

FAITHFUL TO THE WORD

Systematic Theology Series

ANTHROPOLOGY

The Doctrine of Humanity

Created, Fallen, and Redeemable — What It Means to Be Human Before God

UNIT 4

The Constitution of Human Nature

Lesson 12

The Origin of the Soul

Creationism vs. Traducianism

“Where Does the Soul Come From?”

Key Texts: Ecclesiastes 12:7; Zechariah 12:1; Hebrews 12:9; Isaiah 57:16; Genesis 2:7; Psalm 139:13–16

“Thus declares the Lord who stretches out the heavens, lays the foundation of the earth, and forms the spirit of man within him.”

Zechariah 12:1, NASB 1995

Dr. Joshua Nichols

Pastor, Theologian, Author

faithfultotheword.com

Introduction

Lesson 11 established that the human person consists of two fundamental components, a material body and an immaterial soul, and defended this dichotomist position against the alternatives of trichotomy and physicalism. Lesson 12 asks a further and more precise question about the immaterial component: where does it come from? The body's origin is clear: it descends from the parents through the ordinary processes of biological generation, as the genealogies of Scripture consistently assume and as the ordinary observation of human experience confirms. But the origin of the soul, the genuinely immaterial, genuinely personal, genuinely distinct dimension of the human person, is a question that requires more careful theological attention, because the soul, by definition, cannot be simply generated by the same biological processes that produce the body.

The question of the soul's origin has generated two major positions in the history of Christian theology: creationism and traducianism. Creationism holds that God directly creates a new soul for each individual human being at or near the moment of conception, so that every soul is an immediate creation of God rather than a product of natural generation. Traducianism holds that the soul, like the body, is transmitted from parents to children through natural generation, so that the soul of each individual human being derives ultimately from the soul of Adam in the same way that the body derives ultimately from the dust of the ground. Both positions have been held by theologians of genuine Reformed conviction and genuine exegetical seriousness, and neither has achieved the kind of confessional consensus that settles the question with the authority of the tradition.

This lesson engages both positions with the intellectual honesty they deserve, presenting the strongest form of each, examining the biblical evidence marshaled in support of each, identifying the genuine difficulties that each faces, and arriving at a pastoral conclusion that honors both the genuine convictions of the creationists in the tradition and the genuine insights of the traducianists. The lesson proceeds in six sections: the question framed and its stakes identified; the creationist position stated and its biblical support examined; the traducianist position stated and its biblical support examined; the primary difficulty each position faces and the responses each tradition has offered; the Reformed tradition's own historical engagement with the debate and the positions of its most eminent figures; and the pastoral and doxological conclusion that the debate produces.

A preliminary note on the stakes of the question is important. The debate between creationism and traducianism is not a debate about peripheral matters; it touches the doctrines of original sin, the nature of divine creative activity, the constitution of the human person, and the relationship between the soul and its Creator. Yet it is also a debate in which the biblical evidence does not clearly and decisively favor one position over the other, which is precisely why the tradition has not settled it. The student who completes this lesson will be equipped not with the certainty that one position is simply correct and the other simply wrong, but with the theological clarity to hold whichever position he finds more persuasive with intellectual honesty and humble conviction, recognizing that the debate is one in which godly interpreters of the Scriptures have reached different conclusions for reasons that are exegetically and theologically respectable.

I. The Question and Its Stakes: Where Does Each Soul Come From?

Why the Origin of the Individual Soul Is Not a Peripheral Theological Question

A. Framing the Question

The question of the soul's origin arises from the combination of two settled theological convictions that the preceding lessons of this series have established. The first conviction is that the human person possesses a genuinely immaterial soul that is distinct from the body, capable of conscious existence separated from the body, and constitutive of the personal identity that persists through the intermediate state and into the resurrection. The second conviction is that Adam was the specially created first man whose soul was animated by the direct, personal, immediate act of God in breathing the *nishmat chayyim* (the breath of life) into the body formed from the dust, a creative act that Genesis 2:7 presents as unique, unrepeated, and determinative of the human constitution. The question the two convictions together generate is: how does this pattern repeat? Adam's soul was directly breathed into existence by God. How do the souls of Adam's descendants come to exist?

The question is not merely a curiosity about the mechanics of conception and birth; it is a question with genuine theological ramifications. It bears on the doctrine of original sin: if the soul is directly created by God for each individual human being, how does a God-created soul become a fallen soul, bearing the corruption and the guilt that the doctrine of original sin attributes to every human being as a member of Adam's race? It bears on the doctrine of the *imago Dei*: if the soul derives from Adam by natural generation, does it derive the image as well, and in what form? It bears on the doctrine of Christ's Incarnation: how did the eternal Son take on a human soul without that soul being subject to original sin, given that the Incarnation involved the assumption of a genuine human soul? And it bears on the doctrine of divine creative activity: does God's creative work continue in the creation of individual souls throughout the history of the human race, or was the original creation of Adam's soul the once-for-all creative act from which all subsequent souls derive by natural transmission?

The pastoral stakes of the question are equally significant. The conviction that God directly creates each individual soul, if creationism is correct, is a conviction that undergirds the sense of each person's direct, individual, personal relationship to the Creator: God did not merely create humanity in general but created this specific soul at this specific moment for this specific person. The conviction that the soul derives from Adam by natural generation, if traducianism is correct, is a conviction that undergirds the organic unity of the human race and the comprehensive character of the fall's transmission: sin is not merely imputed to Adam's descendants by a forensic act of divine reckoning but genuinely inherited through the natural process by which the corruption of the original soul propagates through the human family. Both convictions carry genuine pastoral and theological weight, and the debate between them is a debate about which set of convictions is more adequately grounded in the biblical testimony.

B. The Historical Context: Who Held What and Why

The history of the debate between creationism and traducianism in the Western Christian tradition extends from the patristic era to the present, and the positions of the tradition's most eminent figures do not align neatly with any single confessional tradition. In the patristic era, Tertullian was the most vigorous advocate of traducianism, arguing that the soul is transmitted from the parents to the child in the sexual act and that this transmission accounts for the universal propagation of original sin. Jerome and the later Latin tradition generally favored creationism, arguing that the direct divine creation of each soul is the only account that adequately preserves the soul's dignity and its direct relationship to the Creator. Augustine himself famously refused to settle the question, acknowledging that the biblical evidence did not clearly favor either position and expressing concern that traducianism might compromise the soul's immaterial dignity.

In the Reformed tradition, the division persists with equal clarity. Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, Francis Turretin, and Louis Berkhof all affirm creationism as the more scripturally adequate position, arguing that the texts cited in

favor of creationism (Zechariah 12:1; Hebrews 12:9; Isaiah 57:16; Ecclesiastes 12:7) more directly establish the divine creation of each individual soul than the texts cited by traducianists establish the natural transmission of souls. On the other side, W. G. T. Shedd and Augustus Strong defend traducianism as the position that most naturally accounts for the transmission of original sin without the theological difficulties that creationism generates. The fact that the question divides the Reformed tradition internally, with leading representatives on both sides, is itself a significant datum: it suggests that neither position has a clearly decisive biblical warrant, and that the question falls into the category of genuine theological disputation within the bounds of Reformed orthodoxy.

The Lutheran tradition has generally favored traducianism, in part because Luther himself appears to have held it and in part because the Lutheran insistence on the realism of original sin's transmission makes traducianism's account of the soul's inheritance of Adam's corruption more naturally coherent. The Roman Catholic tradition has generally favored creationism, following the position of Aquinas, who argued for the direct creation of each soul on both philosophical and theological grounds. The Eastern Orthodox tradition has been less consistently aligned with either position. The breadth of the distribution of both positions across the major confessional traditions is further evidence that the question is one on which the biblical and theological evidence genuinely underdetermines the conclusion, and on which the church has historically been willing to exercise theological humility.

“Furthermore, we had earthly fathers to discipline us, and we respected them; shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of spirits, and live?”

Hebrews 12:9, NASB 1995

II. The Creationist Position: God Directly Creates Each Soul

The Biblical Case for the Immediate Divine Origin of Every Individual Soul

A. *The Primary Biblical Support for Creationism*

The creationist position rests on four primary texts that, taken together, present a picture of God as the direct, immediate Creator of each individual human soul: Zechariah 12:1, Hebrews 12:9, Isaiah 57:16, and Ecclesiastes 12:7. Each text is worth examining with care, because the creationist's argument depends on the cumulative force of the collection rather than on the decisive authority of any single verse.

Zechariah 12:1 is the text most frequently cited by creationists as their primary proof: “The burden of the word of the Lord concerning Israel. Thus declares the Lord who stretches out the heavens, lays the foundation of the earth, and forms the spirit of man within him” (NASB 1995). The parallelism of the verse is theologically suggestive: God is described as the One who stretches out the heavens (an act of cosmological creation), who lays the foundation of the earth (an act of cosmological creation), and who forms (יוצר, *yotzer*, the same root as the *yatsar* of Genesis 2:7) the spirit of man within him. The three acts are presented as parallel divine activities, suggesting that the forming of the spirit is as direct and as immediate an act of God as the stretching of the heavens. Creationists argue that if God forms the spirit of man within him with the same directness with which He stretched out the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth, then the soul is not a product of natural generation but of immediate divine creative activity. Hebrews 12:9 provides the second major proof: “shall we not much rather be subject to the Father of spirits, and live?” The designation of God as the “Father of spirits”, as distinct from the earthly fathers who are fathers of bodies, implies a direct parental relationship between God and each individual human spirit, a relationship most naturally understood as the relationship of Creator to creature rather than the relationship of the sustainer of a naturally transmitted spiritual substance.

Isaiah 57:16 contributes a third strand of creationist evidence: “For I will not contend forever, nor will I always be angry; for the spirit would grow faint before Me, and the breath of those whom I have made.” The phrase “the breath of those whom I have made” (*nishmat*, the same term as in Genesis 2:7’s “breath of life”) attributes to God the creative authorship of the breath/spirit of each individual human being. The parallel with the *nishmat chayyim* of Genesis 2:7 is significant: if the divine breathing of the *nishmat* in Genesis 2:7 was the direct creative act by which Adam’s soul was constituted, and if Isaiah 57:16 attributes the same *nishmat* to God’s creative work in each individual human being, then the implication is that each individual soul is as directly created by God as Adam’s soul was. Ecclesiastes 12:7, examined in the preceding lesson, provides the fourth strand: “the spirit will return to God who gave it”, the soul’s return to God as the One who “gave” it implies that the soul was directly given by God to the individual person rather than derived from natural generation. The cumulative picture of these four texts is of a God who is the immediate, direct, personal Creator of each individual human soul.

B. *The Theological Strengths of Creationism*

Beyond the specific biblical texts, the creationist position is supported by several theological considerations that commend it to the careful theologian. First, creationism most naturally preserves the direct, personal relationship between God the Creator and each individual human creature. If God directly creates each soul at the moment of conception, then every human being is the immediate handiwork of God in the most personal sense, not merely a product of the natural processes that God has set in motion and sustains, but the specific, individual, personally intended creation of the One who forms each spirit within each person. This is the theological conviction that lies behind Psalm 139:13–16’s account of God’s personal formative involvement in each individual from the moment of conception: “For You formed my inward parts; You wove me in my mother’s womb.” On the creationist reading, the forming of the inward parts includes the direct creation of the soul that makes the person who he is from the earliest moment of his existence.

Second, creationism more naturally preserves the immaterial dignity of the soul. The traducianist’s claim that the soul is transmitted through natural generation raises the philosophical question of how an immaterial substance can be transmitted through a biological process, a question that critics of traducianism have consistently identified as its most serious philosophical difficulty. If the soul is genuinely immaterial, not a physical substance, not constituted by biological processes, then the transmission of the soul through biological generation seems to require either that the soul has some material component that allows for biological transmission (a position that compromises the dichotomist’s insistence on the soul’s genuine immateriality) or that the mechanism of transmission is simply opaque and inexplicable. The creationist avoids this difficulty by positing a mechanism for the soul’s origin that is appropriate to its nature: an immaterial substance is created by the direct creative act of God, just as the material body is generated by the natural processes that God has ordained for the propagation of the species.

Third, creationism has the advantage of maintaining the direct creative activity of God in the constitution of each individual person throughout the history of the human race. The creationist does not need to posit a single explosive creative act in Adam from which all subsequent souls are derived by a process that the Scriptures do not describe; he posits, instead, an ongoing divine creative activity in which God directly constitutes each human soul as a unique and immediate expression of His personal creative care for each member of the human family. This account of ongoing divine creative activity resonates with the Scriptures’ consistent portrayal of God as the immediate Sustainer and Governor of the created order, not a God who wound up the clock of creation and stepped back, but the living God whose active, personal involvement in the existence of each creature is the precondition of its continued existence.

III. The Traducianist Position: The Soul Derives from the Parents

The Biblical Case for the Natural Transmission of the Soul Through Generation

A. The Primary Biblical Support for Traducianism

The traducianist position rests on a different set of biblical considerations, centered on the account of the original creation in Genesis 2:7, the genealogical unity of the human race in Adam, and the analogical use of Hebrews 7:9–10. The traducianist’s primary argument from Genesis 2:7 is from silence combined with the structure of the biblical narrative: God breathed the *nishmat chayyim* specifically into Adam, constituting him as a living being, and Genesis 2:7 records no subsequent act of divine soul-creation for any subsequent human being. The creation of Eve (Genesis 2:21–22) involved the taking of material from Adam’s body but made no mention of a separate act of divine soul-creation; and the genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 describe the propagation of the human race through natural generation without any reference to repeated divine acts of soul-creation. The argument is that if God had directly created a new soul for each individual human being, the Scriptures’ consistent pattern of tracing the human race through natural generation would be misleading or incomplete.

The Hebrews 7:9–10 passage provides the traducianist’s most explicit biblical support for the transmission of a personal dimension of identity through natural generation: “And, so to speak, through Abraham even Levi, who received tithes, paid tithes, for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him.” The argument turns on Paul’s claim that Levi participated in Abraham’s act of tithing because Levi “was still in the loins of his father” (Abraham) at the time of the act. The traducianist argues that if a personal, responsible participation in an act can be attributed to someone who was present in the loins of his ancestor three generations prior, then the natural transmission of personal identity, including the immaterial dimension of the person, through natural generation is a biblical category. If Levi’s personal identity was present in Abraham’s loins in a morally significant sense, then the soul of each subsequent human being may be present in the loins of his ancestors in a similarly constitutive sense.

The third major biblical support for traducianism is the general principle of Genesis 1:24–25 and 1:28, where God commands the creatures He has made to be fruitful and multiply after their own kind. The multiplication of human beings “after their own kind” through natural generation implies a transmission of the full human nature, not merely the body but the whole person, from parents to children. If the soul is a genuine component of the human nature that distinguishes human beings from all other creatures, then the multiplication of human beings after their own kind implies the transmission of the soul as well as the body. The traducianist argues that the creationist’s appeal to repeated divine acts of soul-creation for each individual human being is not required by and not supported by the Scriptures’ account of the propagation of the human race through natural generation.

B. The Theological Strengths of Traducianism: Original Sin and Its Transmission

The traducianist’s strongest argument is not exegetical but theological: traducianism most naturally accounts for the transmission of original sin. The doctrine of original sin holds that every human being inherits from Adam not merely the guilt of his transgression (by federal imputation) but also the corruption of human nature, the sinful inclinations, the enslaved will, the darkened mind, and the disordered affections that characterize the fallen human creature from birth. Paul declares in Romans 5:12 that “through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned” (NASB 1995), and the psalmist confesses in Psalm 51:5 that “in sin my mother conceived me.” The corruption of human nature is not a consequence of personal sin; it is a condition inherited at birth, present from the very beginning of the individual’s existence.

For the traducianist, the mechanism of this inheritance is natural and transparent: the soul is transmitted from parents to children through natural generation, and the corruption of the soul that sin introduced in Adam is transmitted along with the soul itself, just as a genetic defect is transmitted from parent to child through the biological process of generation. On this account, the corruption of original sin is genuinely inherited rather than

merely imputed, because the soul that is transmitted is the soul that bears the corruption. The traducianist charges that creationism faces an insuperable difficulty at precisely this point: if God directly creates each individual soul, and if God is holy and just and cannot create a corrupt soul, then how does the newly created soul become the bearer of the corruption of original sin? The creationist's answer, that the newly created soul is placed in the corrupted body and thereby becomes corrupted through its union with the body, seems to either locate the original corruption in the body alone (a residual Gnosticism that compromises the doctrine of total depravity) or to make God responsible for placing a pure soul in circumstances that He knows will result in its corruption.

The traducianist also argues that his position better accounts for the organic unity of the human race that the Pauline argument of Romans 5:12–21 requires. If Adam's guilt is imputed to his descendants and Adam's corruption is inherited by his descendants, the most natural account of how this imputation and this inheritance occur is that the descendants were genuinely present in Adam in some ontological sense, not merely forensically reckoned to be in him by a divine legal declaration, but actually part of his humanity in a way that makes their participation in his transgression real rather than merely attributed. The Hebrews 7:9–10 passage, with its account of Levi's real presence in Abraham's loins at the time of the tithing, provides the biblical category for this kind of seminal presence of the descendant in the ancestor. On the traducianist's account, the entire human race was seminally present in Adam at the time of the fall, bearing not merely Adam's federal representative status but his actual nature, and therefore inheriting his corruption as a genuine inheritance rather than a merely imputed condition.

“Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me.”

Psalm 51:5, NASB 1995

IV. The Difficulties on Both Sides: Where Each Position Faces Genuine Challenge

The Theological Problems That Neither Position Has Fully Resolved

A. *The Creationist's Difficulty: How Does a God-Created Soul Become Fallen?*

The creationist's most persistent difficulty is the transmission of original sin, the problem that the traducianist presses with considerable force. If God directly creates a new soul for each individual human being at the moment of conception, the question immediately arises: how does this freshly created, directly God-given soul become corrupted by original sin? The difficulty is not merely practical; it is theological. If God creates the soul directly and immediately, and if the soul as created by God is not already corrupt (for God cannot create a corrupt substance without being responsible for the corruption He has introduced into the creature), then the soul must become corrupt at some point after its creation. But when? And how? And is the mechanism of the soul's corruption compatible with the holiness and justice of a God who directly created it?

The most common creationist response is to argue that the soul becomes corrupt through its union with the body, that the body, which derives from the corrupted Adamic humanity through natural generation, is the vehicle through which the corruption of original sin is communicated to the newly created soul. On this account, the soul is created pure but becomes corrupt through its necessary union with the corrupt body in which it is placed. This response has been offered by Turretin, Hodge, and Berkhof with varying degrees of sophistication, and it has a certain surface plausibility: if the body is already the product of corrupted Adamic generation, and if the soul is necessarily united to this corrupt body from the moment of its creation, then the union of soul and body might be the mechanism of the soul's corruption. But this response faces serious difficulties of its own. It seems to locate the original locus of corruption in the body, with the soul's corruption being secondary and derivative, which appears to compromise the totality of the fall's damage to the whole person, including the soul itself. And it raises

the question of why a directly created soul, united to a corrupt body, could not resist that corruption, a question whose answer seems to require either the weakening of the soul's created integrity or the attribution of the corruption to divine design in a way that implicates God's holiness.

Berkhof's own response to this difficulty acknowledges its force with characteristic honesty: "Creatianists are not able to explain completely how a soul created pure becomes sinful." This acknowledgment from one of the tradition's most careful systematic theologians reflects the genuine theological challenge that creationism faces at this point, and it is the honest intellectual posture that the question demands. The creationist can point to the mystery of divine sovereignty and the inadequacy of human understanding to fully comprehend the mechanism by which a good creation becomes corrupted, as he appeals to the same sovereign mystery in the case of Adam's original fall. But the traducianist is right to press the point: the creationist owes the tradition at least the acknowledgment that his position's account of original sin's transmission is incomplete, even if it is not therefore false.

B. *The Traducianist's Difficulty: How Is an Immaterial Substance Transmitted Biologically?*

The traducianist's most persistent difficulty is the philosophical problem of transmission: how can a genuinely immaterial substance be transmitted through the biological process of natural generation? The difficulty is fundamental rather than merely practical. If the soul is genuinely immaterial, not composed of matter, not subject to the physical processes that govern the transmission of biological information from parent to child, then there appears to be no mechanism by which it could be "transmitted" through natural generation in the way that the body is transmitted. The body can be transmitted through natural generation because the body is a material substance, and material substances can be subdivided, inherited, and modified through biological processes. But the soul, by definition, is not a material substance, and the claim that it can be "transmitted" through a biological process seems to require either that the soul has some material component that allows for biological transmission or that the transmission is not really biological but something else entirely.

The traducianist's most common response to this difficulty is to argue that the transmission of the soul through natural generation is a mystery, a genuine divine act that cannot be reduced to the biological processes of material generation, but that occurs in and through and with those processes in a manner that exceeds the comprehension of the creature. The traducianist can point to the fact that the union of body and soul itself exceeds human comprehension in its mechanism: how an immaterial soul and a material body constitute a single unified person is a mystery that neither dichotomists nor trichotomists can fully explain, yet both affirm. The mystery of soul-body union does not refute the reality of the union; similarly, the mystery of the soul's transmission through natural generation does not refute the reality of the transmission.

The traducianist also faces a difficulty with respect to the Incarnation. If the soul is transmitted through natural generation from Adam through all human generations, then the human soul of Jesus Christ, assumed in the Incarnation from the human nature inherited from His human ancestors through Mary, would have been subject to the same corrupting transmission that produces original sin in every other member of the human race. The traducianist must therefore provide an account of how Christ's human soul was preserved from the corruption of original sin despite its origin through natural generation from Adamic humanity. The usual traducianist response invokes the supernatural intervention of the Holy Spirit in the conception of Christ (Luke 1:35: "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you") as the mechanism by which the corruption that would otherwise be transmitted was prevented. But this response effectively posits a direct divine act preventing corruption in Christ's case, which raises the question of why such a direct divine act was not invoked to prevent corruption in every other case, and seems to bring the traducianist's account of natural transmission partially into alignment with the creationist's account of direct divine creative activity.

V. The Reformed Tradition's Engagement: Evaluating the Evidence

How the Tradition's Most Careful Thinkers Have Approached an Unresolved Question

A. *Where the Creationists Have the Stronger Case*

A careful assessment of the biblical and theological evidence suggests that the creationist position, despite its difficulty with original sin's transmission, has the stronger exegetical case. The four texts most directly bearing on the question, Zechariah 12:1 ("forms the spirit of man within him"), Hebrews 12:9 ("Father of spirits"), Isaiah 57:16 ("the breath of those whom I have made"), and Ecclesiastes 12:7 ("the spirit will return to God who gave it"), each attribute the individual soul's origin to the direct creative activity of God rather than to natural generation. None of these texts says that God created Adam's soul and that all subsequent souls derive from Adam's soul by natural generation; each of them says that God is the Creator or Giver or Father of each individual soul.

The traducianist's primary texts are more indirect. The argument from silence in Genesis 2:7 (no subsequent soul-creation mentioned) is a negative argument that carries weight only if the absence of explicit reference to repeated soul-creation is more naturally explained by the non-occurrence of such creation than by the silence of a narrative that does not enumerate every act of God. The Hebrews 7:9–10 argument about Levi in Abraham's loins is an argument from analogy that requires a significant extension of its context: the passage is about the superiority of Melchizedek's priesthood over the Levitical priesthood, not about the mechanism of the soul's transmission through natural generation, and the use of "still in the loins of his father" may be a forensic or representative expression rather than an ontological claim about the actual presence of Levi's soul in Abraham. The Genesis 1:28 argument about multiplication after one's kind is a general statement about human propagation that does not specifically address the transmission of the soul rather than the body.

Turretin's careful assessment of the evidence in the Institutes of Elenctic Theology, affirming creationism as the more scripturally supported position while acknowledging that both positions face genuine difficulties, represents the kind of judicious Reformed engagement with an unresolved question that this lesson recommends. Turretin recognizes that the creationist's difficulty with original sin is genuine and that the traducianist's solution has attractions; but he concludes that the direct statements of Scripture about God as the Creator of each individual spirit carry more exegetical weight than the indirect and analogical arguments of the traducianist. The majority position of the Reformed tradition, creationism, appears to be the more scripturally grounded conclusion, even if it is not without genuine difficulty.

B. *The Pastoral Wisdom: Holding Conviction with Humility*

The debate between creationism and traducianism is a debate in which the biblical evidence does not clearly and decisively favor either position, the theological tradition is genuinely divided among its most eminent representatives, and the doctrinal stakes, while real, do not rise to the level at which error on the question constitutes a departure from the substance of the faith. The appropriate pastoral response to such a debate is the combination of reasoned conviction and genuine humility that the best of the tradition has modeled: holding the position that the biblical evidence most directly supports (creationism, in the judgment of this series, following Turretin, Hodge, and Berkhof) while acknowledging the genuine force of the traducianist's primary argument and refusing to treat the debate as settled beyond the capacity of careful exegetes to reach different conclusions.

What both positions affirm with equal conviction, and what the debate itself does not put in question, is the set of convictions that this lesson has treated as settled throughout: every human soul is created by God; every human soul belongs to God; every human soul is accountable to God; every human soul is the object of God's sovereign knowledge, love, and providential care from the first moment of its existence; and every human soul is destined for either the eternal blessedness of the presence of God or the eternal just punishment of separation from God. These convictions are the pastoral substance of the doctrine of the soul's origin, and they are convictions that both creationists and traducianists affirm without reservation. The debate between the two positions is a debate about the mechanism of the soul's origin, not about the theological character of the soul itself or the God who created it.

The practical pastoral application of this position of humble conviction is straightforward: the pastor who has worked through the debate carefully enough to hold a reasoned position will hold it with the intellectual confidence that careful exegesis warrants, while refusing to make it a test of orthodoxy or a ground for division in the community of faith. The young person who has been formed by a traducianist tradition and who raises the question in a pastoral context deserves the same honest engagement as the scholar who has studied the debate in detail: a clear account of the primary evidence, a fair presentation of both positions' strengths and difficulties, a reasoned statement of the position this series holds, and the explicit acknowledgment that the question is one on which godly interpreters have differed and on which genuine intellectual humility is not a sign of theological weakness but of theological maturity.

VI. The Doxological Conclusion: Every Soul Bears the Mark of Its Maker

What Both Positions Affirm, and Why That Affirmation Is Worth More Than the Debate

The debate between creationism and traducianism, for all its genuine theological interest and genuine practical significance, is ultimately a debate about a question that stands at the edge of what the Scriptures have chosen to reveal with explicit clarity. The mechanism by which each individual soul comes to exist, whether by direct divine creation at conception or by natural transmission through generation, is a question about which the Scriptures provide suggestive but not decisive evidence, and the tradition's inability to resolve the question after two millennia of careful engagement is itself a form of hermeneutical data: it suggests that the Scriptures have not addressed the mechanism of the soul's origin with the specificity that would be required to settle the debate. What the Scriptures have addressed with abundant clarity and with consistent emphasis is something more important and more pastorally urgent: not the mechanism of the soul's origin but the character of the One who is responsible for every soul's existence.

Zechariah 12:1's description of God as the One who "forms the spirit of man within him", whether or not the forming is immediate creation or mediated through natural generation, establishes that God is the ultimate source and the ultimate Author of every human spirit. Hebrews 12:9's designation of God as "the Father of spirits", whether or not the fatherhood is the direct fatherhood of creationism or the providentially mediated fatherhood of traducianism, establishes that every human soul stands in a parental relationship to God that is more intimate and more constitutive than the relationship it stands in to its earthly parents. Ecclesiastes 12:7's declaration that "the spirit will return to God who gave it", whether or not the giving was immediate divine creation or divinely ordained natural transmission, establishes that every human spirit belongs ultimately to God, is kept ultimately by God, and returns ultimately to God at the moment of death.

These affirmations are the theological substance that both positions share, and they are the affirmations that produce the pastoral posture that the doctrine of the soul's origin is designed to cultivate in the believer: the posture of the creature who knows that his soul is not his own possession, that it did not originate in the chance configuration of natural processes, and that it will not dissolve into nothingness at the end of mortal life, but that it was given to him by the God who knew him before he was formed, who formed the spirit within him with the same creative care with which He stretched out the heavens and laid the foundation of the earth, and who will one day receive it back when the dust returns to the earth as it was. This is the doxological conclusion of the doctrine of the soul's origin, and it is a conclusion that both creationists and traducianists can reach together, even as they hold their convictions about the mechanism of the origin with the intellectual honesty and the theological humility that the quality of the evidence requires. "O Lord, You have searched me and known me" (Psalm 139:1, NASB 1995). The God who formed the spirit within each person knows that person, from before the first moment of his existence to the last, and beyond.

“For thus says the high and exalted One who lives forever, whose name is Holy ... I will not accuse forever ... For the spirit would grow faint before Me, and the breath of those whom I have made.”

Isaiah 57:15–16, NASB 1995

Theological Terms and Definitions

Term	Definition
Creationism (Soul)	The position that God directly and immediately creates a new individual soul for each human being at or near the moment of conception. On this account, the soul does not derive from the parents through natural generation but is the immediate creation of God, placed in the body that is itself generated through natural processes. Defended by Zechariah 12:1 (“forms the spirit of man within him”), Hebrews 12:9 (“Father of spirits”), Isaiah 57:16 (“the breath of those whom I have made”), and Ecclesiastes 12:7 (“the spirit will return to God who gave it”). Affirmed by Turretin, Hodge, Berkhof, and the majority of the Reformed tradition.
Traducianism	The position that the soul, like the body, is transmitted from parents to children through the ordinary process of natural generation. On this account, all human souls derive ultimately from the soul of Adam, just as all human bodies derive ultimately from the body formed from the dust of the ground. The primary theological strength of traducianism is its natural account of the transmission of original sin: if the soul is transmitted through natural generation, the corruption of the original soul propagates through the human race with the soul itself. Affirmed by Tertullian in the patristic period and by W. G. T. Shedd and Augustus Strong in the Reformed tradition.
Zechariah 12:1	The primary creationist proof text: “Thus declares the Lord who stretches out the heavens, lays the foundation of the earth, and forms (יוצר, <i>yotzer</i>) the spirit of man within him.” The parallelism of the verse presents the forming of the spirit as a direct divine act parallel to the cosmological acts of creation, and the use of the same verbal root as Genesis 2:7’s <i>yatsar</i> suggests the same direct divine formation of the spirit as was applied to Adam’s body. Creationists argue that the verse most naturally supports the immediate divine creation of each individual soul.
Hebrews 12:9	The New Testament’s most direct designation of God as “the Father of spirits” (<i>ton patera ton pneumaton</i>), contrasting with earthly fathers who discipline the body. Creationists argue that the distinction between the earthly fathers of bodies and the heavenly Father of spirits most naturally implies that God stands in a direct parental, that is, creative, relationship to each individual spirit, a relationship not mediated through natural generation. Traducianists argue that the verse establishes God’s providential authority over spirits without specifying the mechanism of their origin.
Hebrews 7:9–10	The traducianist’s primary proof text for the seminal presence of descendants in their ancestors: “And, so to speak, through Abraham even Levi ... paid tithes, for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him.” The traducianist argues that Levi’s real personal presence in Abraham’s loins provides a biblical category for the seminal presence of the entire human race in Adam, and for the transmission of both personal identity and inherited corruption through natural generation. Creationists argue that the passage is about federal representation in the argument for Melchizedek’s priestly superiority, not about the mechanism of the soul’s transmission.
Seminal Presence	The traducianist’s concept for the real personal presence of descendants in their ancestors through the natural chain of generation. On this account, all human beings were seminally present in Adam at the time of the fall, which is why they

	genuinely participate in Adam's transgression and genuinely inherit the corruption it produced, rather than merely being forensically reckoned as having participated. The concept of seminal presence is derived from Hebrews 7:9–10's account of Levi being "in the loins" of Abraham and is used by traducianists to ground both the realism of original sin's transmission and the justice of the human race's condemnation in Adam.
Federal Imputation	The doctrine that Adam's guilt is reckoned (imputed) to all his descendants by divine decree on the basis of his representative (federal) headship, rather than by virtue of their personal participation in his act. Federal imputation is the mechanism by which creationists typically account for the transmission of original guilt: even if the soul is not transmitted through natural generation, the guilt of Adam's transgression is imputed to every soul on the basis of Adam's covenantal representation. The traducianist argues that federal imputation alone does not fully account for the inherited corruption of nature (as distinct from imputed guilt), which requires the additional mechanism of natural transmission.
Nishmat Chayyim	Hebrew: "breath of life" (נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים). The divine breath that God breathed into Adam in Genesis 2:7, constituting him as a living being (nephesh chayyah). The creationist appeals to the nishmat imagery in Isaiah 57:16 ("the breath [nishmat] of those whom I have made") to argue that God's direct breathing of the nishmat into Adam was paradigmatic of His creative involvement in constituting each individual human soul. The traducianist appeals to the singularity of the Genesis 2:7 event, God breathed into Adam alone, not into each subsequent human being, to argue that all subsequent souls derive from Adam's soul rather than from fresh divine breath.
Ars Moriendi	Latin for "the art of dying well." The tradition of pastoral preparation for death, practiced in the medieval and Reformation church, that sought to equip Christians to face death with theological understanding, spiritual preparation, and personal courage. The doctrine of the soul's origin is relevant to the ars moriendi because it bears on the confidence with which the believer can face death: the knowledge that the soul was created by God (creationism) or given life through divine sovereign sustenance (traducianism) grounds the conviction that the soul belongs to God and will be held safely by Him through the intermediate state and into the resurrection.
Theological Humility	The intellectual and spiritual posture of holding theological convictions with appropriate confidence while acknowledging the genuine limits of human understanding, the genuine weight of evidence that does not clearly favor one's position, and the genuine possibility that other careful interpreters of Scripture may reach different conclusions for reasons that are exegetically and theologically respectable. Theological humility does not require skepticism about doctrines that the Scriptures address clearly; it requires the honest acknowledgment, in the case of doctrines that the Scriptures address less clearly, that the tradition's inability to settle a question after sustained engagement is itself a form of hermeneutical data.

Practical Application

A. *For the Mind: What Must We Believe?*

We must believe the set of convictions that both creationists and traducianists affirm without reservation: every human soul is created by God; every human soul belongs to God; every human soul is accountable to God; and every human soul is the object of God's sovereign knowledge, love, and providential care from the first moment of its existence. These convictions are not peripheral conclusions drawn from the debate; they are the theological substance of the doctrine of the soul's origin that the Scriptures consistently and clearly affirm, regardless of the mechanism through which each individual soul comes to exist. The debate between creationism and traducianism is a debate about the mechanism; the affirmations above are not in dispute.

Beyond these shared affirmations, this series holds the creationist position as the more scripturally supported conclusion, following the exegetical judgment of Turretin, Hodge, and Berkhof. The four creationist proof texts, Zechariah 12:1, Hebrews 12:9, Isaiah 57:16, and Ecclesiastes 12:7, more directly establish the divine creation of each individual soul than the traducianist's texts establish the natural transmission of souls. The creationist's difficulty with original sin's transmission is genuine and must be acknowledged honestly, but it does not override the more direct biblical evidence. The student who holds this position should hold it with the intellectual confidence that careful exegesis warrants and with the humble acknowledgment that the debate is not settled beyond the capacity of careful interpreters to reach different conclusions.

B. *For the Heart: What Must We Feel and Desire?*

Let the doctrine of the soul's divine origin, whatever the mechanism through which it is brought about, produce in you the specific quality of creaturely reverence that Psalm 139 describes: the awe of the creature who knows that the God who searches him and knows him ("O Lord, You have searched me and known me," v. 1) is the same God who formed his inward parts and wove him in his mother's womb (v. 13), and who therefore knows him from within, from the beginning, with an intimacy that no creaturely relationship can match or replace. The soul's divine origin is not a doctrine about the past; it is a doctrine about the present relationship between the soul and its Maker, and the appropriate present response to that relationship is not merely intellectual assent but the specific quality of reverent, trusting, worshipful dependence that belongs to the creature who knows it is held by the One who made it.

Desire also the quality of pastoral sensitivity to others that the doctrine of the soul's divine origin demands. Every person you encounter, in the congregation, in the community, in the hospital, in the prison, in the nursing home, has a soul whose ultimate Author is the God who stretches out the heavens and lays the foundations of the earth. The forming of that soul, whether by immediate divine creation or by divinely governed natural transmission, was an act of divine attention and divine care directed at this specific person, for this specific existence, in this specific life. The pastoral care of souls is not merely the management of people's problems; it is the stewardship of the handiwork of the One who formed each spirit within each person.

C. *For the Hands: What Must We Do?*

- Read Zechariah 12:1, Hebrews 12:9, Isaiah 57:16, and Ecclesiastes 12:7 side by side, attending to what each text specifically says about God's relationship to the individual human spirit. For each text, ask: does this verse most naturally support the creationist claim that God directly creates each individual soul, or is it compatible with the traducianist claim that God creates the soul mediately through natural generation? Identify the specific exegetical features of each text that bear most directly on this question and write a brief paragraph summarizing your assessment of each.
- Read Romans 5:12–21 with the creationism/traducianism debate specifically in view. Which mechanism of original sin's transmission, the creationist's account of imputation-plus-body-contact or the traducianist's

account of natural soul-transmission, does the passage most naturally support? Does Paul's argument require either position specifically, or is it compatible with both? What does your reading of the passage suggest about the relative merits of the two positions' accounts of original sin's transmission?

- **Read Louis Berkhof's Systematic Theology, the section on the origin of the soul.** Berkhof's treatment is among the most careful and most balanced in the Reformed tradition, presenting both positions with genuine fairness and arriving at a creationist conclusion while honestly acknowledging the traducianist's strongest objection. Reading his treatment alongside W. G. T. Shedd's defense of traducianism in Dogmatic Theology will give the student the most thorough exposure to both sides of the debate that the Reformed tradition has produced.
- Identify one specific pastoral situation in which the doctrine of the soul's origin bears directly on the care you offer: a conversation with a grieving parent whose child died in infancy, a counseling session with a person questioning whether his soul has worth and significance, a deathbed visit with a person facing the dissolution of the body. For each situation, identify the specific convictions about the soul's divine origin, shared by both creationists and traducianists, that are most directly applicable, and commit to holding those convictions with enough clarity that they can function as genuine pastoral resources rather than theoretical doctrines.
- Practice the theological humility that this lesson recommends in a specific context where you hold a theological conviction that is genuinely contested among careful interpreters of Scripture. It may be the creationism/traducianism debate itself, or another question on which the tradition is divided. Write out your own position and the reasons for it; then write out the strongest form of the opposing position and the reasons for it; and then write a brief statement of the appropriate level of confidence with which you believe your position should be held. The exercise of articulating both positions carefully and of calibrating your confidence appropriately is the practical discipline of theological humility.

Study and Discussion Questions

Opening Question

- Before working through this lesson, had you ever considered the question of where each individual soul comes from? If so, which position were you aware of, and why? If not, does the question strike you as genuinely important or as an exercise in theological speculation beyond what is necessary or edifying? Has the lesson changed your assessment of the question's importance?

Observation Questions (What Do the Texts Say?)

- Read Zechariah 12:1 in its full prophetic context (Zechariah 12:1–14). What is the primary subject of the oracle, and what function does the description of God as the One who “forms the spirit of man within him” serve in the larger passage? Does the context suggest that the verse is primarily intended as a statement about the mechanism of individual soul-creation, or as a statement about God’s comprehensive sovereign power over all things, including the human spirit? How does the answer to this contextual question affect the verse’s weight as a creationist proof text?
- Read Hebrews 12:4–11 in full. What is the primary argument of the passage, and how does the designation of God as “the Father of spirits” (v. 9) function within that argument? Is the contrast between earthly fathers and the Father of spirits primarily about the mechanism of the soul’s origin, or primarily about the authority and the character of the discipline each administers? How does the answer to this question affect the verse’s weight as a creationist proof text?
- Read Hebrews 7:1–10 in full. What is the primary argument of the passage about Melchizedek and the superiority of his priesthood to the Levitical priesthood? What function does the claim that Levi “was still in the loins of his father” (v. 10) serve in that argument? Is it more naturally read as an ontological claim about Levi’s actual personal presence in Abraham, or as a federal/representative claim about Levi’s participation in Abraham’s covenant relationship? How does the answer affect the verse’s weight as a traducianist proof text?
- Read Romans 5:12–21 with specific attention to the mechanism by which condemnation spreads from Adam to “all men” (v. 12). Does Paul explicitly identify the mechanism as (a) the natural transmission of a corrupted soul, (b) the federal imputation of Adam’s guilt, or (c) both? What does the phrase “because all sinned” in verse 12 contribute to the question of whether Paul envisions a real seminal participation in Adam’s sin or a federal reckoning of it? Which mechanism does the passage most naturally presuppose?
- Read Psalm 51:5 (“Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me”) and Psalm 139:13–16 side by side. How do the two passages together illuminate the question of the soul’s origin and its relationship to original sin? Does Psalm 51:5 support the traducianist’s claim that the soul is transmitted through natural generation along with the corruption of sin, or is it compatible with the creationist’s claim that the soul is created pure but corrupted through union with the body? How do both passages bear on the question of when each individual comes to exist as a full person before God?

Interpretation Questions (What Does It Mean?)

- The lesson identifies the creationist’s primary difficulty as the transmission of original sin: if God creates each soul directly and purely, how does it become corrupted? The most common creationist response is that the soul becomes corrupted through its union with the corrupt body. How satisfying do you find this response? Does it adequately account for the Scriptures’ consistent picture of sin as rooted in the soul (the heart, the will, the affections) rather than merely in the body? Or does the response risk compromising the holistic character of the fall’s damage to the whole person?
- The lesson identifies the traducianist’s primary difficulty as the philosophical problem of transmission: how can an immaterial substance be transmitted through a biological process? The traducianist’s response appeals to mystery. How satisfying do you find this response? Is it a legitimate appeal to genuine theological

mystery, or is it an evasion of a genuine philosophical problem? What additional resources, theological, philosophical, or biblical, might a traducianist employ to strengthen the response?

- The lesson notes that the traducianist faces a particular difficulty with the Incarnation: if the soul is transmitted through natural generation from Adam, how was Christ's human soul preserved from the corruption of original sin? Evaluate the traducianist's typical response (the supernatural intervention of the Holy Spirit at conception prevented the corruption). Is this response exegetically grounded? Does it bring traducianism partially into alignment with creationism in the specific case of the Incarnation? And if so, what does that suggest about the relative merits of the two positions?
- The lesson recommends creationism as the more scripturally supported position, following the judgment of Turretin, Hodge, and Berkhof, while acknowledging the genuine force of the traducianist's argument about original sin. Do you agree with this assessment? Which position do you find more convincing after working through the lesson, and what specific exegetical or theological consideration is most responsible for your judgment? What would it take, what specific piece of evidence, what specific argument, to change your mind?
- The lesson closes by identifying a set of theological convictions shared by both creationists and traducianists, every soul created by, belonging to, and accountable to God, as more important for the pastoral life of the church than the mechanism of the soul's origin. Is this claim about relative importance correct? Can the mechanism question be entirely set aside in pastoral practice, or does the mechanism have specific pastoral implications that the shared convictions alone cannot supply? Identify any pastoral context in which the creationist/traducianist distinction would make a practical difference to the care offered.

Application Questions (What Does It Demand of Us?)

- The lesson recommends the intellectual posture of "reasoned conviction held with genuine humility" as the appropriate response to theological debates that the tradition has not resolved. Evaluate your own tendency in theological debate. Are you more inclined toward premature certainty, treating unresolved questions as settled beyond what the evidence warrants, or toward premature skepticism, treating genuinely well-supported positions as insufficiently certain because alternative positions exist? What specific disciplines of mind and character would most effectively address your particular tendency?
- The shared conviction that every soul belongs to God and will return to God at death is a conviction with specific implications for the pastoral ministry to the dying and the bereaved. How does the knowledge that the dying person's soul is in the hands of the One who formed it, whether that forming was immediate creation or divinely governed natural transmission, shape the specific content of the pastoral care you offer at the deathbed and at the graveside? What specific words, prayers, or Scripture texts most effectively communicate this conviction in the pastoral context?
- The creationist's conviction that God directly creates each individual soul supports a specific theological account of each person's unique worth and significance: you are not merely the product of natural processes but the direct, personal, specific creation of the living God, who formed your spirit within you with the same creative care with which He stretched out the heavens. How vividly does this conviction function in your own sense of your identity and worth before God? And how might it function more effectively, what devotional practices, what Scriptures, what patterns of prayer, would most help to translate this theological conviction from intellectual assent to lived personal reality?
- The traducianist's conviction about the organic unity of the human race in Adam, the real seminal presence of all humanity in the first man, has implications for the way we understand both our solidarity in sin and our solidarity in Christ. How does the conviction of organic unity with Adam and organic union with Christ (Ephesians 1:4: "He chose us in Him before the foundation of the world") shape the way you understand your own relationship to the community of faith, to the fallen human race, and to the redemptive work of the Last Adam? Does this solidarity language function as a living theological reality in your understanding of the church, or primarily as an abstract doctrinal category?

- The lesson closes with the observation that the debate about the soul's origin ultimately points to the God who is the Author of every soul, whose creative care for each individual spirit is the theological substance of the doctrine regardless of the mechanism. Spend time this week in Psalm 139 as a devotional exercise, reading it slowly and meditatively as an account of what it means to have a soul whose Maker is the God who searches and knows you from within, from the beginning, and to the end. What specific phrases of the Psalm most vividly express the theological substance that the doctrine of the soul's origin is designed to produce in the believer, and what specific acts of prayer, gratitude, or trust does that substance call for from you?

Prayer Focus

Open this twelfth lesson of the Anthropology series with a reading of Psalm 139:1–18, which was introduced in the previous lesson as the Old Testament’s most sustained account of God’s whole-person knowledge of the individual human creature. Read it now with specific attention to what it implies about the origin and the ownership of the soul. “O Lord, You have searched me and known me” (v. 1): the Creator of the soul knows His creature with the intimacy of the One who made it. “You formed my inward parts; You wove me in my mother’s womb” (v. 13): whether by immediate creation or by divinely governed natural formation, the One who speaks here claims the creative authorship of the creature’s innermost constitution. “My frame was not hidden from You, when I was made in secret” (v. 15): the soul’s formation, hidden from every human eye, was visible to and governed by the One who formed it. “How precious also are Your thoughts to me, O God! How vast is the sum of them!” (v. 17): the God who formed the soul within the creature has thoughts about that creature that exceed the creature’s capacity to number. Read the Psalm as a prayer of awe and gratitude for the God who is the Author of your soul, regardless of the mechanism through which that authorship was exercised.

Spend time in Trinitarian adoration, allowing the doctrine of the soul’s divine origin to deepen your worship. Begin with the Father, the Creator and Sustainer of every soul, the God who forms the spirit of man within him, who is the Father of spirits, who gives the breath of life to those whom He has made, and who receives the spirit back when the dust returns to the earth. Adore the Father whose creative and providential care for each individual soul is more intimate and more comprehensive than the creature can comprehend, and whose purposes for each soul He has made are purposes of knowledge, of love, and ultimately of glory. Move to the Son, the Last Adam, who assumed a genuine human soul in the Incarnation, a soul formed by the Holy Spirit’s overshadowing in the womb of Mary, without the corruption of original sin, so that the souls whose Author He was might be redeemed by the One who had become what they are. Adore the Son who, in taking on a human soul, demonstrated that the human soul was not too low a thing for the divine Son to assume, and who by assuming it declared the infinite worth of every soul formed in His image. Conclude with the Spirit, through whose overshadowing the soul of the incarnate Son was formed without sin, through whose regenerating work the fallen soul is renewed in the image of the Son, and whose indwelling presence in every believer is the first installment of the full redemption of the whole person, soul and body together, that the resurrection will complete.

Pray together for the congregation and for the individuals in its care in three specific directions. First, for the theological formation that the doctrine of the soul’s divine origin is designed to produce: the specific quality of creaturely reverence, self-offering, and trust in the God who formed each soul and who holds each soul in His care. Pray that this theological conviction would descend from the level of intellectual assent to the level of lived personal reality, that every member of the community would carry through the daily experience of embodied life the specific awareness of being a soul in the hands of the God who formed it. Second, for the pastoral care of those in the community who are facing the loss of other souls: the bereaved who have lost a spouse, a child, a parent, a friend. Pray that the conviction that the departed soul has returned to God who gave it, and that in the case of the believer, it has returned to the conscious presence of the Lord who redeemed it, would function as a genuine pastoral resource, grounding the grief of loss in the hope of reunion and the confidence of divine care. Third, for the theological humility that the unresolved character of the creationism/traducianism debate recommends: pray that the community would hold its theological convictions with the combination of reasoned confidence and genuine humility that becomes those who have received the Word of God as their final authority and who recognize the genuine limits of their ability to extract from that Word more than it clearly teaches.

“O Lord, You have searched me and known me. You know when I sit down and when I rise up; You understand my thought from afar.”

Psalm 139:1–2, NASB 1995

Key Texts: *Genesis 2:7; Psalm 51:5; 139:13–16; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Zechariah 12:1; Isaiah 57:15–16; Hebrews 7:9–10; 12:9; Romans 5:12–21*

Soli Deo Gloria
To God Alone Be the Glory

FAITHFUL TO THE WORD

Dr. Joshua Nichols

josh@faithfultotheword.com | faithfultotheword.com