

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1130 – July 31, 2011

Trinity In Review

If you'd turn to 1 Cor 12:13. We'll start there and move ahead to some new material. We've seen the four Pentecost's in the Book of Acts and Peter's explanation of the Acts 2 Jewish Pentecost. So far as Peter was aware the kingdom offer was still on the table and he associated the tongues phenomena with everything being prepared and ready for the kingdom. The king had been crucified, risen, ascended and was now seated at the right hand of the Father as God incarnate and the king had poured forth this which they both saw and heard. So the pouring out was evidence that Jesus was accepted by the Father in heaven and He had all authority to pour forth the Spirit on your average laymen. And it was a convicting message the men of Israeli heard that day.

Then we see the Samaritan Pentecost in Acts 8 and this was so weird that the apostles came up from Jerusalem to see this. How can this be? How can half breeds believe in a Jewish Messiah? But that is apparently what was happening and when they came they laid hands on them and the Spirit fell upon them in the same way he had fallen on the Jews in Acts 2. So this signified that evidently Samaritans are being integrated into the same thing Jews were already a part of.

Then came the greatest hurdle of all - the Gentile Pentecost in Acts 10. And for this to happen Peter's thinking had to be completely changed. Gentiles were dogs, they were unclean and a good Jew didn't step foot in a Gentile home. So if Peter is going to ever step foot in Cornelius' home he's going to have to be convinced by some pretty heavy theology. And that's what God showed Peter. When he went into that home understand that was a major breakthrough, something radically different is now going on and Peter understood that Gentiles are being accepted by grace through faith, apart

from circumcision, apart from Judaism. So now you have Jews in Acts 2, Samaritans in Acts 8 and Gentiles in Acts 10. And gradually it is realized more and more that something new has begun, and that something new is different from Israel. This is not the nation Israel; this is something the world had never been seen before.

Finally the fourth group comes in, Acts 19, the disciples of John the Baptist had to be integrated so they didn't form a rival group and that occurs through Paul out in the dispersion. So now you have all four groups in one group and Paul in 1 Cor 12:13 summarizes what had taken place. "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether slave or free, and we were all made to drink of one Spirit." Notice that last clause, "all made to drink," they were forced into this, this didn't happen willingly, they didn't all join hands around the campfire and sing kumbayah, they had to be forced into this because the uniting of these people groups is not natural, so all were made to drink of one and the same Spirit. That forms a new body that we call the Church; a totally new thing that had never been seen before.

And notice how it is described by analogy as a human body, it's not described as a son, Israel was by analogy a son of YHWH, but the Church is described by analogy as a human body. The human body that was designed and created by an instantaneous act of God in the Garden of Eden was designed the way it was designed so as to serve as a teaching device to relay content about the Church. What is the Church? It's like a body, it has various parts but they all work together in a whole and it has a head, that head is Jesus Christ, He directs the Church. So what you're seeing in the Book of Acts is the formation of this body, it picks up some Jewish components, it picks up some Samaritan components, it picks up some Gentile components, but the important thing is that they are all one body. They are not three bodies with three different Holy Spirit's, they are one body with one Holy Spirit. He formed that and the way Paul says he formed that was by baptism.

There are lots of baptisms in Scripture, but basically there are wet baptisms and dry baptisms. This is not a wet baptism, one of the groups in Acts didn't even get wet, but they did all get the dry baptism of the Spirit. And that's what Paul is insisting brought them into this one body that is designed after the anatomy and physiology of the human body.

And realizing that gives you the analogy for how this thing called the Church is supposed to operate. If you've had any kind of physical problem, it could be as minor as losing your big toenail, but when that happens you know how vital that part is. And there are parts that are more vital than others. But the point is that suddenly when a part loses its function the rest of the body suffers. And that's the point Paul is making here in 1 Cor 12. Every part of the body is crucial to a healthy body of Christ. The Jewish parts are just as important as the Gentile parts. Isn't that what this verse is saying? We make a point to draw this out because the lesson that is coming out of the Book of Acts, that there is the Church universal, means it transcends all cultural lines. It's tragic but down through Church history Christians have divided up and everyone who is white forms a white church and everyone who is black forms a black church and everyone who is Indian forms an Indian church and everyone who is a cowboy forms a cowboy church and we divide over any and every issue. And it's understandable but there's something wrong about it too.

One of the great Jewish Christians of all time in the 20th century was Leopold Cohn who started the American Board of Missions to the Jews, and he wrote a neat little tract that's interesting. It's titled "*What it Has Cost the Church to Withhold the Gospel From the Jews*," and he says had the Church evangelized Jews all during the early centuries of the Church the church never would have gone amillennial, because the Jewish people would have automatically corrected that bad theology. They would have said, now wait a minute, Israel means Israel, it doesn't mean Church, it means Israel, and it would have saved the Church from centuries of persecuting the Jews and calling them the Christ killers and all of that. And it's a tragedy that it happened, the Church did more to persecute the Jews than any other single group and it was all because there were so few Jews in the Church that there was no one to stand up and say, hey, wait a minute, this is a Jewish book, not a Gentile book, and you can't go into our book and start re-defining Israel and saying all this is allegory. That's not how you interpret our book and it would have saved the Church a whole lot of worthless and dangerous eschatology.

So we have to understand that if we just followed this one verse in the NT, that we're all in a single body called the Church, it would have radical repercussions for unity and diversity within the Church, it would be

functioning as one body and not 500 bodies all split up over skin color, culture and what side of your head you part your hair, all secondary issues.

Last time we also said that entrance into this single body called the Church is through the baptism of the Spirit that brings us into union with Christ. That is something that is totally different than OT Israel. You didn't enter Israel through Spirit baptism; you entered Israel through physical birth and physical circumcision. So there's an entirely different means of entry. And this is just one of the many things that separate the nation Israel from the Church.

Another thing we saw that clearly separates the nation Israel from the Church is the tongues phenomena in the Book of Acts. Here we have the witness going out, not exclusively in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek, but in all kinds of languages. God is picking up the diversity of languages He brought about at Babel and saying, that language barrier that He built back there to separate Israel from the nations is coming down. Now the witness is going out in all languages of the earth, clearly saying the Jewish Messiah is for all men no matter what their language, no matter what their culture, no matter what their skin color, Christ is for all men.

This new situation was authenticated by prophecy. Prophecy was active because prophecy is what? It's given to reveal new truths. Since this is a new truth you have to have this gift operational so we have verbal testimony as to what is going on here. And so certain gifts were given like prophecy to reveal this and alongside of them certain gifts like miracles to authenticate the new revelation. So you have miraculous gifts and prophecy active during this time but we said that all ceased. This position known classically as cessationism, and while it was necessary for the foundation of the Church, once that foundation was laid those gifts were no longer necessary and now the authority is vested in this book. Once the canon was closed in AD96 there are no more prophets, no more apostles, no more revelation, etc...sola scriptura.

That's a controversial position but it is the historic position of the church and today you have quasi-biblical cults like Roman Catholicism and Mormons that insist we have apostles or apostolic-like authority and you get out of them post-biblical revelation or traditions that are superior in authority to the Scriptures. The way they get to these positions is by denying

cessationism. They're non-cessationists and they have to be because they deny the authority is in this book, if they admitted that all authority was vested in this book then they'd have to reject their religion. So we have a cessation of the sign gifts and now this book is the final authority.

Before we go on to a review of the Trinity and the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, we want to clarify a third major indicator of the difference between Israel and the Church and this is seen by the conspicuous absence of something in the NT. Not once, never, in any passage do you read that the OT covenants; the Abrahamic, the Land, the Davidic or the New, have been fulfilled.

What they do admit is that certain spiritual benefits are now flowing over to the Church *because* of our union with Christ. They're not coming over to us because of our union with national Israel. We didn't become Jews when we believed in Jesus Christ, we came into union with Christ and therefore indirectly we have received some of the spiritual benefits of the covenants by being in union with Him. But we have not replaced Israel. Remember, these covenants are legal documents, highly, highly technical literature, and you don't come into highly technical legal literature and start reading it allegorically. How do you read it? You read it literally. Why do you read it literally? Because contracts have terms, they have parties and if you don't maintain the original meaning of those terms and parties until the covenant is fulfilled then the terms and parties are changing and we don't know who has been faithful to the terms of the contract and who hasn't. How, if these things change can contract serve its basic purpose of being a measuring stick for faithfulness? By definition the measuring stick can't be changing from week to week. So this is why Dispensationalism is insisting, against Covenant Theology, that we maintain the original meaning of the terms in the contract until the contract is fulfilled. We insist you cannot jump around and change the terms and say, oh, Israel, that means the Church.

So for example, we have the Abrahamic Covenant, it has specific terms, specific promises. What are they? I will give you, Israel, a land, a seed and a worldwide blessing. The other three covenants do what to these three terms? They elaborate on them, they amplify. So the Land covenant reveals further details about the land promised to Israel. That is not fulfilled to the Church. You can't magically change earth into heaven. We don't take over that

promise. The seed promise is amplified in the Davidic Covenant and Jesus Christ is the One from David's genealogy who will eventually sit on David's earthly throne and fulfill it. And again, you can't magically change the location of David's throne on earth and make it the Father's throne in heaven, it doesn't fit the terms of the contract. And you can't read back meaning that is not originally in the terms just because you want to maintain some theological scheme.

The New Covenant is the enlarged explanation of the worldwide blessing. Here Jesus Christ is specified in the NT as the founding sacrifice of this covenant, they're all ratified by a blood sacrifice. But the parties to the New Covenant are the tribes of Israel and Judah. It promises national regeneration. And you can't suddenly say, well, that just means the Church. The Church isn't even a nation to begin with, the Church transcends nations, it's supra-national. So how are the original terms of the New Covenant fulfilled to the Church? They're not. Yet Covenant Theology insists that while the NT does not say explicitly that the New Covenant is fulfilled, it certainly implies it. Dispensational Theologian Renald Showers replies, "Many Covenant Theologians claim that the New Covenant is being fulfilled totally in the church today. According to this view, the literal nation Israel forfeited any relationship to the covenant because of its unbelief and rebellion against God. The church in the present age has replaced Israel in that relationship. Thus, the promise of the New Covenant which was presented in the Old Testament is to be fulfilled in a spiritualized Israel (Church) now. They are not to be fulfilled in the literal nation of Israel in the future... By contrast, Dispensational Theologians claim that since God promised to establish the New Covenant with the literal people of Israel (Jer. 31:31), since God intended the New Covenant to be unconditional in nature... And since God declared that he would fulfill the promises of the New Covenant with Israel, not because the nation would deserve it, but because of its disobedience (Ezk. 36:21-36), then the literal nation of Israel has not forfeited its relationship to the New Covenant because of its unbelief and rebellion against God."

So, it appears from a reading of the New Testament that neither Luke nor Paul teach that the new covenant has been fulfilled. Rather, both Luke and Paul teach that the second kingdom offer to Israel was rejected and that the Church came on center stage. Thus Israel has apparently been temporarily set aside until the completion of the body of Christ. Because the members of

the Church had been spirit baptized into union with Christ, then indirectly certain blessings from those covenants come to members of that body. But the fulfillment of those Old Testament covenants made with Israel can only be fulfilled to a future Israel. So that shows another difference between the OT nation Israel and the NT Church and it has wide implications for how we will be handling eschatology later.

Alright, we want to shift gears and come now to the doctrinal repercussions of the earthy origin of the Church on the day of Pentecost and this is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. And to introduce this we want to review what we learned earlier about the Trinity, because remember, the Holy Spirit is the Third Person of the Trinity - Father, Son and Holy Spirit. So to keep our balance we want to learn about the Holy Spirit as He is in the Trinity. It will save you, it will keep you balanced, it will enable you to understand New Testament passages, and the Holy Spirit's role in our lives to learn about Him inside the structure of the Trinity.

So just to review the points we made earlier, God is Absolutely One: God cannot be divided into parts based upon some prior categories or qualities. He is fully each of His attributes.

God is Absolutely Three: God has an aggregative nature that is eternally threefold, which is itself the archetypical source of logic and number, basis of math by the way, the number theory begins with the Trinity.

God's Three-ness Refers to Eternal Distinctions, Not Just Role Distinctions: It's not that God is God and then when He puts His working clothes on He turns into the Father, the Son or the Spirit. The Holy Spirit, the Son and the Father do have distinct and preferred roles, but beneath that they are inherently distinct. Otherwise they wouldn't have been distinct before creation, because if their roles in salvation didn't start until the fall, does that mean that they weren't distinct before the fall? I don't think so. "The so-called "economic trinity" derives from a fundamental 'ontological trinity'."

The Subordination within the Trinity Does Not Refer to Essence: In other words, because we say there's sort of a progression from Father to Son to the Holy Spirit does not mean the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Father or He has less of each divine attribute than the Father. This subordination is not one of

subordinate essence. It's rather to be looked upon as a team, and how a team works. The Trinity can be viewed in one sense, now not absolutely, but in one sense these are the way they fit together, it's like man and woman.

In fact, when feminism invaded evangelical circles there were two famous women who wrote a book on it and it's interesting that when they dealt with this issue of role, they insisted that a subordinate role meant subordinate essence. That's the basis of feminism. In the book they have to address the Trinity, if they have any scholarly integrity, you've got to because you've got the same problem. You've got roles that look like inferiority but aren't. And sure enough when they got to the Trinity they said that it has to be rethought. You can smell a rat right away; if your view of truth is such that it doesn't fit the Trinity, I think we have a rather basic problem going on here. This is not a peripheral, incidental, side issue somewhere; this is right at the heart of Christian theology.

The subordination within the Trinity does not refer to essence. There is a relationship among the three Persons of subordination from the Father through the "begotten" Son to the "proceeding" Spirit." And those two words you want to know because next week we're going to take those two up. The word "begotten" is used of the Son. The word "proceeding" is used of the Spirit throughout the Church and the creeds, and it is two words that you want to know as Christians. When you get some cultist that knocks on your front door someday, they are going to pin your ears back because they're going to say see, we believe the creeds, Jesus is begotten of the Father, and that means that He's inferior, He came after the Father and was created by the Father.

The last one, With Respect to the Salvation of Man the Triunity is Perceived With Both Threeness and Oneness: The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit each have distinct roles in man's salvation, yet at the same time we worship the One God.

I want to take you to two passages to remind you that when we went through the Trinity doctrine I referred you to key OT passages that referred to the Trinity, because you'll get somebody that says oh, the Trinity is never stated in the Bible clearly and you Christians can't show us a passage of Scripture that refers to the Trinity. Well, yes I can. Turn to Isaiah 48, this is one of

those uh-oh verses. I'm going to show you two verses, both from Isaiah; by the way, what's the clearest reference to the Trinity in the New Testament? Think of a mission's conference. At a mission's conference what is the verse everybody talks about? The Great Commission. And what in the Great Commission is the clearest New Testament statement of the Trinity, "baptizing them in the name," does it say "names" or does it say "name?" The noun "name" is singular, "name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." Clear statement, Matt 28, but we don't want to use the New Testament; we'll go to the Old Testament, just for our Jehovah's Witness friends.

Isaiah 48:16, "Come near to Me, listen to this: From the first I have not spoken in secret, From the time it took place, I was there." Everybody cool so far? God's speaking? Yes. What do you do with the last clause? "And now the Lord God has sent Me, and His Spirit." See what I said, uh-oh. What do we do with this one? Clearly God is speaking; clearly He says God has sent Me, and clearly He says God sent the Spirit. There is the Trinity in the Old Testament.

The second passage you want to think about, write down somewhere in case you have to use it someday, Isaiah 61:1, you have to go to Isaiah 60:22 to see the context, it says "I, the LORD, will hasten it in its time." That's who is speaking. Now in 61:1 the same person is speaking, it's a continuation, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me—to bring good news to the afflicted; He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to captives, and freedom to prisoners." It talks about the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, and then it says the Lord has anointed Me. Who quoted verse 1 in the New Testament? In the synagogue? The Lord Jesus Christ. So the Lord Jesus Christ Himself used this particular verse to explain how He understood Himself. And people were really ticked when He did it; they got the point, a very non-polite type of verse unless you really are the Lord. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me—to bring good news to the afflicted."

The point I'm saying is that the Father, Son and Spirit have to be thought about together, don't get imbalanced, and that's going to be important when we think about what the Holy Spirit does for us.

To introduce Him, so far in our New Testament portion we have been focusing on whom? On the Lord Jesus Christ. We studied His birth, His life, His death and His resurrection. And the New Testament says somehow we are already, prior to our death and resurrection, in some way identified with Christ's death and resurrection and even His ascension and session. We are right now seated with Him in the heavenlies, not in the future; NOW, present tense. So all this is coming out now, and you'll notice, it's all focusing on whom? The Lord Jesus Christ. I make this point, and here's the bottom line of what I'm saying by way of introduction to the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit's emphasis is not upon the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit's emphasis is upon God the Son. The Holy Spirit's emphasis is always on Christ and never on Himself. That's been a source of confusion in church history; it really has. And we still have some absolutely bizarre stuff going on, people rolling down the aisles laughing like hyenas and it's uh, the Holy Spirit that did this. Yet the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures is in the regeneration business, He is in the indwelling business, He is in the baptism business, He is in the sealing business, and He's in a few more businesses, but usually the people that are freaking out over all the Holy Spirit stuff don't even know what these words mean and they're the Biblical words.

There's an order to the Trinity. The Third Person elevates and reveres the Second Person, just as the Second Person elevates and reveres His Father. Jesus Christ always deferred to His Father, and the Holy Spirit always defers to Jesus Christ. So let's make a little practical application here. How can you detect a genuine work of the Holy Spirit? What is the Holy Spirit doing? He is doing something to reveal the Lord Jesus Christ, so a detection device, or a meter that tells you whether something is of the Holy Spirit or not is what does this something tell us about Jesus Christ and His work? That's how you tell whether it's the work of the Holy Spirit, not with this hoopla, people freaking out, laughing like hyenas or whatever they did in Toronto, and going through all this stuff. That doesn't tell me a thing about Jesus Christ. So let's get it straight, at the core of Christian theology is the Trinity, and you never get away from it. That structure is always there.

I want to quote from Dr L.S. Chafer. Dr Chafer many of you know founded Dallas Seminary in the 1920's and he ran across a lot of ignorance about the Holy Spirit because it was in his time that all this ridiculous stuff was coming out and being attributed to the Holy Spirit. He said, "For want of

extended and constructed teaching with respect to the Holy Spirit, the Christian church is, for the most part, in the same position as the twelve disciples of John the Baptist whom Paul found at Ephesus. Their statement – sincere and free from pretense – was, ‘We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost’ (Acts 19:1)... Almost every error or disproportionate emphasis upon some aspect of doctrine on the part of a few is caused by the neglect of that truth on the part of the many. The Pentecostal errors with their misuse of Biblical terms and their assumptions would never have developed to any extent had the full and right doctrine of the Holy Spirit been taught generally and in its right proportions."

Dr. Chafer is, of course, being facetious with his use of Acts 19:1, but his point is a great one. We never would have seen all this Pentecostal junk if people had just understood the Biblical doctrine of the Holy Spirit from the start.

Alright, let's look at the first point of the Holy Spirit. First truth, just as we refer to God the Son as begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things are made, you know the creed. There is a term that is associated with the Third Person of the Trinity, and it's called proceeding. The Holy Spirit "Proceeds" from the Father and the Son. That word "Proceed" is not in the Bible but the idea is in the Bible because what do we learn on the day of Pentecost? What did Peter say that Jesus did when He got to the Father's right hand? He poured forth the Holy Spirit. And that's what proceeds means. It means the Holy Spirit was poured forth from the Father and the Son. You'll see that in creeds, that's what it means when you recite the great creeds of Christianity, you'll see that statement, you may not have appreciated what that statement means, but what these guys cranked out in these creeds was well-thought out and debated, argued about, voted upon, a lot of work went into those great creeds. And this term was decided upon for a very interesting reason.

Before we get to the verses I want to take you on a little tour of church history related to this point, and I want you to see something about how history in the west unfolded according to this point. This is not something you're going to get in school, secular school, because this kind of stuff is all filtered out of the curriculum, except by a few bold and courageous teachers who defy the system and teach it anyway.

Just as the Son is said to be ‘eternally begotten’ of the Father, the Holy Spirit is said to ‘eternally proceed’ from both the Father and the Son.” Notice the difference? The Son is not said to be begotten by the Holy Spirit. It says the Son is begotten from the Father only, but when you get to the Holy Spirit, the Third Person, He is said to have proceeded from both the Father and the Son. That may sound like a silly little difference, why do you have to have “both,” this is hair-splitting, I can’t be bothered with this theological fine point. We’ll see how theologically a fine point this is.

Have you ever heard the expression, “it doesn’t matter one iota?” It’s an idiom. Do you know where that came from? That is a quote from a guy who wrote the history of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Gibbon. He was attacking Christianity, and he coined the term, it doesn’t matter one iota. He got the word from two Greek words that were being debated about the nature of Jesus Christ. One was *homoiousios* and the other was *homoousios*, one had an iota in it, the other one didn’t and the debate was whether Jesus Christ was of the same essence as the Father, of divine substance, or whether Jesus Christ was of a like essence as the Father. And Gibbon with his cutting, condescending attitude toward these sorts of issues said mockingly, it doesn’t matter one iota. That’s where that statement came from. But the iota is the difference between Jesus Christ being God and Jesus Christ being like God. So next time you see something that doesn’t matter one iota just remember that one. It’s a neat point to get you into a discussion where you might actually get a person to think for five minutes about the repercussions of that.

Well, there’s another little expression called the *Filioque* clause that people say, that doesn’t matter one iota, it’s just Medieval trivia. Those of you who have had Latin, this is a Latin word and suffix tacked on to part of the Latin noun *Filios*, which is “Son” and *que* is “and,” and what it means is “and the Son,” that’s where the word *Filioque* came from.

And in church history you find the *Filioque* in the creeds. We have the Apostle’s Creed, that’s an early creed, nobody knows exactly how it got generated, we know it didn’t come from the apostles but it came from some post-apostolic group. It was an early exposition of the great truths of the Christian faith. But the problem was, it wasn’t definite enough, so you had

apostates come in, denying this and that, they liked to shift things around, you know, people that like to argue what does “is” mean, that kind of stuff. And this went on in church history until the church said, we have to do something about this, we can’t have all this sliding around. So they wrote the Nicene Creed and you can see by comparing it with the Apostles Creed. It’s a bigger creed, it’s packed with more stuff, and it came later. The reason it came later and had more stuff in it was to stop people from sliding all over the place; they wanted to clarify more precisely the Christian faith.

So, for example, if we compare, in the second paragraph of the Apostle’s Creed, it says “and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived of the Holy Spirit,” etc. The Nicene Creed, second paragraph, what do they do with the person of Christ. “And in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father by whom all things are made.” Then it gives more about Jesus Christ and what He did. What difference do you notice between the Nicene Creed and the Apostle’s Creed? A complete exposition and defense of the nature of Jesus Christ and His work. That was an issue then, because if you don’t get the nature of Christ right you will not get His work of salvation right or anything else right.

Compare the third paragraph - the third paragraph of the Apostle’s Creed: And in the Holy Ghost; the holy Church; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; (the life everlasting).” The third paragraph of the Nicene Creed says, “I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life,” see what they’re doing there? They’re doing to the Holy Spirit just what they did to Christ, they’re expositing His nature. “I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son,” there’s the *Filioque* clause where it says “and the Son,” that is the *Filioque*. It was not in the original Nicene Creed; it was added years later, retroactively to clarify the deity of the Holy Spirit over against the Arians who argued that only the Father was the true God. So it’s part and parcel of the exposition and defense of the Trinity, and in particular the third member of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit. If you continue to read that same sentence, right after the *Filioque*, there’s another clause that tells you the practical impact of the *Filioque*. In other words, by insisting on the *Filioque*, “from the Father and the Son,” they

then said here's what it means, "who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified."

So the Holy Spirit receives worship as much as the Father and the Son. Does that contradict what I just said before? No, this means that He is fully divine and is to be respected and treated as divine. It's just that He prefers us to direct our attention to the Son. We worship the Holy Spirit as God, recognizing that He leads us to Christ. That's His function, that's His duty. Alright, we just got to point one and we didn't even finish that, but next time we'll get into the difference this makes politically. Every doctrine has repercussions and if you start a schism over who the Holy Spirit proceeds from; whether He proceeds from the Father alone or from both the Father and the Son that has historically trickled down into politics. And you'll see, while it may seem like a minor point to you, it has not been a minor point for millions of people and that's because logically when you start down a path that path leads to a very definite place and we want to see what that place is where the people who rejected the *Filioque* clause went.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2011