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The theology of Albert Benjamin Simpson, founder of The Christian and Missionary Alliance and suggested proto-Pentecostal, was, if nothing else, thoroughly and deeply Christocentric, perhaps, too much so. Simpson’s “Fourfold Gospel” heralded that it is Christ who is the Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming King. Given Christ’s central role in his thought, it is no surprise that one finds within Simpson’s copious writings a thorough, while not a systemized, Christology. As part of this larger Christology, Simpson, following centuries of Christian theological tradition, was sure to champion the fullness of Christ’s humanity. Furthermore, he noted that the efficacy of Christ’s redeeming work was dependent on his full humanity. Yet, as has been shown previously, Simpson’s Christology is open to the charge of heresy in this very area.¹

Strictly speaking, Simpson’s Christology may be understood to be Apollinarian² and, therefore, inadequate. Like Apollinaris the Younger, Simpson asserted that while Jesus possessed a human physical body and a reasonable human soul, his spirit was essentially divine. Consequently, since Simpson’s Christ did not take on a human spirit and, therefore, did not take on the fullness of human being, it may be alleged that he is unable to be humanity’s representative and, consequently, its substitute. As the ancients said, what Christ did not (fully) assume, he could not save.³

The classic case against Apollinarianism (and, consequently, against Simpson), however, while based on a thoroughly and precisely

---

² Ironically, Simpson explicitly dismisses Apollinarianism. Yet, his definition of the classic heresy is inadequate. This may be the reason why he may not have recognized that his own Christology may be recognized as such. Albert B. Simpson, The Gospel of John, “Christ in the Bible,” vol. 15, (New York: Alliance Press, 1904), 43; Albert B. Simpson, “The Christ of Christmas,” Living Truths 4:12 (December 1904): 700.
defined Christology is also grounded upon a theological anthropology. This anthropology, however, is defined neither so thoroughly nor so precisely. While the Christology that developed during the third and fourth centuries was thorough and detailed, the anthropology that undergirded them was neither so thorough nor so detailed. While the Church Fathers may have held and expounded anthropologies particular to them, no ecumenical council ever ultimately defined, endorsed, or promoted a particular and explicit anthropology. Theological anthropology, it seems, in spite of its essential role in defining Christology, was simply assumed and without thorough, precise, or authoritative definition. Therefore, there is no ecumenically accepted, precise, and definitive Christian anthropology per se.

Consequently, in spite of what may seem to be evidence to the contrary, it may be that Simpson’s Christology is adequate should his anthropology (while also remaining true to Scripture), like his Christology, assert that humanity properly and essentially possesses a divine spirit. Such is, indeed, the case: Simpson asserted that humanity, in its proper and essential nature, is constituted of a physical body, a sensate soul, and a divine spirit. As a result, Simpson’s anthropology allows for a Christ who bears a divine spirit and who is, at the same time, fully human.

SIMPSON’S ANTHROPOLOGY

For Simpson, humanity, like the God it images, is essentially a complex being. While the one God exists in three persons (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), each human is one person, yet, at the same time, is constituted by three aspects: body, soul, and spirit. All three of these together “constitute the entire man.” According to Simpson, the possession of a spirit is both a quality unique to human being and the apex of humanity’s trichotomous nature. It is the spirit that enables humanity to sense

---

4 While there are occasions where Simpson speaks in a more dichotomous form, this is usually done so in a meristic way, referring to the totality of human being and not identifying the constituent parts of humanity per se.

5 Simpson, *Genesis and Exodus*, 44. These three together provide a “shadow” of the Trinity. Simpson, *Genesis and Exodus*, 45.
other spiritual beings, to comprehend and obey spiritual truth, and, especially, to be cognizant of and to relate intimately with God who spirit. Since communion with God is the very purpose for which humanity was created, the proper operation of the spirit is essential to proper human being.

Rather than being common, however, Simpson contended that this essential form of humanity is rare; indeed, it is found only in three instances in human history: in creation, in human redemption, and in the Incarnation.

IN CREATION

First, arguing from each of Genesis 1 and 2, Simpson noted that humanity’s initial reception of its spirit occurred as a distinct act of creation. In Genesis 1:27, God announced that humanity is to be made in “our image.” Simpson proposed that, while it implies more, this creation of humanity in the image of God connotes humanity’s having been created as a kind of trinity itself—in its case, a being constituted of body, soul, and spirit. All three aspects together and operating properly result in essential human being and the reflection of the imago dei.

Yet, this is not the whole story. Simpson asserted that Genesis 2 goes beyond the more general description of Genesis 1, describing in greater detail how humanity was not only created a triune being but,

---


more specifically, was created a spiritual being. According to Simpson, both the human body and the human soul are products that God fashioned from the dust of the earth.\textsuperscript{10} As such, they are part of and related to the natural order. The reception of the spirit, however, is distinct from the creation of the body and soul in at least two ways. First, it is distinct in time. The body and soul were created in one discrete act and the spirit was received in a second act subsequent to the first. Second, and more importantly, the two works are distinct in the means employed. Beyond the creative act described in Genesis 1, the reception of the spirit is not the result of divine fiat alone.\textsuperscript{11} In contrast to the creation of the body and soul, the spirit is not received by the divine forming of pre-existent materials. Rather, the spirit is received from the far more intimate work of “God’s direct inbreathing”\textsuperscript{12} into humanity. The spirit’s origin is, thus, divine and not, of a kind, natural. This inspiration of the human spirit is, undoubtedly, part of the larger work of human creation. Yet, it is, at the same time, distinct from the rest of human creation in time, in means, and even in its nature.

For Simpson, that which animates humanity, that which makes it a “living soul,” is neither simply God’s activation of a potentiality inherent to human being nor is it merely the impartation of some object called “life.” Rather, that which was communicated to Adam was nothing less than the gracious impartation of “God’s own life.”\textsuperscript{13} It is “the imparting to man of the Divine spirit, the very life of God Himself.”\textsuperscript{14} It is “the inbreathing of God’s life.”\textsuperscript{15} It is not that God’s action of in-breathing merely jump-started within humanity some kind of mechanical action inherent to human construction. Rather, human life is the consequence of the overflowing life of God within humanity.\textsuperscript{16} It is this

\begin{enumerate}
\item Simpson, \textit{Genesis and Exodus}, 42.
\item While Simpson does use the idea of divine “fiat” to describe this work, it is not something accomplished by the objective proclamation of God alone. Simpson, \textit{Genesis and Exodus}, 42.
\item Albert B. Simpson, “The Breath of God,” 269.
\item Simpson, \textit{Genesis and Exodus}, 44.
\item “Our life came not from the ground, nor from the physical forces and functions, but from the imparting of the human [spirit] through God’s direct inbreathing...the very
\end{enumerate}
breathing, the “breath of lives,” that both animates humanity’s natural being and provides the content of its spiritual existence. The human spirit, then, is divine in nature.

Simpson believed that nothing else in all of creation was created in this fashion nor, consequently, does anything else share in the very life of God. Therefore, humanity, as created, exists on “a higher plane of existence” and constitutes “a higher order of beings” than the balance of creation. The account of Genesis 2 describes not only the conclusion of the divine work of creation, it also describes the epitome of God’s creative work, what Simpson called, the “last and crowning stage of the work of creation” and “the climax and crown of the material universe.”

Simpson noted that this divine spirit, while essential to the nature of humanity, is at the same time, distinct from “natural” humanity. It is “the addition to the man, [it is that] which constitutes his higher character and heavenly power.” This spirit is, on the one hand, a natural constituent of human being; it is, on the other hand, anything but natural. Thus, humanity is, in its very essence, a hybrid. In both its physical and “psychical” (soul) aspects, it is like the rest of the created order. Yet, humanity also bears a spiritual nature; a nature distinct from that of the rest of creation. It is in this nature that humanity, even if to a limited degree, actually “partakes of the divine nature.” In this h-


17 Simpson asserted that the plurality found in this phrase—“breath of lives”—“implies that man received more than one kind of life” in that moment. It received both “a rational and spiritual subsistence.” Simpson, Genesis and Exodus, 44.


bridity, Simpson suggested that humanity is “[the] Microcosm”\(^{23}\) of all that exists—that is, its relates to both the Creator and the creature—and shares in “the strength of the iron, but also, alas, the weakness of the clay.”\(^{24}\)

**AT THE FALL**

The divine spirit in humanity, however, was not to remain unscathed. Remaining true to his Presbyterian upbringing and ordination, Simpson noted that the Fall maligned the whole of the human constitution. So devastating was sin’s deleterious effects that the spirit became, at least, monstrously maligned. It was, in Simpson’s words “degraded, defiled, and buried.”\(^{25}\) Consequently, the effects of sin have left humanity nothing more than a “splendid brute”\(^{26}\) with a “lingering glory,”\(^{27}\) a being with a “lost divinity.”\(^{28}\) The Fall left the humanity’s spiritual capacities greatly truncated, at best.\(^{29}\) The spirit was now “fallen, the conscience . . . deranged, the will . . . enfeebled and wrongly directed, and our highest aspirations and intuitions . . . under the influence of wicked spirits and unholy motives.”\(^{30}\)

Simpson taught that the fall of the human spirit led to the illegitimate ascendance of the “psychical” nature to a place of control. The “psychical” nature, including the rational aspect of human being, however, was neither designed nor properly equipped to direct humanity. While the soul’s properties and abilities are essential to human thriving,

\(^{23}\) Simpson, *Genesis and Exodus*, 42.


they were intended to be supervised by the human spirit. Complicating the issue further is the fact that this “psychical” nature, while still operative, was also maligned in the Fall. While it continued to function in its own realm, it could not do even that as it ought. While it continued to function, it could not do so properly.

Practically, the maligning of the spirit left humanity in want of spiritual light and without spiritual organs. Without the proper operation of this spirit, humanity was, at the very least, enfeebled in its ability to fulfill its nature and calling. That is, the degradation of its spirit left humanity unable to recognize God. Simpson wrote, “We must have the mind of God, the Spirit of God, the nature of God, to know God and things divine.” So thorough was its injury that the things of God now appear to be foolishness. Most tragically, humanity is now unable to do what was primary to its very creation—to commune with the One who is spirit. Without the proper operation of the spirit, humanity was no longer the imago dei—at least not as fully as it once had been. Without the proper and complete operation of the spirit, humanity was, in effect, alienated both from its true self and from its God. The ruin of the spirit left humanity, as it were, subhuman.

RENEWED AT CONVERSION

The good news, according to Simpson, however, is that God has not abandoned the human spirit to this state of degradation without hope of restoration. Through the work of the Holy Spirit, the human spirit

---

31 According to Simpson, the spirit is “the predominant faculty and force of the Christian life, dominating the mind as the mind dominates the body.” Albert B. Simpson, “What is Christianity?” The Christian and Missionary Alliance 24:23 (June 17, 1905): 374; “The true life is where the body and soul are under the control of the spirit, and the spirit is under control of the Holy Ghost, the indwelling Spirit and Life of God.” Simpson, “The Breath of God,” 271.
33 Simpson, “What is Christianity?” 382.
34 The psychical man “cannot perceive or receive the things of the Spirit of God; indeed, they are foolishness to him. He has not the capacity to understand them.” Albert B. Simpson, “Teaching of the Church,” The Christian and Missionary Alliance 19:23 (December 1, 1897): 538.
may be revived and repaired, restoring humanity to the image of God\textsuperscript{36} and returning the spirit to its place as the controlling aspect of human being. Yet, according to Simpson, this work is more than merely restorative or merely revitalizing. While clearly similar to the work of God at creation, in this subsequent instance, the Holy Spirit actually indwells humanity and, in effect, becomes a further addition to natural humanity. The purpose of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is not only to commune with it, but to further guide and empower the human spirit in its responsibilities.\textsuperscript{37}

By this exceedingly intimate indwelling of the One who is God Simpson argued that humanity is consequently taken up to an even greater level of participation in the divine nature than it experienced in the Garden. For Simpson, the mere restoration of humanity to even the splendour of its prelapsarian state would be far too meagre a result for the magnitude of the sacrifice of Christ.\textsuperscript{38} This new level of existence, and not humanity even as originally created, becomes the zenith of creation. Simpson noted that while humanity’s creation was the “crowning stage of the work of creation,”\textsuperscript{39} and while it was originally created “a little lower than the angels,”\textsuperscript{40} Holy Spirit-indwelt humanity consequently “has been raised above the rank of angels to partake of the very nature of God, to be a joint-heir with the Son of God and to share eternally the throne of [its] Creator and that attribute of the eternal Son.”\textsuperscript{41}

\textsuperscript{36} Simpson, Genesis and Exodus, 46.
\textsuperscript{37} Simpson, “The Breath of God,” 271. Regrettably, confusion arises from Simpson’s teaching at this point. Simpson is unclear regarding the exact nature of what, or who, was inspirited at the creation of humanity. While it is clear that Simpson asserts that the spirit that was received was of divine origin and nature, it is less clear whether this was the Spirit of God or the reception of something else. I would contend, however, for the latter. This is because of Simpson’s teaching regarding what happens in humanity’s redemption. In Simpson’s understanding, redeemed humanity, because it is indwelt by the Holy Spirit, is capable of far more than even the inspirited, prelapsarian Adam.
\textsuperscript{41} Simpson, “Grace Abounding,” 167. In addition, he is “united with God and [possesses] in the depths of his being the very spirit and nature of the eternal Jehovah.”
It is this form of humanity, Simpson said, that may be truly and accurately called the sons of God.\footnote{Albert B. Simpson, “The Names of Christ’s People,” The Christian Alliance 4:6 (February 7, 1890): 82.} This existence, which Simpson would argue was God’s ultimate intent for humanity all along, is “an entirely different sphere”\footnote{Albert B. Simpson, “Ishmael and Isaac, or the Death of Self,” The Christian Alliance and Foreign Missionary Weekly 5:8 (August 29, 1890): 118.} of being than anything in the created order had heretofore experienced.

For Simpson, the indwelling of the Spirit results in far more than merely a restoration to the Adamic situation, even that of the unfallen Adam.\footnote{In fact, Simpson asserts that the spirit that is restored by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is “incapable of sin.” Albert B. Simpson, “The Flesh and the Spirit,” The Word, Work, and World 3:5 & 6 (May/June 1883): 74. In another instance, Simpson uses the term “infallible” to describe this sanctifying work’s potential. Simpson, Genesis and Exodus, 49.} That condition, he believed, remained liable to and, perhaps, even destined to fall.\footnote{Albert B. Simpson, “Christ, Our Surety,” The Christian and Missionary Weekly 6:23 (June 5, 1891): 355.} The restored, uplifted, and Spirit-indwelt humanity, however, was now capable of holiness.\footnote{Albert B. Simpson, “Ishmael and Isaac, or the Death of Self,” The Christian Alliance and Foreign Missionary Weekly 5:8 (August 29, 1890): 118.} Practically speaking, Simpson believed that the renovative work and personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit not only restores those human spiritual capacities and abilities necessary for humanity to commune with God, it enables humanity to do so to the extent that was God’s intent all along.\footnote{Simpson, “The Breath of God,” 270.}
IN THE INCARNATION

The third instance of the divine-inspirited humanity is the person of Jesus Christ. Simpson asserted that in the Incarnation we do not have one who merely resembles humanity, even if remarkably so. Rather, in Jesus we have someone who was fully human, of “the very same humanity with us.” Simpson calls him, variously, the “true man,” “the true and perfect man,” and the “real man.” Jesus is, Simpson said, “as human as we.” This thorough identification with humanity means that Christ bears the full extent of the humanity’s trichotomous nature; a sensate body, a reasonable soul, and a divine spirit. All that essentially constitutes humanity also essentially constitutes the Incarnate Christ. What humanity is, Christ is. He has taken on the fullness of essential human nature, without omission.

Simpson was clear, and repeatedly so, that Christ’s spirit was divine in nature. While a more in-depth analysis may be found in the previous article mentioned earlier, I will lay out the basic assertions again here. First, in describing the nature of Christ’s spirit, Simpson

---

49 Simpson, Genesis and Exodus, 48.
50 Simpson, Genesis and Exodus, 45.
55 Some might argue that Jesus Christ did not bear the sinful human nature and, therefore, is not fully human. Of course, Simpson would reply that while fallen human nature is common to human nature, it is neither natural nor necessary to the human condition. While it may be common, it is not a necessary constituent of human being.
56 At times, Simpson refers, instead, to the “mind of Christ.” By this term, he did was not referring to the mere intellectual capacities of Christ. For Simpson, such would be part of the “psychical” operations of human being. That is, it was within the realm of the soul and, therefore, a natural capacity. Instead, when referring to the “mind of Christ,” Simpson was referring to that capacity and capability within Christ to recognize and comprehend things of a divine nature; e.g., Albert B. Simpson, “The Holy Spirit in the Epistles to the Corinthians,” 314. Simpson, “Teaching of the Church,” 538.
used terms that are clearly appropriate to God alone. He described Christ’s spirit, for instance, as “infinite”\(^{57}\) on one occasion and as “glorious”\(^{58}\) on another. Second, he regularly spoke about Christ’s capability and capacity to grasp the divine, even the deep things of God. For Simpson, not only does this capability and capacity fall within the pur-view of the spirit, the potency to be able to actually accomplish their scope is clearly divine. Only the divine has the ability to grasp the divine.\(^ {59}\)

For Simpson Christ’s thorough humanity is evident in a number of ways. First, it is seen “in His submission to the ordinance of baptism at the hands of John” and the attitude of utter dependence expressed in it.\(^ {60}\) Second, Christ’s thorough-going humanity is seen in his dependence upon the Holy Spirit for life and ministry.\(^ {61}\) Simpson asserted that Christ’s ability to resist the temptations in the wilderness (and consequently to that for that matter) came from the Holy Spirit.\(^ {62}\)

He noted that the power for Christ’s miracles and even that of his teaching was not based on the capacities or capabilities of his divine nature. Instead, the Incarnate Christ, the one who was thoroughly human, in order to fulfill the calling of God in his life, depended upon the Spirit to do so—a very human response.\(^ {63}\) While remaining fully divine, the Incarnate Christ possessed no inherent advantage over or power greater


\(^{60}\) “In no respect was the perfect humanity of Jesus Christ, and His entire identifica-
tion with our fallen human race more strikingly manifested that in His submission to


York: Christian Alliance, 1929), 55. Simpson also notes, “The fact that Jesus Christ
was tempted is the most emphatic proof of His actual humanity. It was in our nature
that He was tempted, for ‘God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any

York: Christian Alliance, 1929), 49; Simpson, \textit{The Gospel of Luke}, 65. Furthermore,
Simpson notes that Christ’s humanity is further evidenced by his dependence upon
the Scriptures for his authority and on his disciples to move his ministry forward.
than the rest of the human race. That is, as one who was thoroughly human, Christ made himself subject to all of the natural human limitations and experienced the full scope of human need. For the case to be otherwise would mean that Christ was only somewhat human. For Simpson, humanity was defined both by what it was able to do and, equally, by what it was not able to do.

For those acquainted with Simpson’s theology, it will come as no surprise that he notes that Jesus, rather than conforming to a model of humanity where another (whether actual or ideal) is the norm, serves as the norm for humanity Himself. It is Jesus, and not some other, who serves as the true measure of humanity. That is, Jesus is “our Pattern.”

For Simpson, Christ serves as the pattern for humanity in at least two ways; he is both the prototype and the archetype. First, as the prototype, Simpson argued that Christ, in the Incarnation, did not take on a humanity whose form was conceived in Eden. Rather, Simpson asserted that when humanity was formed in the Garden, it was fashioned according to the pattern of the Incarnate Christ. Humanity’s creation as a trichotomy, including its divine spirit, was based upon the pattern of the Incarnation rather than the other way around. As the archetype, Simpson asserted that the Incarnate Christ exemplifies what humanity ought to be. Therefore, the very “goal [of salvation] is the complete likeness of Christ.” Beyond this, Simpson also noted that it is, particularly, the resurrected Christ that serves as humanity’s archetype. Consequently, the full reception of this likeness can only be fully be received

---

64 Simpson understood this to be the consequence of the Son’s kenosis, whereby He “suspended the prerogative and resource of his deity, and took the place of a dependent man, drawing all His strength from God through faith and prayer.” Simpson, The Gospel of Luke, 39.
and manifest upon His return.\textsuperscript{68} In summary, for Simpson, “[Jesus] is not a man but He is the Man.”\textsuperscript{69}

**CONCLUSION**

A.B. Simpson, founder of The Christian and Missionary Alliance and key influencer of the early Pentecostal movement, taught that humans are, by nature, trichotomous beings, constituted of a physical body, a reasonable soul, and a divine spirit. Further, he taught that this trichotomous humanity, both by God’s design and His creative action possesses a spirit of both divine source and divine nature. While a sample of such humanity may not be readily observable due to the deleterious and universal effects of the Fall, Simpson argued that it does exist in three separate instances: in creation, in humanity’s final redemption, and in the Incarnation.

While contemporary humanity may neither possess nor manifest this divine spirit, at least readily and certainly not universally, such does not necessarily mean that the possession of a divine spirit is either contrary to or alien to human nature. Scripture does not describe postlapsarian humanity either as the norm for or as the epitome of proper human being. It is important to note that Simpson’s anthropology asserts that humanity’s prototype, its telos, and its archetype—those three leading candidates for serving as the norm for human nature—all bear this divine spirit. First, humanity as originally created (the prototype) possessed a divine spirit, received immediately from the work and person of God Himself. Second, humanity, redeemed from the deleterious effects of the Fall and restored to its true nature, has this divine spirit restored within it. Finally, Christ, who may be understood to be both humanity’s archetype and prototype, also bears a divine spirit.\textsuperscript{70}


\textsuperscript{70} For Simpson’s case, it does not matter whether Christ or the prelapsarian Adam is considered to be the human prototype, since Simpson asserts that both possess this divine spirit.
Simpson’s Christology challenge’s a phenomenological definition of humanity and does not align with the considered anthropology of many. For this reason it may be judged inadequate, and yet Simpson’s anthropology and Christology in some ways fit one another, at least as it pertains to natural human possession of a divine spirit. Therefore, at least, Simpson’s anthropology and his Christology bear an internal consistency. Therefore, given its own consistent interior logic, Simpson’s allegedly Apollinarian Christology is not at odds with his anthropology and, therefore, on that ground, is not inadequate. That is, in Simpson’s theology, the divine-spirit-bearing Christ is not alien to the human condition. Rather, he is the norm for the human condition and, therefore, is able to represent and redeem humanity. Simpson would argue that the concern of Gregory of Nanzianzus expressed above, that Christ bear the fullness of the nature of that which he seeks to redeem, has nothing to fear either from his Christology or his anthropology. If that is Gregory’s lone concern, then Simpson’s anthropology and, consequently, his Christology may be deemed orthodox.

The internal consistency of Simpson’s own theology, particularly his anthropology and his Christology, however, is insufficient cause to establish its orthodoxy. While internal consistency may be a test of orthodoxy, it is not a sufficient test. Error may be internally consistent and still be error. To show that Simpson’s anthropology and Christology are mutually consistent, as this paper set out to do, only proves the consistency of Simpson’s theology; it does not ensure its orthodoxy.

The theological task of Christology is to adequately and accurately describe Jesus in light of the revelation received regarding him. One of the primary roles of Christology is to answer the puzzle of the Incarnation. More particularly, Christology must seek to describe and to defend the Church’s creed that Jesus is both fully divine and fully human. To define and defend the full humanity of Christ, of course, means that the Church must also (if not previously) define its anthropology. As noted earlier, for various reasons, particularly to combat emerging heresies, the Church developed a thoroughly and precisely defined Christology. Interestingly, however, the anthropology upon which this Christology rests and upon which it is absolutely dependent was never as thoroughly nor as precisely defined. It seems as though anthropology was simply assumed.
The challenge in determining the adequacy of Simpson’s Christology—or anyone’s Christology for that matter—is, at least in part, in determining the orthodoxy of the anthropology upon which that Christology is built or, at least, to which it is inextricably related. Judging the adequacy and orthodoxy of any Christology cannot move forward with any confidence or any finality until a closely related question is answered, “What does it mean to be human?” While the Church has made pronouncements regarding Christology throughout history, judging various offerings as either orthodox or heterodox, it has most often done so without also explicitly defining its anthropology.

Yet, the church, especially those ecumenical councils charged with the task of tackling Christological heresies, seemed satisfied with an anthropology not explicitly defined. Not only that, it seemed satisfied to assume definitions of Christology based on (or at least related to) these undefined and assumed anthropologies. Consequently, in their adoption of Christological definitions and any attendant anathemas, they also adopted particular, even if assumed, anthropologies. While these may not have been as explicitly and precisely defined as they possibly could have been or, more to the point, as we may currently wish them to be, they are, in fact, still in effect as ecumenical pronouncements of the church, even if only implicitly so.

What does that, therefore, mean in regard to Simpson’s anthropology? It means that in spite of the fact that Simpson’s anthropology may be consistent with his Christology, and in spite of the fact that Simpson may be able to marshal biblical support for his position, and that there may be no explicit, ecumenical definitions with which Simpson’s anthropology may be in conflict, both his Christology and his anthropology are, at the very least, like that of Apollonaris, the Younger, over 1600 years ago, outside of the veil of established, though not explicated, orthodoxy.