

## THE FULLNESS OF THE GODHEAD

By T. Doy Moyer

As we consider the Deity of Christ, we must study Colossians 2:9. Some who have been arguing that Christ was divested of the attributes and characteristics of Deity while upon this earth are teaching that this verse does not refer to Christ in the flesh. One position among these advocates even says that it does not refer to Christ at all. This will be reviewed later. We cannot minimize the seriousness of this issue, especially when some are trying to persuade us that Christ could not have possessed the fullness of Deity on earth, saying that He divested the attributes and characteristics of Deity.

### Overview

Colossians 2:9 tells us that Christ is, and ever has been, fully God. Jesus has always been Deity, with all that is inherent in Deity. He *never* has been some paganized, stripped down version of Deity. His *divine nature*, which cannot change, has always been the same (Heb. 1:12; 13:8). He was not just the "person" of God, as has been recently taught, but "God," which necessarily includes His attributes and characteristics. All other passages dealing with the subject of the humanity and Deity of Christ must not contradict this verse. For instance, Philippians 2:5-9 does not teach that Christ ceased possessing the *nature* of Deity (the attributes and characteristics that make Him who He is). Verse 7 does not mean that when Christ emptied Himself, He "poured out *of* Himself" all of the powers, characteristics, and attributes "that were His as divine." The text does not say that. All of the arguments about Jesus being the "person" of God without the attributes of Deity are nothing more than man-made philosophy and empty deceit. No Scripture teaches such. The "fullness" of Colossians 2:9 includes those attributes and characteristics; and Christ has always been the "fullness" of Deity, even while on earth. Does this mean that Christ exercised at all times *all* of those powers and attributes? No. But the fact that He may not use a particular power at all times does not mean He is devoid of that power. God is not now using every power available to Him (we would be consumed), but He is still all-powerful. Does this mean that Christ was not really a man? No. Christ was a man, although not "just a man." Does it mean that He used these powers of Deity to overcome sin and temptation? No. He did not need to.<sup>1</sup> If people cannot understand how Christ can be fully God on earth and at the same time be fully man, then that is a problem they will have to work out. I accept it by faith, not because I can understand it all. Unbelief causes men to try to explain that away.

There is no problem reconciling Philippians 2:6-8 with Colossians 2:9. Philippians 2 teaches that Christ emptied Himself, appearing not in the form of God (i.e. the visible manifestation of His position and status as God), but taking on the form of a servant (i.e. the role and position of servant). He came as a man to live among men. Yet, His appearing on earth as a man in the role of a servant did not change His divine nature. The fullness of the Godhead entered the body of flesh. There is no contradiction.

### Colossians 2:8-10

Colossians 2:8-10 says (NKJV):

"Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ. For in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; and you are complete in Him, who is the head of all principality and power."

Paul speaks of "philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men," and "the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ" (vs. 8). The statement in verse 9, "for in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," was given to counter the vain philosophy and give a basis upon which we can be complete in Christ. One of these empty deceits was the gnostic heresy which denied that God could actually come in the flesh. The gnostics believed that matter was inherently evil, and from that false premise reasoned that God, who is good, cannot dwell in a fleshly, material body. They believed that the fullness of the Godhead was distributed among the angels, and that Jesus was only an emanation of the fullness of God. John addressed this in 1 John 4:2 and 2 John 7. They denied that Jesus Christ — who is God (Jn. 1:1) — could actually come in the flesh and still be the fullness of Deity. But if Christ was not really God manifested in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16), then that man who called himself Jesus Christ was a fraud. Without the fullness of Deity dwelling in the body of Jesus, He would have been "just a man" and therefore *not* our Savior; He would not have been "Immanuel" (God with us). Thus, Colossians 2:9 affirms the fact that the Jesus Christ who lived in the flesh really was God, i.e. the "fullness of the Godhead" was in Him bodily. Faith in Christ as the fullness of Deity is essential (cf. Jn. 8:24). Don't let anyone's philosophy — whether gnostic, Jewish, pantheistic, or any modern doctrines about Christ — persuade you otherwise. Falling into those philosophies would destroy the relationship we have with Christ.

Verse 9 says: "For in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Legitimate definitions will answer some incorrect arguments and help us understand what Paul is saying. The "For" (because) connects verse 8 with verse 9. As opposed to these vain philosophies, we must believe that the fullness of Deity is in Jesus, indicating that these philosophies and deceits have to do with denying the full Deity of Jesus. "In" refers to place. "Him" identifies Christ as the One in whom the fullness of the Godhead dwells or lives. The crux of this discussion is in the following words: "dwells, fullness," "Godhead," and "bodily."

### Definitions

"Dwells" (*katoikei*) is from *kata*, meaning "down," and *oikeo*, meaning "to be at home." This indicates a permanence. Bullinger says it means "to settle down in a fixed dwelling; to dwell fixedly in a place."<sup>2</sup> Whatever "dwells," or is at home, "in Him," is permanent, not transient. "At home" in Christ is the *fullness* of Godhood, not just a portion. The verb is present tense, showing action in progress, a continual state. The verse does not say that the Godhead *started* dwelling in Him at some point in time, such as when He was glorified. The text does not say *when* (although the implication is that there never was a time when He was not Deity). Rather, the *where* is what the verse addresses, i.e. "in Him." The fullness of Deity had been and still is dwelling in Him. Jesus is Deity in all eternity. He was God "in the beginning" (Jn. 1:1), He was God in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16), and He is still God today. In other words, "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever" (Heb. 13:8). The fullness of His divine essence entered the body of flesh, and still remains with Him. Vincent says that the present tense of "dwells" is used "to denote an *eternal* and *essential* characteristic of Christ's being. The indwelling of the divine fulness in Him is characteristic of Him as Christ, from all ages and to all ages."<sup>3</sup> Robertson comments, "The fulness of the Godhead was in Christ before

the Incarnation (John 1:1, 18; Phil. 2:6), during the Incarnation (John 1:14, 18; 1 John 1:1-3). It was the Son of God who came in the likeness of men (Phil. 2:7). Paul here disposes of the Docetic theory that Jesus had no human body as well as the Cerinthian separation between the man Jesus and the Aeon Christ. He asserts plainly the deity and the humanity of Jesus Christ in corporeal form."<sup>4</sup>

"Fullness" (*pleroma*) means the "sum total, fulness, even (super)abundance."<sup>5</sup> As it pertains to Colossians 2:9, it means "the full deity"<sup>6</sup> or "the full measure of deity."<sup>7</sup>

There is nothing lacking in the divine nature of Christ. To suggest that He was stripped of the attributes and characteristics of Deity is to make Christ less than who He is. It is to fall into the deceitful traps of vain philosophy. The "Kenotic Theory," taken from Philippians 2:7, is one such modern vain philosophy which says that Jesus, when He came to this earth, divested all that made Him divine (i.e. divine attributes) in order to become only a man. D. M. Baillie, in critiquing this theory, made these noteworthy comments:

"Instead of giving us a doctrine of Incarnation in which Jesus Christ is both God and man, the Kenotic Theory appears to me to give a story of a temporary theophany, in which He who formerly was God changed Himself temporarily into man, or exchanged His divinity for humanity ... For though the Son of God thus keeps His personal identity in becoming the subject of the human attributes which He assumes, He has divested Himself of the *distinctively divine* attributes; which would imply, if language means anything, that in becoming human He ceased to be divine ... The Kenoticist would then be involved in saying that He who before the Incarnation had been a divine Being now turned into a man, with human instead of divine attributes, for the time. He *had been* God, but now He was a man. If taken in all its implications, that seems more like a pagan story of metamorphosis than like the Christian doctrine of Incarnation, which has always found in the life of Jesus on earth God and man in simultaneous union —the Godhead 'veiled in flesh' but not *changed into* humanity"<sup>8</sup> (Baillie's emphasis).

As opposed to the idea that Christ divested those "distinctly divine" attributes, Colossians 2:9 denies that Christ was (and is) anything less than total and absolute Deity. Baillie was right in saying that if language means anything, the idea of Christ's divesting those divine attributes means that in becoming human He ceased to be divine. This is why some are charged with teaching heresy. They have taught that Christ divested those distinctly divine attributes, and language *does* mean something.

"Godhead" (*theotes*) is the same as "Deity." We have heard some try to define "Deity" to mean only the "person of God,"<sup>9</sup> with or without the divine attributes and characteristics. Such is an unfounded assumption,<sup>10</sup> a misuse of definition and Scripture, done so in order to justify the idea that Christ was stripped of all His attributes, characteristics, and powers (i.e. nature) that were His as divine. The term does not refer to just the "person" of God, but "the state of being God, Godhead."<sup>11</sup> It is the "Divine essence of Godhood"<sup>12</sup> and "the divine nature and perfections."<sup>13</sup> It is "that which God is."<sup>14</sup> Trench comments that Paul is "declaring that in the Son there dwells all the fulness of absolute Godhead; they were no mere rays of divine glory which gilded Him, lighting up his person for a season and with a splendour not his own; but He was, and is, absolute and perfect God; and the Apostle uses [*theotes*] to express this essential and personal Godhead of the Son."<sup>15</sup>

Deity, then, is that which God is. It is the state of being God. If Colossians 2:9 only applies to Christ after His ascension, then He was not God while on this earth. If the fullness of the Godhead was something He only received later, then He was not in the state of being God on earth and He really was "just an ordinary man." If the "fullness of the Godhead" is something *we* receive, as we will note some affirm, then we would become Deity. The term "Godhead" is vital to the discussion.

There are two alternative meanings to the word translated "*Bodily*" (*somatikos*). The first means "corporeally,"<sup>16</sup> denoting Christ's human body. The word comes from soma which refers to a body; "*bodily*" is an adverb from soma also referring to the body. "*The* word refers to the human body of Christ."<sup>17</sup> This word affirms the humanity of Jesus. He really was a man. Yet, even in His humanity, He was fully God. In that corporeal body was more than a mere human spirit, more than a spirit stripped of divinity and Godhood. "*The* fullness of the Godhead" was in it. "The fulness of the Divine nature became incarnate, and was indwelling in the body of the Redeemer."<sup>18</sup> It is also true of Him after the ascension, for the body He had on earth is the body He ascended with, and is now glorified. "*The* fulness of the Godhead dwelt in His person from His birth to His ascension. He carried His human body with Him into heaven, and in His glorified body now and ever dwells the fulness of the Godhead."<sup>19</sup> His flesh did not see corruption (Acts 2:31). The same Jesus who was crucified was raised up and made "both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). There was no change in His divine nature. The same Jesus that lived on earth is now in heaven. The same "fulness of the Godhead" that dwelt in Him on earth continues to indwell Him now. Thus, the physical body of Jesus is included in this word. "*All* the fulness of the Deity' = the whole sum and substance of the infinite attributes that belong to Deity and thus constitute Deity. This fulness 'dwells in Christ.' Some insert: since his exaltation. Paul does not say that. Kenoticism is in error. And so is also Socinianism and its modernistic offspring. Christ is and ever was the God-man."<sup>20</sup> Those who poke fun at and criticize the fact that Christ was simultaneously God and man (God-man) are guilty of blasphemy and deny the truth.

If Jesus were not fully Deity while on earth, then His life and death here would be vain. He came to redeem and save mankind from sin. No mere man could do this. "What Paul says here lies back of all statements such as 1 Peter 2:24: 'bore our sins in his own body'; Colossians 1:22: 'reconciled in the body of his flesh through death'; Hebrews 10:5: 'a body thou hast fitted for me,' verse 10: 'the offering of the body of Christ'; all those passages that speak about the blood and the cross of Christ."<sup>21</sup> The body was prepared for Jesus for the purpose of His doing God's will in saving mankind. If the "fulness of the Deity" was not in that prepared body, then what does His life on earth accomplish so far as our salvation goes? Proving that man does not "have to sin" would not have been enough to save all who have sinned (Rom. 3:23). He had to taste death and take the punishment for sin (Heb. 2:9). He did this in the human body. The "church of God" was "purchased with His own blood" (Acts 20:28). It was God manifested in the flesh who shed His blood. If that is not true, then a mere man died — a finite price with infinite value. That is impossible.

The other alternative to the word translated "bodily" is that it means "embodied" or concentrated in a visible, tangible form. Hendriksen says it means "embodied, given concrete expression, fully realized in him." He further says, "Since, therefore, all the fulness of the indwelling essence of God is thus completely concentrated in Christ, there is no need of or justification for looking elsewhere for help, salvation or spiritual perfection."<sup>22</sup> This would be saying that Christ is the full expression of Deity; in other words, He is "the brightness of His glory and the express image of His person" (Heb. 1:3). That sense of the word would still include Christ in the flesh, as He appeared in a tangible, visible form (Jn. 1:1, 14-18; 14:7-9). Some say that the word means "wholly," or "substantially." Given that this were true, it would not deny the eternal and essential truth of Colossians 2:9. It would still be saying that the fullness of Deity was in Him; that Christ has always been Deity. In that case, it would mean that the fullness of the Godhead was really in Him, as opposed to figuratively. The phrase of the verse itself seems to go against that, since the terms "all" and "fulness" are already used. Paul didn't need to use another term that means the same thing.

However it may be taken, the evidence shows that the adverb "bodily" includes the physical body of Christ. Taking it at face value to refer to Christ's body is most reasonable. A position I will review, however, must use the term in such a way as to *exclude* the body of Christ; if "bodily" refers to or includes a real "body," then the position is destroyed.

Proper definitions show that Colossians 2:9 includes Jesus while He was in the flesh. Paul is talking about Christ being fully Deity, which includes the attributes and characteristics that are the essence of the divine nature. To conclude otherwise demands a redefining of terms.

### **Does Colossians 2:9 Refer To "Blessings"?**

One opposing advocate took the position that Colossians 2:9 "describes the glorified Christ, his state after his resurrection and exaltation."<sup>23</sup> A year later, the same writer shifts positions, saying that it does not refer to Christ at all, but rather to the spiritual blessings *we have* in Christ. In redefining the terms, this position says that the "fullness of the Godhead" refers not to the Deity of Christ, but to the spiritual blessings of God that belong to us. The entire phrase, "In Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" is reinterpreted to mean "In Christ are all the spiritual blessings of God wholly."<sup>24</sup> The position is based on the phrase "in Him," saying that since it occurs several times in the context referring to our relationship to Christ, then it must also be so here. Then, "fullness of the Godhead" is distorted to refer to blessings of God instead of Deity. "Bodily" is defined to mean "wholly" or "substantially," and it is denied that it can refer to a physical body.

### **"In Him"**

First, the phrase "in Him" alone does not necessarily mean "relationship with." What that phrase means in any particular instance is determined by its modifiers. *We* are not the subject of 2:9; Christ is (vs. 8). The verses consistently give the subject in connection with "in Him." Notice the other occurrences of the phrase in Colossians 2:5-13. Verse 5: "*your* faith in Christ"; vs. 6-7: "*you* have received ... so walk in Him ... built up in Him ... as *you* have been taught"; vs. 10: "*you* are complete in Him"; vs. 11: "In Him *you*..." The subject of the phrase is always given. However, verse 9 does not give *us* as the subject. Paul is establishing the basis for our relationship with Christ, which is the fact that it is not after the vain philosophies of man, but in the fullness of the Godhead as it dwells in Christ. The reason we can be "complete in Him" is because He is completely God. Without that fact about Christ, then what we would have "in Him" is worthless. The phrase "in Him" is a preposition modified by "dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." If we understand what the "fullness of the Godhead" is, and that it "dwells ... bodily" somewhere, then we'll know what "in Him" refers to in this verse.

The advocate of the position under review states that "The language 'in him' is never used to describe the physical body of Christ, nor the nature of Christ, it is always used in reference to the Christian's relationship with Christ." In the next paragraph, he says, "Paul always uses 'in him' to refer to the Christian's relationship in Christ and never once is it used to refer to the person of Christ or his physical body."<sup>25</sup> Notice how he confidently uses the terms "always ... never once." In light of what he says about being a "careful Bible student," he ought to be more careful himself. In the list of verses that he gives where the phrase "in him" is used, one verse is conspicuously missing. He omits Colossians 1:17, which says, "And He is before all things, and *in Him all things consist.*" "Consist" (*sunistemi*) means "continue, endure, exist, hold together."<sup>26</sup> Christ is the "coherer," the

One who makes all things stand together. This is what Hebrews 1:3 says: "upholding all things by the word of His power." This could not be referring to our relationship with Christ. Paul clearly uses the phrase "in Him" with reference to the nature and power that is *in* Christ. The idea that the phrase 'in him' is *never* used to refer to the person or nature of Christ is false.

The argument is made that the remote context does not support the view that Colossians 2:9 refers to the Deity of Christ. This is where the advocate refers to all of the other verses that use the phrase "in Him" in Colossians. As noted, however, Colossians 1:17 is missing from his list. Read what Paul says in Colossians 1:15-22. There can be no doubt that Paul is discussing the *nature* of Christ, and how His nature is the basis for our relationship with Him. Paul is establishing His *Deity* when he says, "For by Him all things were created ..." (vs. 16), "in Him all things consist" (vs. 17), and "in Him all the fullness should dwell" (vs. 19). Notice how that in the context of these statements about the *nature* of Christ, Paul deals with our relationship to Him. Paul even mentions that our relationship is based not only on who Christ is, but also what Christ accomplished "in the body of His flesh" (vs. 22). So the argument that the remote context of Colossians does not support the position that Colossians 2:9 refers to Christ's Deity is false. Paul does in chapter two what he does in chapter one. He discusses our relationship with Christ and in the midst of that affirms that Christ is Deity, which serves as the foundation for our relationship with Him. That is the consistent contextual position.

There is no reason to assign anything but a literal meaning to the phrase "in Him" in Colossians 2:9. "In Him ... bodily" should be understood literally, not figuratively. One of the basic rules of interpretation is that the literal meaning takes precedence over the figurative. A verse is to be understood literally unless there is something there that demands it be taken otherwise — when the literal meaning of a word or sentence involves an impossibility or an absurdity.<sup>27</sup> There is no problem in understanding Colossians 2:9 literally. It fits the context and coincides with what the rest of Scripture teaches about Christ.

### "Godhead"

The fatal flaw of the "blessings" position is the misuse of the term "Godhead." Any position that does not use the term according to its proper definition is wrong. We have already noted its legitimate meaning which is "the state of being God," not blessings or person. If, in verse 9, "in Him" means "relationship with," then the verse would be teaching that when we are in Christ, we are in the state of being God. Take all the legitimate definitions and make the application to see if it makes sense. Every proper definition would mean that when we are "in Him," according to this interpretation, then we fully have the divine essence of Godhood, personality of God, characteristics, distinctly divine nature, perfections and attributes, the state of being God, Godhood, Deity, that which God is, etc.. In other words, *we are Deity* when we are "in Him." (The only way to avoid this conclusion would be to redefine "Godhead," which is precisely what has been done. It is the fallacy of equivocation.) The text does not say that "in him dwelleth all the fullness of [the blessings of] the Godhead bodily," as the errorist mandates. Rather, it is the "fullness of the Godhead." Furthermore, the fullness of the Godhead (state of being) does not dwell in our relationship or fellowship with God. Whether we are in Christ or not does not change where the fullness of Deity dwells. The full state of Deity does not and cannot belong to us. To say that "all the fullness of the Godhead" means "all the spiritual blessings of God" is a distortion of the phrase. If *theotes* does mean the "state of being God," then "in Him" must refer to Christ Himself, for we cannot be in the state of Godhood.

The writer states that the difference between our positions "is the proper understanding of 'in him' and the 'content' of the 'fullness of the Godhead,' not the meaning of 'the Godhead.'"<sup>28</sup> As noted, "in him" is determined by its modifiers. Understanding "in him" in this verse is useless until we understand what "the fullness of the Godhead" is. As for the "contents" of the Godhead, the meaning of the term is sufficient to know the truth. It is that which God is; the whole sum and substance of the infinite attributes that belong to Deity and thus constitute Deity (Lenski). Why not just accept it for what it is?

There is a similarity in the phrases "the fullness of the Godhead" and "fullness of God" in Ephesians 3:19. Even though "Godhead" (*theotes*) has the same root as "God" (*theos*), they do not refer to the exact same thing. "Fullness of the Godhead," in Colossians 2:9, refers to the fullness of the *state of being God* (Godhood), and "fullness of God," in Ephesians 3:19, refers not to the state of Godhood, but to the fullness of that which God (the One who is in the state of Godhood) communicates to us as Christ dwells *in* our hearts through faith (vs. 17). When we are in fellowship with God, He dwells with us and in us (Jn. 14:23). Ephesians 3:19 says, "that *you* may be *filled* with all the fullness of God," possibly referring to the temple where God's presence was, which is figuratively used to affirm God's presence in His people (Eph. 2:21-22). His Spirit is "in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith" (3:16-17). It speaks to the presence of God in the hearts of believers. Here, the fullness is not "Godhood." We are not filled with the "state of being God." Vincent notes, "*Fullness of God* is the fulness which God imparts through the dwelling of Christ in the heart; Christ, in whom the Father was pleased that all the fulness should dwell (Col. 1:19), and in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead (Col. 2:9)."<sup>29</sup>

The prayer that Paul is making in Ephesians 3 points to our goal to become more like God. His righteousness is the standard that we must try to attain (Matt. 5:48; Eph. 4:13). Of course, we cannot become God; but we can, as much as is possible, become conformed to the image of Jesus Christ (Rom. 8:29), and thereby become *partakers* of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1:3-4). Hendriksen comments, "But what Paul prays is that those addressed may be filled *to* the fulness of God. Perfection, in other words, also in such matters as knowledge, love, blessedness must ever remain *the goal*; to become more and more like God, *the ultimate ideal*."<sup>30</sup>

Colossians 2:9, however, is establishing the basis upon which we can have a relationship with Christ and be complete in Him: because He is the true God, not the false God of some vain philosophy. Since He is God in the fullest sense, we can be "full" in Him. Ephesians 3:19 and Colossians 2:9 complement each other. Blessings are involved, but the whole basis for our being conformed to the image of Christ and being filled with His blessings is the fact that He is absolute Deity. Ephesians 3:19 says, in essence, what Colossians 2:10 says, i.e. that we are complete (full) in Him. It is closer to verse 10, not verse 9.

## Conclusion

Colossians 2:9 refers to the Deity of Christ, including His time on this earth. The context shows it to be so, and proper definitions back that up. Whatever trouble we may have with understanding the complete and simultaneous Deity and humanity of Christ cannot be explained away by negating either of those truths. We must accept by faith what the Bible says. It clearly establishes the Deity and humanity of Christ in the statement, "For in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily."

1. Those who have opposed false teaching on the nature of Christ have been falsely accused

of taking positions that they've never come close to taking. These positions include:

A. That Jesus was not a man. Read what has been written. His full humanity has always been affirmed, along with His full Deity.

B. That Jesus was not tempted. I have affirmed from the beginning that Christ's temptations were real (Heb. 4:15). I do not believe that Jesus desired to do evil (Jn. 8:44). Such is not necessary in order for a temptation to be real. Jesus was tempted in all areas that we are; the difference is that we all have let our lusts draw us away to sin while Christ did not.

C. That Jesus overcame sin because He was Deity. Wayne Greeson, in the 1990 October issue of *Faith and Facts*, cited me as teaching this, but did not prove it. He just *said* I took the position. I have stated many times that Jesus did not need to use the power of Deity to overcome sin.

Trying to back us into positions that we don't take is unethical. Such strategies are unbecoming even of the world. Any charge must be given proper evidence.

2. Ethelbert W. Bullinger, *A Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek New Testament*, p. 239.
3. M. R. Vincent, *Word Studies in the New Testament*, vol. III, p. 487.
4. A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, vol. IV, p. 491.
5. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, second edition, p. 672.
6. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, abridged in one volume by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, p. 870.
7. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 672.
8. D. M. Baillie, *God Was In Christ*, 1948, pp. 96-97.
9. One example of this is shown in an exchange between John Welch and Gene Frost. Welch: "the fullness of the Godhead was always in Jesus." Frost: "Now what do you mean by 'Godhead?' Define it." Welch: "The fullness of the person, spirit, or essence of Jesus." Taped meeting of preachers, Beaver Dam, KY January 8, 1991.
10. "Notice the absurdity of arguing that the 'all the fullness of the Godhead' refers to the person of God." Wayne Greeson, *Faith and Facts*, October 1991, p. 80.
11. Henry Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 288.
12. W.E. Vine, *Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words*, vol. I, p. 179.
13. Edward Robinson, *Greek and English Lexicon of the N.T.*, p. 334.
14. Hermann Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N.T. Greek*, p. 281.
15. Richard C. Trench, *Synonyms of the N.T.*, p. 8.
16. Bullinger, p. 106; Vine, p. 72; Arndt and Gingrich, p. 800.
17. Fritz Rienecker, *A Linguistic Key To The Greek New Testament*, p. 573.
18. Albert Barnes, *Barnes' Notes on the New Testament*, p. 1069.
19. Vincent, p. 487.
20. R.C.H. Lenski, *Interpretation of Colossians*, p. 101.
21. *Ibid*, pp. 100-101.
22. William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary; Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon*, p. 112.
23. Wayne Greeson, *Faith and Facts*, October 1990, p. 92.
24. Wayne Greeson, *Faith and Facts*, October 1991, p. 74.
25. *Ibid*, p. 81



26. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 791.
27. See D.R. Dungan, *Hermeneutics*, p. 195.
28. Wayne Greeson, *Faith and Facts*, October 1991, p. 76.
29. Vincent, p. 385.
30. William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary; Galatians and Ephesians*, p. 174.

— 1422 Cloverhill Drive  
Louisville, KY 40216