of Cowles:

He (Christ) takes a position of comparative subordination (rather than "subjection") to that Supreme One . . . [thus making] the power of Christ less prominent before the universe than it had been while the work [of fulfilling His commission] was in progress.²⁴

Although we must reject this view as erroneous and inadequate, yet we must admit that following the "subjection" and throughout the whole process, there will be "full

²²Edwards, op. cit., p. 420

²³Lange, op. cit., p. 320

²⁴Henry Cowles, The Longer Epistles of Paul (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1888), p. 275

agreement" between Father and Son; this agreement will result from the "oneness of thought" which has been eternally true of Father and Son; and to the on-looking universe, it may appear to be only a "comparative subordination." However, to explain the "subjection of the Son in any terms that suggest an incompleteness of that subjection must be rejected by a mere surface reading of the text. The "subjection" of the Son to the Father will be complete. This assertion will be supported in the writer's presentation of the view he proposes.

It is the writer's view that the Kingdom which the Son subjects to the Father is a Kingdom not of any authority, but of the persons of the Father and Son. This Kingdom is described as the subjection of the Son to the Father, and the Father to the Son. Ambrose defines this Kingdom as "the mystical body of Christ" - the Church. The writer adds that:

The Kingdom of the Son on earth will cease, when the Church on earth any militant church is gone.

It is the writer's view that the impossibility of this view:

The (a) view is based on the view that all things are put under the Son of the church; (b) although the Church is sometimes called "Christ," yet (it is) never called, "the Son" (as to the one who subjects the self in this passage); and (c) the church has always been subject to God.

²⁵Edwards, *loc. cit.*

²⁶Gordon, *loc. cit.*

²⁷Ibid., p. 336

²⁸Ibid., pp. 312-3, p. 150

²⁹Ibid., pp. 332-3

Those holding this position believe that the subjection of the Son refers only to Christ's presentation of His church to the Father. Because of His identification with her, they see in her subjection, the subjection of the Son Himself.

Some of these men equate all believers with the church, explaining "that the kingdom which the Son subjects to the Father is a kingdom not of any authority, but of the persons of the believers."²⁵ Beza simply describes Christ's subjection as "the presentation of the elect to the Father."²⁶ Ambrose defines these "elect" as "the mystical body of Christ - the Church."²⁷ He affirms with Hooker that:

The exercise of the mediatorial kingdom on earth will cease, there being no longer on earth any militant church to govern.²⁸

In refutation Gill explains the impossibility of this view:

The (a) words are spoken of him under whom all things are put, which is not true of the church; (b) although the Church is sometimes called "Christ," yet [it is] never called, "the Son" [as is the one who subjects Himself in this passage]; and (c) the church has always been subject to God.²⁹

²⁵Edwards, loc. cit.

²⁶Godet, loc. cit.

²⁷Ibid., p. 386

²⁸Lias, op. cit., p. 150

²⁹Gill, loc. cit.

Theodore, Ambrose, and Oecumenius explain the subjection of Christ as His "appropriating to Himself the subjection of the Church."³⁰ In its essence, this is only a modification of the Church view. It stands rejected with the others on the basis of the arguments given.

³⁰Edwards, loc. cit.

These are those writers who either omit any comment on the text: Parker,³¹ Dods,³² Maclaren,³³ Butler,³⁴ and Bradley Alford;³⁵ or those who admit no knowledge to adequately explain our passage. As Henry states:

The passage is a summary of mysteries which our present knowledge does not enable us to explain and which our present faculties, perhaps do not enable us to understand.³⁶

Another confesses:

The provisional government, having finished its task, gives place to the immediate and direct government of God. What is implied in this is impossible to say . . . neither can we imagine what Christ Himself shall be and do when the term of His mediatorial administration is finished.³⁷

³¹Joseph Parker, The People's Bible (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., n.d.), XIV, p. 322.

³²W. Robertson Nicoll, "Romans and I Corinthians," The Expositor's Bible (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1900), p. 367.

³³Alexander Maclaren, "Corinthians," Expositions of Holy Scripture (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), p.247.

³⁴J. Glenworth Butler, The Biblework. The New Testament in Two Volumes (New York: The Butler Bible Work Co., 1892), II, 335.

³⁵Bradley H. Alford, Dean Alford's Greek Testament with English Notes (Abridged; New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886), p. 424.

³⁶Carl F. H. Henry, (ed.) The Biblical Expositor (Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Co., 1960), III, p. 357.

³⁷Marcus Dods, An Exposition of the Bible (Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1908), V, 706.

Clarke thinks that "there appears to be a personality essentially in the infinite Godhead that must exist eternally; but how this shall be we can neither tell nor know until that time comes."³⁸

The expositor Beet, though expressing it more reverently, is basically confessing the same ignorance when he writes:

In view of the mysterious words (vs. 24, 28) touching the relation of the Eternal Son to the Eternal Father, rather than speak, the expositor would prefer to bow in silent adoration . . . the difference between the special authority delegated to the Son . . . and the abiding authority of the Son . . . I cannot define.³⁹

Another writes that the language used by Paul was only an attempt to put great truths "before finite minds with a certain degree of accommodation to the finite modes of thought."⁴⁰ In other words these words are to be understood in a figurative sense.

Butler explains the subjection as "nothing else than the act of the divine will, by which the Son is clothed with the power and the right to rule over all."⁴¹

The separate refutation of these views is not necessary. The effort of this entire paper assumes that a Biblical solution can be given for this problem. The suggestions given on the following pages will sufficiently show these views to be inadequate and quite unnecessary.

³⁸Clarke, loc. cit.

³⁹Joseph Agar Beet, A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians (5th ed.; London: Hodder and Stroughton, 1892), p. 279-80.

⁴⁰Cowles, op. cit., p. 276.

⁴¹Butler, loc. cit.

THE MANIFESTATION VIEW

Those who support this view maintain that the subjection of the Son is only "the manifestation by which the Son will make the Father fully known to the whole world."⁴² Augustine "explains it to mean that Christ will lead the saints to a contemplation of God the Father, and manifest God's power to the unbelievers."⁴³

A much fuller definition of this view is given by Hofmann:

The subordination of the Son to the Father consists in fact that He ceases to have in the view of the world that mediate position between the world and God, in consequence of which the world saw Him a ruler different from God, possessing a sovereignty which belonged to Him as His own. This rule within the world ceases because it has reached its end.⁴⁴

According to this view, Christ as man will receive the submission of all God's enemies and then lay them at His Father's feet. "Not," says Estius, "that Christ shall cease to reign, for 'of his kingdom there shall be no end,' but that He will proclaim Him as the source of all power and authority."⁴⁵

⁴²Godet, op. cit., p. 368

⁴³Edwards, loc.cit.

⁴⁴Godet, op. cit., p. 369

⁴⁵Lias, op. cit., p. 148

The fullest explanation and defence of this position is given by Jenks:

Then the man Christ Jesus, who hath appeared in so much majesty during the whole administration of his kingdom, shall appear, on giving it up, to be a subject of the Father. Things are, in Scripture, said to be, when they are manifested and made to appear; this . . . will make it manifest that He who appeared in the majesty of sovereign king, was, during this administration, a subject of God; so it will appear to the divine glory that God may be all in all, that the accomplishment of our salvation may appear all divine, and God alone have the honor of it."⁴⁶

Calvin seems to combine the results of this view with that of the De-Incarnation view, stating:

When Christ will be subject . . . because the veil being then removed, we shall openly behold God reigning in his majesty, and Christ's humanity will then no longer be imposed to keep us back from a closer view of God.⁴⁷

There is much truth in this interpretation. That there will be a greater manifestation of God and His Glory in that day than we have known until then, is undisputed. However, the reducing of the subjection of the Son to have a mere greater view of God the Father, fails to adequately express the full meaning of this passage. With Lange, we simply reject this view because to interpret this passage as a mere "manifestation of His (the Son's) dependence on God in respect to His glory does violence to the meaning of 'subjected.'"⁴⁸

⁴⁶William Jenks, The Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1866), IV, 312.

⁴⁷John Calvin, Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians (Trans. John Pringle; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948), II, 32-33.

⁴⁸Lange, loc. cit.

The subjection of the Son means His delivering up to the Father the administration or visible rulership of the kingdom which He, as Messiah and Mediatorial King, has organized and purified from all rebellion. Butler gives this explanation:

The mediator shall then appear and give in to the Father a full account of his mediatorial undertaking, presenting to him the kingdom in that state of consummation to which he shall have brought it.⁴⁹

Theophylact reduces the delivering over of this kingdom to the Father to his "achieving and accomplishing the purposes of it."⁵⁰

Godet argues:

It is the delivering up of the kingdom which is in question, and of a kingdom whose principle work is to judge, a very different thing from redeeming and interceding; it is not to God that He could deliver up His mediatorial function.⁵¹

Another writes:

The objective fact is here declared, nothing more. The objective fact is that, the aim and end of His kingly administration being accomplished, the God-man transfers from Himself to God alone the supreme sovereignty of all creatures now brought into complete subjection. This act is the last duty of His mediatorial office. The Father now assumes the supreme government thereby

⁴⁹Butler, loc. cit.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 335

⁵¹Godet, loc. cit.

fulfilling the second petition of the Lord's prayer.⁵²

In an attempt to reconcile the conflict of surrendering the kingdom with the teaching of Scripture that His will be an everlasting kingdom (Dan. 7:14), Erdman writes:

His giving up of the mediatorial kingdom to the Father, when the end for which it was established has been everlastingly. . . . The change shall be in the manner of administration, not in the kingdom itself; God shall then come into direct connection with the earth.⁵³

The Administration view has gained in popularity because of its skillful solution to the great problem incurred by those who have attempted a more literal explanation of the text; namely, how can the Son be subject to Another without doing harm to His deity? To guard against such a possibility, Exell writes:

The relative subjection of the incarnation was voluntary and not at all derogatory to His deity. It will not be derogatory to His deity to subject himself by yielding up his Lordship of the mediatorial kingdom. . . . His glory and dominion will be the same, it will merely be a change in the form of administration.⁵⁴

Pool adds:

The Son's subjection doth no where prove his inequality of essence or power with his Father; it only signifies what was spoken before, that Christ should deliver up his mediatory kingdom to His Father; so manifesting that

⁵²F. C. Cook, The Holy Bible with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881), III, p. 363.

⁵³Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown, A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments (Toledo: Jerome B. Names & Co., n.d.), I, 777.

⁵⁴Exell, op. cit., p. 462

whatsoever he had done in the office of Mediator, was done in the name of his Father, and by his power and authority; and that as he was man, he was subjected to his Father.⁵⁵

Although this view agrees most closely with the ancient Jewish traditions that "at the end of the world He (Messiah) would deliver His kingdom to God and forever sit at God's right hand;"⁵⁶ and although the truth supplied in this view must be recognized; we must reject it as an adequate interpretation of the verse before us. The refutation is simple! This view makes the subjection equivalent to the surrendering of the kingdom. This subjection of the kingdom to the Father by the Son-Mediator is discussed in verse 24. The verse before us states that the subjection involves the "Son, himself."

⁵⁵Matthew Pool, Annotations Upon the Holy Bible (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1853), III, 595.

⁵⁶Edwards, loc. cit.

⁵⁷James M. Gray, Christianity's Commentary on the Old and New Testament (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1913), p. 374.

⁵⁸Edwards, loc. cit.

⁵⁹Edwards, loc. cit.

THE OFFICES VIEW

The primary difference between the "Administration" view and the "Offices" view is that the former makes the subjection of the Son directly connected with the delivering up of the kingdom as a material entity outside the King, and the latter equates that subjection with the fulfillment of the functions, or offices, of the King himself. As Gray states:

The subjection of the Son spoken of in this verse is not that of the Son as the Second Person of the Trinity, but as the Mediatorial King of the earthly kingdom.⁵⁷

Perhaps the distinction is more easily seen in the words of Clarke:

The administration of the kingdom of grace closed, no longer is there any state of probation and consequently no need of a distinction between the kingdom of grace and the kingdom of glory: then the Son, being man and Messiah, will cease to exercise any distinct dominion.⁵⁸

Another writer explains more fully that since "there is no longer need of a prophet to teach, of a priest to intercede and make atonement, and of a king to deliver, protect, and govern, the Father will resume the government."⁵⁹

Those who support this view are eager to assert that:

This does not conflict in any way with the belief in the full deity of Christ who shares with the Father the "substance" of the Godhead. It is spoken of the office,

⁵⁷James M. Gray, Christian Worker's Commentary on the Old and New Testaments (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1915), p. 374.

⁵⁸Clarke, loc. cit.

⁵⁹Benson, loc. cit.

not of the person. The reference is to His work as Redeemer and King of God's Kingdom.⁶⁰

Many excellent scholars (Luther, Melanchthon, Bengel, Olshausen) agree that this verse refers to "the cessation of His (the Son's) mediatorial office between God and man; no more need existing for redemption or intercession."⁶¹

The Official interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church explains:

This seems to mean our Lord's office of redeemer and Messiah, which ceases when all the redeemed are gathered. A mediator is no longer needed.⁶²

Perhaps the most thorough explanation of this view has been given by Macknight:

In the present state of mankind, it is suitable to the majesty and purity of God that all his intercourses with them, whether in the way of conferring blessings on them, or of receiving their worship, be carried on by the intervention of a mediator. But after sinners are completely reconciled to God and made perfect in holiness, God will bestow his favors on them immediately, without the intervention of a mediator. The offices of mediator and king becoming unnecessary, will cease. Yet even in this state, the Son in (or in union with) the human nature, though no longer king, (in the sense in which He was king before) will still retain the glory of having created all things and the glory of having saved mankind, and of having destroyed the kingdom of Satan, and Satan himself. In respect of personal perfection, and of the veneration due to him for the great things he hath accomplished, he will continue superior to the highest angels and be acknowledged by them as their superior through all eternity.⁶³

⁶⁰F. Davidson, (ed.), The New Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 988.

⁶¹Godet, loc. cit.

⁶²Don Bernard Orchard, (ed.), A Catholic Commentary On Holy Scripture (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1953), p. 1097

⁶³Benson, loc. cit.

This view comes closest of all the ones stated to giving an accurate, full interpretation of the verse before us. It makes the subjection an action which directly involves the Son, yet it fails to acknowledge any real subjection of Him outside the completion of the purposes for which His offices of Mediator, Priest, and King were intended. We must stubbornly refuse to acknowledge any interpretation that does not give adequate explanation of the words "the Son himself." The text does not state that His functions or offices will cease, but that He who held those offices, which have now lost their primary function, "himself" becomes "subject."

There is another truth hidden in this view; when the Son "subjects himself" the purposes for which He became Mediatorial Priest, Prophet, and King will have been fully accomplished. He will leave no work unfinished before He subjects himself to the Father. Even the last enemy, death, will have been conquered. (vs. 27)

We conclude our discussion of the Incorrect and the Inadequate views with a summary given by Alford:

The interpretation that "subjection" is only an hyperbolical expression for the entire harmony of Christ with the Father (Chrysostom and others); the limitation of it to His human nature (Theodoret, Augustine, and others), with the declarative explanation that then it will thus become plain to all, that Christ even in regard of His kingship is, on the side of His humanity, dependent on the Father, - and the addition, that Christ will then in his divine nature reign with the Father (Calvin): the interpretation (of the words "the Son Himself"), as referring to Christ's mystical Body, i.e., the church (Theodoret) - are idle subterfuges. The refutation of these and all other

attempts to explain away the doctrine here plainly asserted, of the ultimate subordination of the Son, is contained in the three precise and unambiguous words, "the Son Himself." (DeWette)⁶⁴

⁶⁴Henry Alford, The New Testament for English Readers (Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1892), II, 236-7.

INTERPRETATIONS

"The Personal Subjection View"

THE PERSONAL SUBJECTION VIEW

The view proposed here by the writer demands the total subjection of the Son to the Father. It has been called the "Personal Subjection View" to distinguish it clearly from all those views which make either the Offices, the Humanity, or the Administration of the Son of God, the item of his subjection.

The Personal Subjection View states that the Son of God will personally surrender to the Father all the glory and authority delegated to Him; He will voluntarily subject Himself (in His undivided natures) to the Father; and (from that position of subordination within the Triune Godhead) He will fully display that co-equality of power and glory which He had with the Father and the Spirit before the "in the beginning." The only difference is that now the Second Person of the Godhead is both God and Man, and He retains the natures of both.

Because of its great importance, it is necessary to stress that when the Son subjects Himself to the Father and returns to His pre-temporal position in the Trinity, He does so as God, and as Man - fully possessing His Human nature, His literal, glorified, incarnate body, and all the marks upon that Body which were incurred by His humiliation.

The writer found little support for this view among the commentators. Some men clearly set forth one aspect of the picture, but failed to give the full scope and meaning of the total subjection of the Son; as Lange correctly writes:

The co-equal Son, who is Himself essentially God, even when at the highest point of His glory, subjects Himself, with all that has been subordinated under Him, unto the Father, choosing even in His majesty as Lord of all to be dependent upon the Father wholly and forever.⁶⁵

However, these words hardly give adequate interpretation of the text. Godet also is correct as far as his explanation goes:

The Son returns to the state of submission which He had left to fill the place of Messianic sovereignty, because, God communicating Himself directly to all, He ceases to be mediator of God's sovereignty over them.⁶⁶

Farrar adds his comments to the information given by these men:

The end having been attained of mediatorial government and all opposition put down, he resumes the ancient characteristics of his Sonship as the Second Person in the holy Trinity and takes back the glory of eternal ages, long ago resigned, to his bosom.⁶⁷

Of the commentators which the writer has read, only one approaches an adequate explanation of our text and at the same time deals directly with the vital issue of the subjected Son's human nature. Williams, writing of this

⁶⁵Lange, loc. cit. ⁶⁶Godet, op. cit., p. 372

⁶⁷H.D.M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell (eds.), The Pulpit Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing House, 1950), XIX, 517.

subjection, affirms:

He will then hand that perfected kingdom with Himself as Son of God in His humanity - His Title by merit distinct from His Sonship with God in being and essence - and, retaining His Manhood, He will in that Manhood eternally exist in perfect union and obedience with God, just as He existed upon earth in His first advent in the same perfection of Being and obedience.⁶⁸

Having stated the proposed view, the writer will now defend the same by using four arguments, each of which are taken directly from the words of the text.

⁶⁸George Williams, The Student's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures (4th ed.; Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1949), p. 892

DEFENDING ARGUMENTS

For The Personal Subjection View

The Argument from Context rests upon two Greek words found in the text. The first, τότε, meaning "then," is the key to the total preceding context of this verse. The second, καί, meaning "also," directly relates the preceding contextual information with the subject of our verse, namely, "the Son Himself."

The adverb τότε reaches back to verse 24 for its antecedent, εἴτα, "then." This word, εἴτα, stands at the beginning of the contextual passage in which our verse is directly connected. By its close relationship with τότε, it sets this entire passage off from the rest of the chapter as a related, but self-enclosed body of truth.

Between εἴτα and τότε, there is a series of temporal phrases, each of them beginning with the temporal particle ὅταν, which means, "at the time that" or "whenever." These phrases state the events which transpire before the action stated in the εἴτα clause in verse 24 (the coming of the end), and therefore, before the action stated in the τότε phrase in verse 28 (the subjecting of the Son).

The first of the ὅταν phrases is the full surrender of the mediatorial kingdom (and all the administrations and offices thereto attached) to the Father by the Mediatorial King (vs. 24). This surrender is chronologically preceded

by the judgement and destruction of all powers contrary to the sovereign authority of God the Father and His King (vs. 24b-25). This universal subjection includes all powers (whether physical or spiritual, vs. 24b) and all enemies of God (vs. 25); involving their personal acknowledgement of Jesus as Lord and their assignment by Him to their place of eternal damnation. All evil will be purged from God's universe.

The last enemy, death, will be destroyed (vs. 26). For the redeemed, this removes even the faintest taint of the results of the evil that once plagued the universe; for the damned, this removes the last hope of escape and seals their doom of eternal torment. "All things" stand subjected to the Son. Only the Father is excepted.

Εἰτα in verse 24 sums up all these subjections before "the end." These all having been completed, Εἰτα - THEN - comes "the end" and the act of consummation stated in the τοτε phrase in verse 28, occurs.

A close observation of the "subjections" set forth in the οταν phrases will show that, except for the Father Himself, "all things," have been subjected either by or to the Son. The only thing left in all creation and Deity which has not been subjected is the Son Himself.

This brings us to the second word in the Contextual Argument, και. As τοτε includes all the preceeding actions of the οταν phrases through its association with Εἰτα and related them to the time of the action in verse 28; και

gathers all the recipients of the actions of the ὁτι phrases and applies the manner of their action to the subject of verse 28.

It does not matter which meaning of καὶ is used in the translation, the sense of identification of the Son with the preceeding subjects remains constant. If "also" is used, it means that the Son is directly identified with them in the pattern of the action involved; if "even" is used, it recognizes the distance between the Son and the things previously subjected, yet it includes "even" Him in the pattern of their action.

In summary, at the time designated by the adverb τοτε, all things - with the only exception being the Father Himself - have been subjected to the Son. The Son Himself is the only entity which can fulfill the prophecied subjection stated in that verse. The word καὶ demands that the subject of whom this action is predicated will follow the example of the things subjected in the preceeding verses. Each of them was personally ("enemies" vs. 25) and totally ("under His feet" vs. 25) subjected. καὶ demands that the Son also be subjected in this same pattern; namely, personally and totally.

Therefore, only the Son Himself could be the subject stipulated in verse 28, and His subjection must be personal and total.

The Linguistic Argument involves the direct meanings and grammatical usage of three words from our text. The first, υἱός, meaning "son," is the subject of the sentence and the actor in the action inscribed. The second, αὐτός, meaning "himself," is the intensifying pronoun and directly describes the "son." The third, ὑποταγέσθαι, meaning "he will be subject," is the verb in the sentence and distinctly describes the action to be taken by the "son."

The Greek word υἱός stresses the family relationship which legally arises between the various children in the family as opposed to the biological relationship between them and their parents. With the word υἱός is conveyed the idea of inheritance and obedience.

The Son's submission, though embraced willingly and cordially by him, does not originate in His will but is obedience to the law of His own eternal existence and corresponds with His essential relation to the Father.⁶⁹

It is not said that Christ "will subject himself;" but rather, "the Son will subject Himself."

Christ is king as the vicegerent of God. His kingship, therefore, involves that the kingdom will be delivered to the Father. But Christ is also Son, and sonship implies the possibility of subjection, even when it is necessarily accompanied by equality in nature. His kingship and his subjection rest on his sonship. Only

⁶⁹Beet, op. cit., p. 278

the co-equal Son can be fit vicegerent of God. Because He is Son, His highest reward and joy will consist of being subjected to the Father's supremacy.⁷⁰

That the subjection of the Divine Logos is only possible because of His Sonship, many commentators agree. However, when they begin to distinguish exactly what that "Sonship" means, they divide into two directly contradictory camps. One will assert that "Son of God is applied to the Lord Jesus with reference to His human nature, incarnation, and resurrection."⁷¹ Another will explain that the "word used to designate Christ is precisely that which most forcibly characterizes His Divine being; the Son, absolutely speaking."⁷²

Bengel accurately defines the usage of υἱός as:

"The Son," according to both natures, even the divine; which we learn, not so much from his being here called the Son, as that he is expressly considered in relation to the Father. Nor, however, is the Son here spoken of in so far as the Father and the Son are one, which unity of essence indeed is presupposed here; but in respect of the economy of government, inasmuch as the Father has rendered all things subject to Him.⁷³

Because of its depth of insight into the significance of the usage of Christ's name, "the Son," as used in this passage, the writer quotes a lengthy statement by Hesshusius:

⁷⁰Edwards, op. cit., p. 419

⁷¹The Numerical Bible (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, n.d.), p. 321

⁷²Godet, op. cit., p. 368

⁷³John Albert Bengel, Gnomon of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Perkinpine & Higgins, 1860), II, 259

The subjection and obedience of the Son to the Father does not affect the equality of power, nor prove diversity of essence. The Son in all eternity acknowledges with deepest reverence that he was begotten from eternity by the Father. He also acknowledges that he has received the spiritual kingdom from the Father and has been made Lord of the whole world. He will show this to the whole creation through his most holy reverence, subjection, and filial love, that all honor may be rendered to the Father. But all this derogates nothing from the divine honor of the Son, since the Father wills that all men honor the Son, as the Father."⁷⁴

The second proof in the Linguistic Argument lies in the word αὐτός. It is a personal pronoun used here in the nominative case, and usually translated as "he." However, in this verse, it is standing in the predicate position with the subject, ὁ υἱός, and therefore, gives an intensive force to the subject, "the Son HIMSELF."

Thus, αὐτός (in its predicate position) conveys the idea that this subjection will be personal. The Son will not fulfill this subordination through an agency outside himself. He, himself, will do so. This involves the personal attention and action of the God-man himself. The Son, as incarnate in the flesh, visible outwardly in the man-form, and known as the Son of Mary is also to be subject Himself. This subjection will involve Him as He is, and all that He is. No allowance is made for the dividing of His natures. He, as a Person, will personally subject Himself to the Father.

The third proof in the Linguistic Argument is taken from the meaning of the main verb of the sentence, ὑποταγῆσεται.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 260

ὑποταγῆσεται is the Future Passive Indicative, third Person Singular from ὑποτάσσω. This is a compound verb, made from the union of ὑπο, meaning, "under," with τάσσω, meaning, "to arrange." This gives the word the technical definition of "to arrange under, subordinate, put in subjection." This is the meaning of this same verb as it appears in verse 27 of our passage.

In the Passive Voice, ὑποτάσσω means, "to become subject," and therefore, "to obey." However, "to obey" as a subjected person in the sense stressed by ὑποτάσσω does not denote an obedience rendered because of any inferiority of essence or ability. It is "obedience" rendered to those who are placed positionally above the subjected one.

Eerdman writes that He will be subjected:

Not as the creatures are, but as a Son, voluntarily subordinate to, though co-equal with, the Father. In the mediatorial kingdom the Son had been distinct from the Father. Now, His kingdom merges in the Father's, with whom He is one.⁷⁵

ὑποτάσσω is, in this respect, different from the other verbs which convey the idea of "obedience through subjection." The Apostle Paul was careful not to use ὑπακούω - "to obey in response to something that is commanded [with or without the subject understanding or giving personal consent to that which he obeys];" neither did he use ὑπείκω - "to retire or withdraw [and hence, to acknowledge superior powers and submit to their control];"

⁷⁵Jamieson, loc. cit.

nor did he employ the verb καταυῦν - "to be subdued and subjected after struggling against a conqueror [with the idea that the subjected accepts this position against his will and only assumes it because he is powerless to do otherwise]." Any of these verbs would have demanded something of the Son and His dignity which is not at all asserted in the verb ὑποτάσσω.

As Vine has summarized:

ὑποτάσσω is primarily a military term which conveys the idea of ranking under. It denotes (a) to put in subjection, and in the Middle and Passive Voice, to subject oneself, to obey, to be subject to.⁷⁶

Eerdman agrees that:

It affirms no other subjection of the Son than is involved in Sonship. This implies no inferiority of nature, no extrusion from power, but the free submission⁷⁷ of love which is the essence of the filial spirit.

Athanasius, in his dialogue (1st) against the Macedonians writes:

This subjection no more involves inferiority of essence than His subjection (Lk. 2:51) to Mary and Joseph involved inferiority of essence to them.⁷⁸

In their massive Lexicon, Liddell & Scott give an interesting meaning taken from the usage of ὑποτάσσω in the Passive Voice with the Dative. In such instances, the

⁷⁶W. E. Vine, An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words (U.S.A.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1959), IV, 86

⁷⁷Charles R. Erdman, An Exposition: The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1928), 144

⁷⁸Lias, op. cit., p. 150

verb may mean "to underlie, to be implied in, or to be associated with;" it is used in this sense of the content or meaning which underlies a writer's words.⁷⁹

This aspect of close association between the "sub-jected" and the one to whom he becomes "subjected," is seen in the Son's subjection.

As Benson observes:

The divine reign of the Father and Son is from everlasting to everlasting, and only so far as the Father gave the kingdom to the Son, shall the Son deliver it up to the Father (John 13:3). Nor does the Father cease to reign when he gives it to the Son, neither the Son when He delivers it to the Father; but the glory which He had before the world began (John 17:5, Heb. 1:8) will remain even after that is delivered up. Nor will He cease to be king even in His human nature.⁸⁰

Therefore, the subjection of the Son:

does not mean that from that time on Christ will cease to have any part of the kingdom, but that, the work of redemption having been completed, it will cease to be pre-eminently His kingdom, that He will return to the original relationship which He had with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and that the triune God will reign eternally over the perfected kingdom.⁸¹

We have asserted that ὑποταγέσθαι is in the Passive Voice. Our versions regard ὑποταγέσθαι as a future passive: "shall be subjected."

But the form is equally future middle and the thought here demands the middle. . . . By a free act, in harmony

⁷⁹Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (A New Edition; Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.), II, 1897

⁸⁰Benson, loc. cit.

⁸¹Lorraine Boettner, Studies in Theology (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947), 257

with the whole divine plan that made him supreme over all things, Christ subjects himself to the Father.⁸²

Moulton asks the question:

What is the voice of ὑποταγῆσεται in I Cor. 15:28? Is it passive - "be subjected" by as well as "to Him that did subject all things to him"? Or is it middle - "be subject"? Findlay (EGT in loc) calls it "middle in force, like the 2nd aor. pass. in Rom. 19:3, in consistency with the initiative ascribed to Christ throughout." I incline to this, but without accepting the reflexive "subject himself," which accentuates the difference between the identical ὑποταγῆ and ὑποταγῆσεται; the neutral "be subject" explains both, and the context must decide the interpretation.⁸³

The writer concurs with the position thus taken by Moulton, and accepts both his interpretation, "be subject," and his rejection of the reflexive idea. The writer finds greater support for the "middle force" of the action in the intensification of the subject by αὐτῷ.

One other problem confronts us. The action expressed by the Future tense is not always the same. Moulton writes that there is:

No question that the action of the Future is in usage mixed. ἰδω is either "I shall lead" or "I shall bring" the former durative, the latter effective. Thus in Mark 14:28, προΐσω ὑμῖν is probably "I shall go before you," while ἔσω (Ac. 22:15) "to bring" and ἰδεῖ (I Thes. 4:14) "he will bring," refer to the end of the action and not its progress.

Having thus stated the principle, he then applied it to ὑποταγῆσεται:

⁸²R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935), 683

⁸³James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1949), 163

An "ingressive" future may probably be seen in ὑποταγέσθαι I Cor. 15:28. The ῥῆμα seems to show that the Parousia is thought of as initiating a new kind of subordination of the Son to the Father (See Contextual Argument) and not the perpetuation of that which had been conspicuous in the whole of the mediatorial aeon.⁸⁴

In other words, by making ὑποταγέσθαι an "ingressive" (another word for the grammatical term "inceptive," which means, "denoting the beginning of an action, state of occurrence - said of a verb or verb form") future, we distinguish the subjection of the Son as a distinct act resulting immediately in a new condition, rather than a process which is culminated by that act.

Up to the moment of this glorious consummation an economic division of functions exists between the three Persons of the Godhead as regards this sinful world and its salvation. In this very paragraph, the Father does certain things, and the Son other things. In this economic division the incarnate Son rules as King and Lord. When the consummation is reached this position shall cease - for its final object is then attained. From that moment onward, ὁ Θεός, the Triune God in all Three Persons conjointly, one God, shall stand supreme and glorified in the new heaven and the new earth.⁸⁵

Another usage of the "ingressive" future occurs in John 8:32 where the freedom promised to those who know the truth is a point-action which results in a state, which state continues into the future. The stress is upon the position acquired by the action of the verb, not upon the process involved to consummate that action.

⁸⁴Ibid, p. 149

⁸⁵Lenski, op. cit., p. 686

To summarize the evidence from ὑποτάσσω, and apply these facts to the verse before us, we learn that:

(a) Although its primary meaning is "to subject," yet it denotes a subjection in rank or position, not in essence or quality. This subjection does not connote any weakness or unwillingness in the one subjected, nor does it involve any derogatory inferences about him. Thus, the Son of God can legitimately submit to such an action with no harm done against His dignity, deity, or eternal co-equality of essence with the One Whom He is "ranked under." It is also inferred that the ultimate purpose of this subjection is not to suppress the Son, but rather to involve Him in a direct, intimate relationship with the One under Whom His subjection "positionally" places Him.

(b) Although the form is in the Passive Voice, the context and the intensification of the subject by αὐτὸς suggest that we understand ὑποταγῆσεται as having the quality of the Middle Voice. This supports the already established fact that the action here predicated upon the Son will be executed by His own free will. It also demands that this subjection will directly involve some change to the Son Himself - Personally.

(c) Although in usage the action of the Future Tense is not constant, we may affirm that ὑποταγῆσεται is an "ingressive" Future and assert thereby that emphasis of this verb stresses the end of the action stipulated, and not the process.

This verse, therefore, stresses the position which the subjected Son will assume (and therein remain) and not the process by which He arrived there. This means that at the time when the subjection of the Son occurs, then (Tote) He will assume that position which directly results from the action of His subjection. This demands a positive, definite action, as opposed to a continuous process.

Up to this point in our arguments and presentation, we have assumed the identity of Him to Whom the Son subjects Himself. We have adopted the universal opinion that the One Who is described as "him that did subject all things unto him" is the Father, the First Person in the Trinity.

The writer does not wish to differ with this interpretation, but rather to establish it and then to draw a Theological Argument from the descriptive way the Apostle Paul used to present this One in our passage.

The evidences from the context of our verse assert certain things about the One Who "put all things under him" which could only be said of the Father. This One is outside the realm of "all things" (which phrase encompasses the entire scope of all created entities, vs. 27). Also, this One is the "Only Thing" that is not included in the total subjection to the Son, and in that exception, He is clearly pointed out as The One Who "did subject all things unto him" (vs. 27c). Therefore, since it is directly stated in verse 24 that the kingdom will be delivered up to "God, even the Father," and because of the eternal position of supremacy of the Father, over the Son, all scholars have agreed that the Father is here meant by the words, "him that put all things under him."

It is upon the second of these two correct observations that the Theological Argument rests. The writer asserts that the subjection of the Son spoken of in verse 28, though a real subjection, involving certain definite changes in the position of the Son, is basically predicating no more of the Son than has been true of Him throughout the eternal ages; namely, that the Son is, has been, and always will be "subject" to the Father, and acknowledges the Father's supremacy at all times.

This does not mean that Christ was subject to the Father only during His Incarnation. This asserts that the Son, even in His pre-creation union with God in the Triune Godhead, during all the stages of His voluntary humiliation, through His appointed exaltation, and into the post-temporal union in the Godhead, always recognizes and proclaims His subjection to the Father.

This position of subjection of the Son to the Father in the Pre-Incarnation Trinity is acknowledged by Christ himself in the words of His High Priestly Prayer. In John 17, Jesus petitions the Father to "glorify thy Son." In verses 2-4, He acknowledges His place of subjection to the Father (see below) and then specifies: (a) which glory He desires, "with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," verse 5b; and (b) the method by which the Father will "glorify" Him "with that glory." The Father is to do so by glorifying the Son "with thine own self," verse 5a.

This method gives us a clue to the positional

relationship of the Son to the Father "before the world was." It indicates that even the "glory" which the Son then enjoyed was the glory of the Father ("thine own self").

To assert that in the Pre-Incarnation Trinity, the Son was positionally subordinate, does not violate His deity, He was "second among equals;" but He was second, i.e., He was by nature, administration, form and glory subordinate to the Father.

That the Son was subjected to the Father during the Incarnation is the united teaching of all New Testament authors, the Gospel records, and the teachings of Christ Himself.

In John 17 the Son of God recognizes the Father (a) as the Source of His "authority over all flesh," verse 2a; (b) as the Elector of all those to whom the Son is to impart "eternal life," verse 2b; (c) as the Essence of "eternal life" in His being "the only true God," verse 3a; (d) as the Authority of His commission ("whom thou didst send," verse 3b; (e) as the Administrator of "the work which thou hast given me to do," verse 4; (f) as the Sovereign of all those who receive eternal life ("thine they were," verse 6b); (g) as the Author of "the words which thou gavest me," verse 8a; and (h) as the Giver of "all things whatsoever thou gavest me," verse 7a. In short, Jesus is here recognizing His full and total subjection to, and dependence upon, the Father.

This "absolute and eternal submission of the Son to the Father" is clearly seen in I Cor. 3:23 and in 8:6. It

is the recognized thought throughout the entire New Testament, but it finds its most complete expression in this verse. As Gould has stated:

The Son will be subject to the Father as the very one from whom he received universal supremacy and this will be only a return to the original state of things, before the Father delegated this power to him . . . whatever power the Son has, he has derived from the Father for a particular purpose and naturally returns it after the work is ended.⁸⁶

In the Pre-Incarnation inter-relationship among the Trinity, the Son, though being God (Θεός), yet was distinct from the Godhead τὸν Θεόν as a separate personality and was positionally "toward" the Godhead (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν). (Jn. 1:1)

We can neither determine precisely how the Son was "toward" the Godhead, nor can we define the limitations of that position. However, that God has an "image" into which pattern He created man (Gen. 1:26), and that the pre-incarnate Son was already "existing in the form of God" (Phil. 2:6), seems to indicate that He was not only distinguishable from the other Members of the Godhead by personality, but probably by form as well.

The writer is not asserting anything of inequality between the Son and the Father in the realms of power, essence, will, or glory; His equality in these realms is firmly established by the words, "counted not the being on

⁸⁶E. P. Gould, Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1887), 133

an equality with God a thing to be grasped." (Phil. 2:6b) But, having acknowledged His Deity, we affirm that this verse shows the positional subjection of the Son to the Father in this Pre-Incarnation state. This is more clearly seen in this verse as it is:

translated by some, "He snatched not greedily at His equality with God." Though He were God, yet He was always Son. The object of His mediatorial [function, including all His work of redemption and intercession] was not to obtain this kingdom for Himself, but for His Father (Matt. 26:39; John 5:30; 6:38; 7:18; 8:50-54; Eph. 1:10). . . .so that the disorder and confusion of the universe shall henceforth cease, and one vast system of order, peace and love shall reign from the Father and source of all things.⁸⁷

An exhaustive study of the subjection of the Son to the Father through the Incarnation is beyond the limits of this paper. The point we are interested in establishing is (a) that the Son was subject during that time, (b) that His subjection was not because of the Incarnation, but rather that the Incarnation was possible because of the subjection; and (c) that this position of subjection was voluntarily assumed, readily acknowledged, and total in scope of the Son of God.

Humanly speaking, Christ subjected himself when He assumed our nature and submitted to the Cross. His present exaltation is a reward for that submission (Ph. 2) and consists of a relative dominion ending when He finishes that particular work.⁸⁸

The Incarnation was a fuller experience of that subjection which the Son had eternally experienced with the Father, It did not involve any destruction of His

⁸⁷Lias, loc. cit.

⁸⁸Exell, loc. cit.

Absolute Deity, for He Who "became flesh and tabernacled among us" (John 1:14, mar. rd.) was Immanuel - "God with us." At the time of the Incarnation, "a child is born;" but "a Son is given" (Isa. 9:6).

The Son suffered no subjection at the Incarnation which was not already predicated to Him by His nature and position in the Union of the Trinity. The Incarnation was a change of degree, not of nature. It did not change the fact of His subjection to the Father, but it did make His subjection one of greater degree because He then became "lower than the angels" and was made subject to men (as servant to them), to the temptations of Satan (as last Adam), to those evil designs which were encompassed within the will of the Father (as Judas' betrayal), and even to death.

The Son voluntarily took this place of greater subjection (Phil. 2:7). When He had assumed it, He did not shrink from the complete subjection it demanded of Him (2:8). This full obedience merited for Him: an exalted Name (Phil. 2:10), universal Lordship (2:10), universal power (Matt. 28:18), and an eternal habitation - His body.

This kingdom [authority] our Lord received in the human nature (over "all power in heaven, [i.e., angelic] and on earth, [i.e., men]) as the reward of his humiliation, and was solemnly installed in it after his resurrection when He ascended into heaven and was invited by God to "sit on My right Hand."⁸⁹

In summary, the change in the subjection of the Son during the Incarnation was one of greater degree, not one of changing His nature. He was no more subject to the Father (as far as the fact of His subjection is concerned) during that period than He had been in the Pre-Incarnation inter-relationship of the Trinity. The Incarnation-subjection was one of greater degree because, to accomplish the Father's will, the Son had to take a place of subjection to His own creatures. Also, to accomplish the designs of the Father, the Son voluntarily subjected Himself to the agonies of separation from His Father.

Because of His full obedience, the Father has granted the Son a position of universal lordship, honor, and authority. Only the Father Himself will remain excepted from this total subjection of "all things" to the Son. However, the body which the Son took unto Himself in His incarnation, and the human nature which it represents, is an acquisition which the Son will eternally retain.

During the Kingdom, the Incarnate Son will receive the fulfillment of this honor and authority which He has been given by the Father for His total obedience. Only the Father will be excepted from the universal acclaim and lordship of the glorified Messianic King.

Though He is God, yet, inasmuch as he is somewhat else besides God, and in this whole dispensation acts not as God, but as Mediator, nor as the offended Majesty, but as one interpassing in favor of His offending creatures, and this by virtue of his consent and commission who acts and appears always in that character, he may properly be said to have this power given to him: he

may reign as God, with power unlimited, and yet may reign as Mediator, with a power delegated and limited to these particular purposes.⁹⁰

When the Kingdom purposes have been fulfilled, the Son will deliver up the same to His Father. Having now fully accomplished its designs, the delegated authority of the Son will also be surrendered.

This subjection of all things to Christ does not include God himself; on the contrary, God remains supreme, and even Christ shall voluntarily subject himself to God, that he may be the power which rules supreme.⁹¹

Beet has difficulty defining this "special" authority and distinguishing it from His "natural" authority:

The difference between the special authority delegated to the Son for the suppression of the revolt and afterwards laid down, and the abiding authority of the Son as the Father's representative and His own divine nature, I cannot define.⁹²

The difficulty is quickly removed when we remember that all authority of the Son must be accounted for on the basis of His eternal subjection to the Father. Beet correctly designates the authority delegated to the Son by the Father specifically for the purposes of the Kingdom as being:

Probably it is connected with the fact that in consequence of sin the Son did what the Father never did, viz; became man and died. In consequence of this, He exercises now an authority which is specially His own and will continue only for a time.⁹³

⁹⁰George Baker Stevens, The Messages of Paul (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), 130

⁹¹Matthew Henry, op. cit. p. 580

⁹²Beet, op. cit., p. 280

⁹³Ibid, p. 280

The problem which Beet (and others) face is precisely this: After this "special" authority (which is distinctly the Son's by gift from the Father) has accomplished its purposes and the Son surrenders it back to the Father, what "personal" authority is left to the Son which would be His to administer "outside" the position of full subjection to the Father?

The answer is as simple as it is obvious: none. The Son has never possessed, desired, nor willed any authority which was not naturally His in His position of subjection to the Father. Even that "special" authority which was granted to Him because of His obedience to the purposes of His Incarnation was received and administered with full recognition of His subjection to the Father.

As Mediator, Christ has certain functions to discharge which, from their very nature, cannot be eternal. The last of God's elect gathered in, there will be none to need the blood of sprinkling or intercession of an "advocate with the Father." Then shall all that sovereignty which, for temporary purposes, has been wielded by and through the humanity of Christ, pass again to the Godhead whence it was derived. Then shall the Creator no longer acting via the instrumentality of a Mediator, assume visibly the dominion over His infinite and now purified empire and administer its every concern "personally."⁹⁴

Or, as Dick writes:

The mediatorial kingdom of Christ . . . will end when its design is accomplished; he will cease to exercise an authority which has no longer an object . . . nothing will remain to be done by the power with which our Savior was invested at his ascension: his work being finished, his commission will expire.⁹⁵

⁹⁴Exell, op. cit., p. 465

⁹⁵Calvin, loc. cit.

We must steadfastly reject the error proposed by Whitby as he writes concerning the Kingdom:

Seeing the human nature alone suffered and the divine nature is capable of no such exaltation, it is certain that this kingdom could be given to Christ only according to His human nature.⁹⁶

In this interpretation, Whitby is forced to divide the natures of Christ and erroneously assert that the Divine nature was not involved in the death of the God-man. This is not at all necessary when we recognize the eternal self-subjection of the Son to the Father. He refutes his own error by writing (in the same paragraph) ". . . this power and judgement was conferred upon Him because He is the Son of God (John 5:27)."⁹⁷

In summary of the Argument from Theology, the exalted position of the Son during His Kingdom reign and the authority which He exercises in the subjection of all God's enemies was given to Him by the Father as a "reward" for His complete obedience to the Divine will during His Incarnation. The purposes of this "special" authority having been accomplished, the Son will give it (with the Kingdom which this authority inaugurated) back to the Father. Thus:

The Son ever reigns with the Father and is subject to the Father. During the activity and performance of the divine work each Person of the Holy Trinity performs His own special duty, during which the various Persons

⁹⁶Daniel Whitby, A Commentary on the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Frederick Scofield & Co., 1877), IV, 659

⁹⁷Ibid. 659

become mutually obligated. After the completion of this task, and the subjection of all to the Son, the Son makes himself subject to the Father just as the Father has honored and glorified the Son, by making all things subject to Him.⁹⁸

Beet describes the nature of that submission as it involves the kingdom:

From the moment of His final triumph, the Son will bow to the Father in a sense in which He does not now, but this must be expounded in harmony with Lk. 1:33 "of His kingdom there shall be no end," and with Rev. 11:15, "The kingdom of this world has become our Lord's and His Christ's: and He will reign for ever and ever." In the latter passage, the united reign of Father and Son is described by the words, "He shall reign."⁹⁹

Barth summarizes the nature of that subjection as it involves the subjects of the kingdom:

Thus shall the purpose of the incarnation of Christ, of the whole plan of salvation, of his mediatory office and kingdom, have been attained. Then shall men no longer need the constantly-renewed mediation of a God-man; for as in Jesus God and man are one, so shall his brethren have become partakers of the divine nature (II Pet. 1:4). Thereby the separate reign of Jesus over the world ceases.¹⁰⁰

This subjection of "the Son himself," though affecting Him personally, will not necessitate the dissolving of His dual natures. As He is Man, His return to a position of subjection within the Trinity confirms the glorious prospect of "his brethren" finally standing "conformed in His image" and their enjoying unbroken, immediate fellowship with the Godhead.

⁹⁸Apostolos Makrakis, Interpretation of the Entire New Testament (Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1950), Vol. two, 1502

⁹⁹Beet, op. cit., p. 279

¹⁰⁰Barth, loc. cit.

This last and most resplendent display of Christ's God-head will elevate the humanity of his saints into a fuller assimilation of himself.¹⁰¹

As He is God, His surrender to the Father will involve no greater subjection than that which was experienced by the Son in His Pre-Incarnation relationship in the Trinity.

As "Father of eternity", He must bring things into that condition in which they will abide eternally. Having accomplished this, for Him, all is accomplished. He desires no kingdom separate from that of the Father; while, on the other hand, the throne will be ever "the throne of God and of the Lamb." It will never cease to be characterized by the One who now sits upon that throne.¹⁰²

¹⁰¹Farrar, loc. cit.

¹⁰²Numerical Bible, op. cit., p. 528

THE ARGUMENT FROM RESULTS

The basis of the Argument from Results is the proper understanding of the phrase "that God may be all in all" and to affirm that the conditions which this phrase describe could not be possible without the total, personal subjection, of the Son to the Father.

The Argument is divided into two parts. The first, that the exact meaning of this phrase necessitates the subjection of the Son; the second, that the conditions described in this phrase necessitate the subjection of the Son.

This whole argument rests upon the assumption that the ἵνα phrase is expressing "purpose." This is the usual meaning of ἵνα when found in grammatical construction that is here employed. Because there is no grammatical reason for taking it otherwise, because the commentators (which the writer has read) have unanimously concluded that this is the usage of ἵνα in this phrase, and because a logical, unbiased reading clearly indicates this to be so, the writer rests this argument upon the understanding that the ἵνα clause expresses the purpose for which all the action of the context is purposed, and toward which climax it moves.

In the first part, two things must be determined: Who is included in the term "God" (ὁ Θεός); and, What is meant by the clause "all in all" (πάντα ἐν παντί)?

The term Θεός is the common Greek word for God. It affirms His sovereignty and describes to Him the supremacy due The Absolute One. This word Θεός suggests that He Who will be "all in all" has every right to be such; He is God, possessing and manifesting all the powers and glories which are characteristic of His Nature.

This word is used here with an article, ὁ. Instead of laying emphasis upon the qualitative distinctions of God (as is true in John 1:1), the Apostle stresses the particular features of Θεός. They are two: He is distinguished as the God, as being apart and above all other "gods"; and He is Trinity. This construction, ὁ Θεός emphasizes the fact that the action stated here will be fulfilled by the total Godhead, as the Tri-Personal, Undivided Unity. It:

Denotes the Tripersonal Deity, which concurred in the counsel of redemption and of creation: the term Father is omitted after it, and the prefix of the Greek article scarcely invalidates this view.¹⁰³

As Godet expresses it:

God in the fulness of His being, at once as Father, the source of all, both in Himself and in the universe; as Son, revealing Him; and as Spirit communicating Him.¹⁰⁴

But:

By God is not meant the Father personally, but God essentially considered, Father, Son, and Spirit, Who are the one true and living God.¹⁰⁵

This only emphasizes what we have before asserted, that the subjection of the Son to the Father will be total,

¹⁰³Cook, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁴Godet, op. cit., p. 373

¹⁰⁵Gill, loc. cit.

involving both His natures in their undivided personality.

For:

There remaining no longer any distinction in the persons of the glorious Trinity, as acting any distinct or separate parts in the kingdom, and so the one infinite essence shall appear, undivided and equal.¹⁰⁶

It is the Triune God . . . the relative position of Christ being no longer required, there is seen only the Divine absoluteness in the never divided Trinity.¹⁰⁷

However, lest we stress this aspect of the truth beyond its bounds (if such could be done), we must emphasize with Exell:

This does not mean that the Son will be lost in the Father, for Christ is One with Father and Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁸

The subjection of the Son in no way implies an absorption into the Trinity that would destroy the personality of the God-man, or sever the dual natures which, in Him, are that Personality. Speaking of the once-crucified, but now subjected, Son, Exell continues:

Now you find Him throned in God, hymned in God, as the everlasting Son of the Father - and yet, He is somehow Son of Mary still, even as He is the Lamb that was slain.¹⁰⁹

Benson, however, asks two questions that must be answered. Commenting on this passage, he writes:

On supposition that it is a proper translation that the Word (John 1:1) in conjunction with the Father and Spirit is to govern: (1) How to speak of the Son's subjection to the Father, seeing he is to reign in conjunction with the Father? (2) How the Son, under the government of the God-head, can be subject to Himself?¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶Clarke, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁷Exell, op. cit., p. 462

¹⁰⁸Ibid, p. 462

¹⁰⁹Ibid, p. 464

¹¹⁰Benson, op. cit., p. 203

Taking the questions in the order that he states them, the writer answers: (1) The text does not say that the Son is to reign in conjunction with the Father. The text states that the Son will be subjected to the Father and that God, Θεός, will be "all in all." This reigning of God as God is only possible following the subjection of the exalted Son to His position of subordination to the Father. As Beet correctly defines:

These verses teach the absolute and eternal submission of the Son to the Father. Even when receiving the homage of the Son, the Father is spoken of by Paul, not as we should say God the Father as distinguished from God the Son, but simply as God.¹¹¹

(2) The text does not state that the Son subjects Himself to the Godhead, but to the Father. This subjection does not occur "under the government of the God-head"; it proceeds and introduces that Triune government.

The opinions concerning the meaning of πάρις ἐν παντί are clearly divided into two camps. The difference of interpretation only concerns the phrase, ἐν παντί. The issue is whether to make παντί neuter, thus making the phrase read, "permeating the whole of things"; or to understand it as masculine, thus giving the phrase the meaning, "in all persons." Those who argue for the neuter make it the "comprehensive neuter - including both persons and things,"¹¹² or consider it "an expression of unlimited comprehensiveness."¹¹³

¹¹¹Beet, op.cit., p. 279 ¹¹²C. Henry, op.cit., p. 420

¹¹³Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume, A New Commentary of Holy Scripture Including the Apocrypha (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), 511

The writer tends to reject this view, and agree with Lange:

According to Rom, 8:19, the expression "in all" might be extended to the entire irrational creation making the adjective Neuter. . . . The immediate context, however, does not conduct us to such an interpretation, though the idea is in itself correct and appropriate.¹¹⁴

The writer also tends to shy away from the "Neuter position" because, if ἐν παντί is considered neuter, then:

all created existences must be here understood, in which God will be the all determining power; - hence, also Satan and his angels included; and thus will come in cessation of damnation, and so the restoration of all things. This contradicts all Pauline writings. . . . Paul puts the lost in contrast with the saved (1:18, comp. Phil 3:19).¹¹⁵

However, having committed himself to the camp of those who affirm παντί to be masculine gender, the writer agrees with Edwards that:

It cannot mean merely "that God may be everything in all men" (Bengel)¹¹⁶. . . this does not account for the ἐν.

But the interpretation of Beet does not adequately convey the meaning of this phrase πάντα ἐν παντί. He thinks it means:

"all things in all persons," i.e., in the inner subjective life of each one, God is to fill up the whole place and be recognized as the one source of all we have and are, the one ruler directing our entire conduct, and the aim of our entire activity.¹¹⁷

Neither is the writer fully satisfied with Meyer's attempt to interpret these words (without involving himself in the controversy over the doctrine of restorationism):

¹¹⁴Lange, loc. cit. ¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 321

¹¹⁶Edwards, op.cit., p.420 ¹¹⁷Beet, op.cit., p.278

He writes:

its scope must be limited to believers, members of the kingdom that has been hitherto ruled by Christ . . . this entirely excludes the doctrine of restoration.¹¹⁸

Both of these views exercise serious limitations upon the words of the text. In Beet's view, the limitation was placed upon the Supply, πάντα; in Meyer's, upon the supplied πάντι. The first limitation is a common one. Most of the commentators, apparently under the influence of the τὸ πάντα's in the previous verses of the context, instinctively interpret πάντα, (without the article τὸ) with the same thought. This is not valid exegesis. The Greek texts (Nestle, Westcott, Hort, Alford) omit the τὸ in this place. The laws of textual criticism would favor the omission of τὸ as the purer text, since it would be more natural for the τὸ to be added (especially under the influence of the τὸ πάντα phrases which appear in this context) than that it was originally included in the text, but omitted by later scholarship or by error. Therefore, accepting the opinion of these scholars, and asserting that the purer text omits τὸ, this removes all limitations upon this word πάντα except for those which would be incurred in the nature of the distribution (expressed by ἐν) or those inherent within the recipients (expressed by πάντι) "all"; therefore, is the predicated description of ὁ Θεός: it sums up the total of what God is, does, and purposes - in His Unity and works

¹¹⁸Lange, loc. cit.

- and then displays this Totality of His power, being, and glory in its simple meaning - "all." The fact that the article τῷ is omitted stresses the quality of the word used; God is not just the "all things", God is "all". There is no measuring His greatness; His grace, His fulness, or Himself. This supply God is, and has provided for the eternal bliss of His children.

As there are no limitations placed upon the Supply, fair exegesis searches in vain for legitimate means of placing any limitation upon the Supplied. As there are no limitations on the Supply, even so the text admits no interpretation which would limit those supplied, πᾶσι. This is the error of Meyer's view. He has limited πᾶσι to refer only to "believers." The word πᾶσι, "all," just as in the preceeding instance, will not allow such a limitation. As the supply of God's riches (flowing from Himself) are boundless and without measure, so the ones in whom these treasures are realized must include a universal "all."

The writer is not suggesting for a moment that we admit the error of the restoration theory into the teaching of this phrase. We will deal with this theory and its relationship to this verse later in this paper. But for an adequate explanation for the words πάντα ἐν πᾶσι that is exegetically accurate, placing no limitations upon them, and not admitting the restoration heresy, the writer suggests this interpretation. As, (1) the grace and truth of our Lord Jesus Christ first divided men into groups of believers and

unbelievers (in response to the equal manifestation of these virtues to their hearts and their personal responses to them) and as, (2) His continued presence among them, confirmed them individually in their respective group, and as, (3) His fuller manifestation of these virtues preceeding His passion established the members permanently in their chosen groups (and drew a sharp line of demarcation between the two groups), and as, (4) the continued manifestation of these same virtues through His followers incited the unbelievers to envy and evil, and as, (5) the full manifestation of these virtues seen in the Person of the judging Son of God both condemns and accelerates the punishment of the unvelievers - so the naked glory and unveiled virtues of Almighty God (as He is "all" to every intelligent creature throughout His entire universe) will through the endless ages of eternity accomplish the some division and confirmation of all men in their "chosen" destinies.

Grant the writer that possibility, and Biblical testimony can be marshalled to show that such a manifestation - though the source of life and joy to the children of God - would perpetuate the most excruciating torments upon those who rejected Him and hate Him personally and violently. What's more, such a manifestation would "daily" increase the joy of the believer, while at the same time confirming the condemned in the ever increasing misery of his perpetually deepening sin; Heaven would thus be constantly growing more happy - Hell would be eternally getting "hotter."

Such an explanation fulfills the requirements of the whole teaching of Scripture, the universal magnitude of God's being "all," and admits no limitation upon the text which is not scribed by the words themselves.

What will the fulfillment of the phrase Ἰν ᾧ ὁ Θεός
πάντα ἐκ πάντων mean to the damned?

We must suppose them to be shut up in some prison house, in some outer darkness, where they shall be as if they were not; and neither the sight, nor the hearing, nor the influence of them shall, in any way disturb the blessedness which shall reign supreme throughout the realms of God, in whose presence there will be a fullness of joy forever and ever.¹¹⁹

What is to be redeemed?

That the Godhead may govern all things immediately by himself without the intervention of a mediator between him and us to exact our obedience in his name, to convey to us his favors and rewards, we being then to render all our duty immediately to him and derive all our happiness immediately from him. As Christ is "all in all" (Col. 3:11) because the Father has put all things into His hands and does all things and governs all things by him; when this economy ceases, the Godhead alone will be "all in all," as governing and influencing all things by himself immediately.¹²⁰

The second part of the Argument from Results rests upon an accurate prediction of the results actually precipitated by the occurrence of God's being "all in all beings." It is implied by this presentation that such conditions could never come to pass until after the Son subjects Himself to the Father.

There will be no separating rebellion of any form: After all things are subjected to Christ at last, and

¹¹⁹Ibid, p. 323

¹²⁰Benson, loc. cit.

he himself subjects himself to God, then God shall be supreme, "all in all," in one perfect harmony, with not a hand or a voice raised against him in the whole universe.¹²¹

"All things" (and therefore all men) without any interruption, no enemy to disturb, will be subordinated to the Son; the Son to the Father . . . this is the end and crown.¹²²

That:

God be recognized as sole Lord and King: "all things will be subordinated to the Son - the Son to the Father."¹²³

At the subjection of the Son to the Father, all "outside forces and entities" have been enclosed in one unit - and the unity of that unit will be sustained by the Unity of the Trinity. There will simply be nothing, personal or metaphysical, to disrupt that unit or threaten that unity.

There will be no separating distinctions of any kind:

As in Christ, there is neither Greek, Jew, circumcision, uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond, free, but Christ is all and in all; so then there will be neither Greek nor Jew, etc., nor rule, authority, etc. but God all in all.¹²⁴

If we take the words "in all" in a universal sense, it is natural to include in them also the angels (comp. Eph. 1:10) and to suppose not only the absolute supremacy of the divine will among them, but also as absolute communication and perfect revelation of the divine love, as intended.¹²⁵

At the subjection of the Son to the Father, He will in Himself draw together all intelligent creatures in the universe (which have not been assigned to eternal damnation).

¹²¹Lenski, op. cit., p. 700 ¹²²Bengel, loc. cit.

¹²³Alford, loc. cit. ¹²⁴Bengel, loc. cit.

¹²⁵Lange, op. cit., p. 321

This universal "brotherhood" will notice no separating distinctions among themselves, for the United God will be their "all" - personally, as well as collectively.

There will be no separating mediation of any kind:

This refers to a removal of the apparatus constructed for allowing us communications with Godhead; we will not need the offices of a Mediator, without which there could now be no access to our Maker.

The mediatorial office, independently on which we must have been everlastingly outcasts, is evidence, throughout the whole of its existence, that this human race does not yet occupy the place whence it fell. With the termination of this office, man will (again) have all the privileges of direct access to his Maker.¹²⁶

All saints will have immediate access [to Him] in whose presence they will be, and with whom they shall have uninterrupted fellowship, without the use of such mediums as they now enjoy.¹²⁷

Therefore,

God can directly, without mediation on His part, live, dwell in them, reveal Himself, and act by them, This time having come, they are, as to position, His equals: God is all in them in the same way as He was and is all in His glorified Son. They have reached the perfect stature of Christ.¹²⁸

The subjection of the Son to the Father will remove forever the office of mediator. Until the time of this subjection, the presence of this office only reminds the redeemed humanity that there are promises to them that are yet to be realized.

There will be no separating revelation of any type:

It may be that on quelling the rebellion and ingathering the redeemed, there will shine forth (the veil of all

¹²⁶Exell, op. cit., p. 465

¹²⁷Gill, loc. cit.

¹²⁸Godet, op. cit., p. 372

mediatorship being removed) upon the immediate apprehension of saints and angels far richer displays of the Divine wisdom, power, and glory, than ever witnessed before, and that in that beatific vision their happiness is to be perfected.¹²⁹

In Christ, in the Church, in every saint, God will fully and ever-increasingly reveal Himself. This is "the glory of God the Father," which is the final purpose attained through the glory of the saints and the Church.¹³⁰

Until the Son subjects Himself to the Father, this full and immediate display of the naked glory and power of God is not possible. Majestically great though the display of the glory of God may be through His Son, we can never fully know the magnitude of the glory of the Godhead until the Son occupies His place in Its Tri-Personal Unity. As long as the Son remains "outside" that Unity, Its "full" glory is not complete.

Because of the lack of clear revelation about the nature of the bliss that awaits the redeemed in the eternal state, the greatest of Biblical scholars have concentrated mind and pen to anticipate some of its celestial blessings. We can list only a few, trusting that these "thought-gems" from great students of the Word will challenge us to a fresh study of the Book and to a present dedication of life so that we may not be "ashamed before Him" when He comes to usher us into these eternal realms.

By the words, "that God may be all in all," the Apostle meant to express:

¹²⁹Lange, op. cit., p. 323

¹³⁰Edwards, loc. cit.

the goal of history and the end of the existence of humanity are the formation of a society of intelligent and free beings brought by Christ into perfect communion with God, and there be rendered capable of exercising, like Jesus Himself when on earth, an unchangeable holy and beneficent activity.¹³¹

That the kingdom of heaven, by means of a regeneration which with the purging away of all dross restores a pure state of like, obtains for itself a new organization of the heavens and the earth to be the theatre for the display of its own peculiar glory and so becomes an immediate theocracy in the absolute and perpetual reign of God, without the human mediatorial form of Christ which had been assumed only for a season, but not therefore without His distinctive character as a Son which He holds in the being of the Triune God, where God is the fullness of life in all its purity and perfection in all the living.¹³²

The redeemed will therefore:

Enter into the sweetest state of peace, where we shall know by experience as little of what is meant by devil, sin, death, wrath, and hell, as was known of these things when as yet all creatures lay concealed in the eternal creative power of God, or when, in the beginning of their creation, they were all alike very good.¹³³

Then will the Heavenly Father together with the Son and Holy Spirit, become directly "the all things in all" to them, and fill their understanding with His Divine wisdom, their wills with His Divine holiness, their desires with His Divine sweetness and joy, their bodies with heavenly glory and delight, and, in short, their entire selves wholly with Himself forever.¹³⁴

Thus, our Bibles begin with "In the beginning God" and the verse that looks farthest into the dim future closes with "God all and in all."¹³⁵

¹³¹Godet, op. cit., p. 375

¹³²Lange, op. cit., p. 321

¹³³Ibid, p. 325

¹³⁴Ibid, p. 324

¹³⁵George P. Pardington, Outline Studies in Christian Doctrine (Harrisburg: Christian Publications, Inc., 1926),

In summary of the Argument from Results, the results here described as occurring after the subjection of the Son to the Father could never appear without this subjection. God could never govern and bless His universe as the Tri-Personal God ô Deûs, could never be the "ALL" to the "all" of His intelligent creation, so long as the Son maintained a position outside the Godhead, even though His mediatorial kingdom and His redemptive offices had accomplished their purposes and were resigned back to their Author, the Father. Therefore, the Results intended and perfected by the subjection of the Son necessitate that He subject Himself as prescribed in verse 28.

ENGLISH PARAPHRASE

"THEN (at the time of the consummation of all the events which have been prophesied concerning the revealed program of God) THE SON (i.e., the Eternal Second Person of the Triune God) ALSO HIMSELF (i.e., personally, an action involving both of His natures in their indissoluble, eternal union in Himself) SHALL BE SUBJECT TO (i.e., shall assume His original position in the Godhead, which position involves His voluntary obedience to and subordination under) THE ONE WHO (i.e., the Father, Who is not superior in essence or power to the Son, but Who, in the economy of the Godhead, officiates as the Designer and Source of all things) SUBJECTED ALL THINGS (i.e., all creation in every realm and form) TO HIM (i.e., to the Son Who, during His mediatorial kingdom, reigned as Sovereign over all but the Father Himself) IN ORDER THAT GOD (i.e., the Triune Godhead, divisible only by functional attributes) MAY BE ALL (i.e., the sum total of the being, function, and sustenance of the Eternal State) IN ALL (i.e., in all creatures which inhabit and share in that State)." I Corinthians 15:28b

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Commentaries

- Alford, Bradley H. Dean Alford's Greek Testament with English Notes. Abridged. London: Rivingtons, 1869.
- Alford, Henry. Vol. II: The Greek Testament. 4th ed. London: Rivingtons, 1865.
- Vol. II: The New Testament for English Readers. Cambridge: Rivingtons, 1892.
- Barnes, Albert. "I Corinthians," Notes, Explanatory and Practical on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1848.
- Barth, C. G. An Expository and Practical Commentary on the Books of Scripture. London: Nisbet and Company, 1873.
- Beet, Joseph Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, 5th ed. London: Hodder and Stroughton,
- Bengel, John Albert. Vol. II: Gnomon of the New Testament. Philadelphia: Perkinpine and Higgins, 1860.
- Benson, Joseph. Vol. II: The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, with Critical, Explanatory, and Practical Notes. New York: T. Carlton & J. Porter, n.d.
- Bickersteth, Edward Henry, The Trinity. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1959.
- Binney, Amos. The People's Commentary. New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1878.
- Boettner, Loraine. Studies In Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1947.
- Butler, J. Glenworth. Vol. II: The Biblework. The New Testament in Two Volumes. New York: The Butler Bible Work Company, 1892.
- Buttrick, George Arthur, (ed.) Vol. X: The Interpreter's Bible. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.

- Calvin, John. Vol. II: Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians, Translated by John Pringle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. Vols. II & V: Systematic Theology. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947.
- Clarke, Adam. Vol. II: The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ - with a Commentary and Critical Notes. New York: Carlton & Phillips, 1853.
- Cook, F. C. Vol. III: The Holy Bible with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1881.
- Cowles, Henry. The Longer Epistles of Paul. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1888.
- Davidson, F. (ed.) The New Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- Dods, Marcus. Vol. V: An Exposition of the Bible. Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Company, 1908.
- Edwards, Thomas Charles. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886.
- Erdman, Charles R. An Exposition - The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1928.
- Eiselen, Fredrick Carl; Lewis, Edwin; and Downey, David G. (eds.) The Abingdon Bible Commentary. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1929.
- Ellicott, Charles John (ed.). Vol. VII: Ellicott's Commentary on the Whole Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Exell, Joseph S. Vol. II: "First Corinthians," The Biblical Illustrator. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.
- Findlay, George G. Vol. II: The Expositor's Greek Testament. W. Robertson Nicoll (ed.). Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1951.
- Geikie, Cunningham. Vol. III: New Testament Hours. Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1917.
- Gill, John. Vol. II: An Exposition of the New Testament. London: William Hill Collingridge, 1853.

- Godet, F. Vol. II: Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.
- Gore, Charles; Goudge, Henry; and Guillaume, Alfred (eds.) A Commentary on Holy Scripture Including the Apocrypha. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1928.
- Gould, E. P. "Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians," Vol. V: An American Commentary on the New Testament, ed. by Alvah Hovey. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1887.
- Gray, James Comper. Vol. XIII: The Biblical Encyclopedia and Museum. Hartford: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1900.
- _____ and Adams, George M. Vol. V: Gray and Adams Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Gray, James M. Christian Worker's Commentary on the Old and New Testaments. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1915.
- Grosheide, F. W. "Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians," The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- Henry, Carl F. H. (ed.). Vol. III: The Biblical Expositor. Philadelphia: A. J. Homan Company, 1960.
- Henry, Matthew. Vol. VI: A Commentary on the Whole Bible. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.
- Ironside, H. A. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1941.
- Jacobs, Henry Eyster (ed.). Vol. III: The Lutheran Commentary. New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1895.
- Jamieson, Robert; Fausset, A. R.; and Brown, David. Vol. VI: A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical on the Old and New Testaments. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1945.
- _____ . A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments. Vol. I: Toledo: Jerome B. Names & Co., n.d.
- Jenks, William. Vol. IV: The Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1866.

- Lange, John Peter. "Corinthians," Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Lenski, R.C.H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1935.
- Lias, J. J. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Cambridge Bible for Schools, and Colleges. ed. J. J. S. Perowne. Cambridge: University Press, 1907.
- Maclaren, Alexander. "Corinthians," Expositions of Holy Scripture. New York: Hodder & Stroughton, n.d.
- Makrakis, Apostolos. Vol. II: Interpretation of the Entire New Testament. Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1950.
- McClain, Alva J. The Greatness of the Kingdom. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890.
- Morgan, G. Campbell. The Corinthian Letters of Paul. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1947.
- Morris, Leon. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1958.
- The New Testament; with English Notes, Critical, Philological, and Explanatory. Vol. II: 4th ed. London: Longman and Company, 1836.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson. "Romans and I Corinthians," The Expositor's Bible. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1900.
- Nowell, Rostron S. St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1931.
- The Numerical Bible, "Acts and II Corinthians." New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, n.d.
- Olshausen, Hermann, Bol. IV: Biblical Commentary on the New Testament, 1st Am. ed. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1858.
- Orchard, Bernard (ed.) A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1953.

- Pardington, George P. Outline Studies in Christian Doctrine. Harrisburg: Christian Publication, Inc., 1926.
- Parker, Joseph. Vol. XIV: The People's Bible. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, n.d.
- Parry, R. St. John (ed.) The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Cambridge: University Press, 1916.
- Pool, Matthew. Vol. III: Annotations Upon the Holy Bible. New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1853.
- Robertson, Archibald. Vol. IV: Word Pictures in the New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers' Publishers, 1931.
- Williams, _____ and Plummer, Alfred. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians," The International Critical Commentary, eds. Charles Augustus Briggs, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Alfred Plummer. 2nd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.
- Scott, Thomas. Vol. VI: The Holy Bible with Explanatory Notes, Practical Observations, and Capious Marginal References. Boston: Samuel T. Armstrong, 1831.
- The Sermon Bible, "Acts VII - I Corinthians XVI." New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1900.
- Spence, H.D.M. and Exell, Joseph S. (eds.) Vol. XIX: The Pulpit Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing House, 1950.
- Stevens, George Barker. "The Messages of Paul," Vol. XI: The Messages of the Bible. Edited by Frank Sanders and Charles F. Kent. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- Strong, Augustus Hopkins. Systematic Theology. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1960.
- Thom, John Hamilton. St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, and Co., 1852.
- Thiessen, Henry Clarence. Introductory Lectures in Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956.
- Trollope, Williams. Vol. II: Analecta Theologica -- A Critical, Philological, and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. London: Gilbert & Rivington, 1842.

- Vincent, Marvin R. Vol. III: Word Studies in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.
- Warfield, Benjamin B. The Lord of Glory. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Weiss, Bernhard. Vol. III: A Commentary on the New Testament. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1906.
- Whitby, Daniel. Vol. IV: A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha. ed. by Simon Patrick. Philadelphia: Frederick Scofield and Co., 1877.
- Williams, George. The Student's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1949.
- Wordsworth, Chr. Vol. II: The New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, in the Original Greek. 5th ed. London: Rivingtons, 1870.

Grammars and Lexicons

- Abbott, Smith G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. Great Britain: T and T Clark, 1944.
- Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Bullinger, Ethelbert W. A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament, 8th ed. London: The Comp Press Ltd., 1957.
- Liddell, Henry C. and Scott, Robert. Vol. II: A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.
- Machan, J. Gresham. New Testament Greek for Beginners. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.
- Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1953.
- Moulton, James Hope. Vol. I: A Grammar of New Testament Greek. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1949.
- _____. and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated From The Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1949.

Thayer, Joseph Henry. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Revised ed. New York: American Book Co., 1889.

Vine, W. E. An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1959.

Texts and Versions

The Amplified New Testament. 14th ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1958.

The Holy Bible. "Berkeley Version in Modern English," Gerrit Verkuyl, (ed.) Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.

The Holy Bible. King James Version. New York: Harper & Brothers, n.d.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.

The Holy Bible. Standard American Revised. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1901.

Moffatt, James. A New Translation of the Bible. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1950.

Nestle, Eberhard. Novum Testamentum Graece. 21st ed. Stuttgart, Germany: Privileg Wortt. Bibelanstalt, 1952.

The New English Bible. New Testament. Oxford: University Press, 1961.

The New Testament in Basic English. New York: E. P. Putton & Co., Inc., 1941.

Phillips, J. B. The New Testament in Modern English. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

The Twentieth Century New Testament. Part II. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1900.

Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton, John Anthony. The New Testament in the Original Greek. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

Wuest, Kenneth S. Vol. II: Wuest's Expanded Translation of the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1958.

Unpublished Materials

Bowman, Edward D. "A Critical Investigation of I Corinthians 15:29." Unpublished monograph, Winona Lake, Indiana: Grace Theological Seminary, 1940.

Lannon, Joseph B. "And By Him to Reconcile All Things Unto Himself, Collossians 1:20." Unpublished Monograph, Winona Lake, Indiana: Grace Theological Seminary, 1958.

Ogden, Donald E. "The Meaning of 'Father of All' in Ephesians 4:16." Unpublished monograph, Winona Lake, Indiana: Grace Theological Seminary, 1954.

Sumey, Charles R. "Even So, In Christ Shall All Be Made Alive. I Corinthians 15:22." Unpublished monograph, Winona Lake, Indiana: Grace Theological Seminary, 1949.

Wraight, Clarence E. "Then Cometh the End. I Corinthians 15:24." Unpublished monograph, Winona Lake, Indiana: Grace Theological Seminary, 1945.