

# **"Jesus, the Son of God"**



**A Refutation  
of the Teaching that He  
only became Son  
in  
Incarnation**



**BY JOHN BLOORE**

**“Jesus, The Son of God”**



# “Jesus, The Son of God”

---

A Refutation of the Teaching that He only  
became Son in Incarnation

---

**T**HE question is being raised: Does Scripture apply the title “Son” to the Lord Jesus Christ before incarnation? was He, the Second Person of the Godhead,\* “Son” before He “became flesh”? In other words, Was He Son in a past eternity?

Let it be admitted that Scripture does not use the expression “The Eternal Son,” but the fact that a certain form of words is not used does not mean that the truth they express is not found in Scripture. Nevertheless, let the actual words of Scripture, and not our own, be our guide and that which we defend.

In a brief consideration of this question, I turn only to two or three points.

---

\* This form of expression is of course based upon the order given in the Lord’s instructions as to baptism.

---

## “JESUS, THE SON OF GOD”

---

Some assert that the titles “Son” and “Son of God” do not attach to our Lord Jesus Christ in the past eternity, and are only applicable to Him in Manhood. These titles then would only belong to Him as born into the world as of Virgin birth. It is said He is *given* and *sent*\* as being the Son in Manhood, for it is claimed that there is no such relative positions as “Father” and “Son” in the past eternity, but only the three distinct Persons of the Godhead in their co-equal, co-eternal existence.

Those advocating this view tell us that in the presence of Nicodemus the Lord spoke of Himself as given by God in love, and that all through John’s Gospel He is before men’s eyes as the Sent One. They assure us that He was here by the gift of God, that is, the Son was so here, but then it is said He was not Son until born of the Virgin. When, then, did God give and send Him as His Son “into the world?”—for thus He speaks of His being sent.

---

\* See later note as to the use of this word.

---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

Holding to this view, it cannot be argued that in the holy conception He was given and sent, for it asserts He was not Son *until* born, and that it is as the Son He is given and sent. Not only so, but it would then be one Divine Person giving Another when there existed no such mutual relations as signified by the names "Father" and "Son;" when they were not in such relative positions as would make giving and sending a possible action of One in relation to the Other. Such action implies subordination of One to the Other, but this is denied as to these Divine Persons before the actual birth of the Second Person into the world. It is said to be derogatory to suppose that such mutual relations or relative positions existed in a past eternity.

Turning from this, if we believe this Divine Person was "Son" in the past eternity all becomes simple. Then we understand that God the Father gave and sent His Son into the world by way of the Virgin birth, that, as thus becoming flesh, becoming fully and really Man,

---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

He might accomplish eternal counsels, and as thus coming into the world do God's will—do it as to its supreme expression in sacrifice for sin at the cross. "God sent forth His Son, come of woman." His coming into the world was in the prepared body to do God's will (Heb. 10: 5-7).

As being "Son" there is subordination to the Father, and it is considered that to think of this as pertaining to a past eternity is derogatory to the Second Person of the Godhead. But *when* did that Person receive the "*commandment*" to lay down His life and take it again? Did He only get this *after* He became Son as born of the Virgin, or did He receive it before He so came?—so that in fact He came forth from the Father, and came into the world (John 16: 28) to obey it, to accomplish the work given Him to do (John 17: 4). Peter speaks of Him as the Lamb "*foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world, but who has been manifested at the end of times for your sake.*" The Lamb of God is the

---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

Son of God (John 1: 29-34), so that if foreknown as the Lamb why not foreknown as Son before the foundation of the world? Will it be said, He was not *foreknown* in that relative position? The Son addressing the Father says: "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world." This certainly was in a past eternity. Is it the love of Divine Persons between whom no *such* relations existed, who were not in such relative positions as "Father" and "Son?"

But I return, to press the point that if Sonship only began with birth into the world, then all the passages which speak of the Son being sent by God, or the Father, can only mean a sending *after* birth took place. Hence, as already said, the question at once arises as to when He was thus sent. At what time, under what circumstances, by what event? Perhaps it will be said that actually the being "sent" must refer to His *public* ministry, and apply from the time of His baptism. But He had spoken about "His Father's business" at the



---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

age of twelve (Luke 2:49), and He also speaks of being "sent into the world" (John 10:36), and at the time of His baptism He had already been in the world for thirty years. This view of the Sonship involves us in confusion as to such statements. It leaves us, as far as Scripture is concerned, without any definite knowledge as to when the sending actually took place.

We are delivered from perplexity when we see that Sonship belongs to the Second Person of the Godhead in the past eternity, as well as when He became flesh, and so henceforth in Manhood forever the Son of God. From this viewpoint there is no difficulty in understanding Gal. 4:4. God sent forth One who was Son already, and the following clauses define the mode of His coming forth—"come of woman, come under law." One already Son was sent, and thus came into the world.

It then becomes simple to understand Him speaking of the "Father" in relation to His coming and being sent. For being already

---

## “JESUS, THE SON OF GOD”

---

“Son” there was already “the Father” to whom in the matter of accomplishing eternal counsels He was subordinate—took such a place in that relation for their accomplishment.

So in John 8, where He repeatedly refers to “My Father,” and of being “sent” by Him, He declares: “If God were your Father ye would have loved Me, for I came forth from God and have come from Him; for neither have I come of Myself, but He has sent Me” (ver. 4). Having already presented Himself as the Son (vers. 35, 36), it appears certain that as such He came forth from God, the Son sent by the Father, and that this coming forth and being sent is not something occurring after birth, but rather that it refers to that Person who was already the Son coming forth from God the Father out of eternity to take His place as Man, and that in the way foreknown and accomplished, as Luke makes known. Again His own words confirm this: “I came out from the Father, and have come into the world; again I leave the world to go to the

---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

Father" (John 16: 28). The Person speaking came out from the Father, and came into the world. Then the Person called the Father was there as that, before He the Person called the Son came into the world.

He came into the world when born of the Virgin (comp. John 18: 37). But was the First Person only "Father" in relation to that miraculous birth, or *that* in a previously subsisting relationship with the Second Person—a relationship existing in eternity? Surely the latter. Hence it can be said: "God sent His only begotten Son into the world," and, "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world." In prayer to the Father, speaking of the disciples, He says: "They... have known truly that I came out from Thee, and have believed that Thou sentest Me" (17: 8). Again He says to the Father: "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the world" (ver. 24)—the love of relationship as Father and Son in a past eternity. And since there is no change as to the Person thus come in flesh He is called

---

## “JESUS, THE SON OF GOD”

---

“Son of God.” Then in addition, as to the process of His coming, God the Father is distinctly His Father in a new way, so that in this connection it is said, “This day have I begotten Thee.” Furthermore, become Man, He who was the Father in a past eternity is *His* God—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

One great feature of Christianity is believing and confessing that Jesus is the Son of God (John 20: 31; 1 John 4: 15). If this means nothing more than that He became the Son as born into the world, then one might so confess Him, and even though affirming the Virgin birth as being the Divine interposition to bring forth a unique Man who should be called and known thereafter as “the Son of God,” could yet deny that *that* Man was God from all eternity. In other words, If He is only Son as born into the world, one then might confess Him as Son in this way while not confessing Him to be Deity eternally co-existent and co-equal with the Father and the Spirit. This, we know, is

---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

utterly subversive of the faith. It follows that this confession, in the light of Scripture, involves the truth of His pre-existence as a distinct Person from all eternity. If this is essential to its proper meaning as a Christian confession, then the Person spoken of was Son in eternity.

Now once we see that this belief and confession must include the fact of His eternal existence, and hence His Sonship during it, we perceive the true bearing of the many passages which speak of Him being sent.\* They ac-

---

\* It is claimed that the use of this word in reference to Divine Persons must be limited to what takes place in time, for "The word 'sent' implies a relative position which is not one of absolute equality. . . . It is assigning to Him [the Lord] an inferior. . . place in Deity." But Scripture speaks of "The Holy Ghost sent from heaven" (1 Pet. 1: 12). As there is no question of incarnation here, such a text destroys the theory of supposed inferiority. Otherwise we would have to admit that since He is thus "sent," the Holy Ghost occupies an inferior place in Deity.

The use of "sent" in reference to Divine Persons clearly signifies *change of place*—the Holy Ghost

---

## “JESUS, THE SON OF GOD”

---

quire the plain and simple meaning that one Divine Person already known as Son in a past eternity was given and sent into the world to accomplish the eternal counsels of love and grace in redemption.

It is further denied that the Second Person of the Godhead was “the Word” in eternity, but that He only became this in giving expression to the mind of God as incarnate.

John says: “The Word *became* flesh.” If this Person is only the Word as incarnate, then this form of statement is misleading, to say the least; it almost looks like a false statement, for according to the view just mentioned the Person spoken of was not the Word before His holy conception, indeed not until He was born could He be so called. It would then be equally

---

sent from heaven, the Son come out from the Father and come into the world, God sent His Son. The force of this word in these connections cannot be set aside by such passages as John 1: 6; 17: 18; Acts 26: 17, where it is simply a reference to a mission given. The context makes all clear.

---

## "JESUS, THE SON OF GOD"

---

misleading to say: "In the beginning *was* the Word," for the Divine Person thus referred to was not that either at or before the primal creation. He was not even the Word in the creating of all things, any more than the Son. He was simply a Divine Person who was neither "the Word" nor "the Son" until present in the world in Manhood. If these things are so, then Scripture does not mean what it says, and we can only understand it by interpolating human phrases, and these may need to be changed as "new light" is received—a precarious position indeed! For example, in the present case we would need to read something like this: "In the beginning *was the Person who now has become the Word*"; and, "*The Person who has now become the Word became flesh.*" Again, when John says, "We know the Son of God has come," we would have to say he really meant, "*We know that an eternally existing Person who became in Manhood the Son of God has come.*"

Such views affect the truthfulness of God's

---

## “JESUS, THE SON OF GOD”

---

Word. This whole discussion resolves itself into the serious question: Are we to take Scripture as it is written in words given by the Holy Spirit? Let us accept them in simple faith, and not be wise above what is written through so-called “new light”—light which, contrary to the meaning of that term, only beclouds and befogs, raising questions as to the meaning of many simple passages, so that only by the adding of words dictated by human reasonings can their meaning become clear. It amounts to the alteration of plain Divine statements to enforce human speculations.



## BY THE SAME AUTHOR

<b>ALTERNATIVE VIEWS of the BIBLE.</b> Cloth, . . .	1.50
The Modern View of the Bible; Principal Features of Modernism; Effects of Modernism; Refutation; Modern Use of the Bible; Some Principles of Interpretation	
<b>MODERNISM and its re-statement of Christian Doctrine: is it the truth of God?</b> . . . . .	Cloth, 1.50
<b>MAN and the FUTURE STATE: an abridgement of F. W. Grant's "Facts and Theories as to a Future State."</b> Paper, .50; cloth, . . . . .	1.00
<b>CHRISTIAN UNITY</b> . . . . .	Cloth, .75
<b>THE MAN CHRIST JESUS: A Meditation on His Life and Death; and, Seven Distinct Titles of Christ in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of His abiding Sufficiency.</b> Paper, .30; cloth, . . . .	.75
<b>"THE PATMOS VISIONS," A Review of Philip Mauro's book, and A Brief Outline of Prophetic Truth</b> . . . . .	.25
<b>CHRISTIAN ASSEMBLY, Simple Papers on the</b> . . .	.15
<b>A STUDY of "The KINGDOM of the HEAVENS" and Related Events</b> . . . . .	.15
<b>BAPTISM: A Study in Scripture</b> . . . . .	.15
<b>FACTS from the RECORD—a brief consideration of the place given in the New Testament to Water Baptism, Sign-Gifts and The Church</b> . .	.15
<b>THE LORD'S SUPPER</b> . . . . .	.10
<b>Christian Companionship. Practical Suggestions for Young Christians</b> . . . . .	.10
<b>Principles of Action relating to Discipline in the House of God</b> . . . . .	.08
<b>Is the Christian a Worshiper of God or an Idolator?</b> .05	
<b>"Jesus, the Son of God"—a refutation that He only became Son in Incarnation</b> . . . . .	.05
<b>A Word of Warning: Worldliness, Moving-Pictures, Dancing, Dress</b> . . . . .	.02
<b>Modern Thought and the Bible</b> . . . . .	.02
<b>"Victory"—to whom does it belong?</b> . . . . .	.02
<b>Orders for \$2.50 sent post free; add 10% for smaller orders</b>	

**LOIZEAUX BROTHERS, BIBLE TRUTH DEPOT,  
19 WEST 21st STREET  
NEW YORK**

**[ PRINTED  
IN U.S.A. ]**

**Five Cents**